

Canadian Commonwealth Flag

a second flag showing our devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty, one would have thought we would adopt the red ensign. But no, the government refuses and we are to take the flag of another country, the royal union flag. It is certainly a royal flag in the United Kingdom, but I ask what is the government afraid of? Is it afraid that if the red ensign were put alongside the one maple leaf flag it would still be the popular flag?

Further, if the red ensign was so unpopular in the province of Quebec—and we had scores and scores of members saying it should not fly in this country—how much more chance is there of the union jack flying in that area? I would say considerably less, and with justification because it is not the flag of Canada. I find it a little difficult to see why, by vote of this house we should take the flag of another country and make it our own. What right have we to do this?

Mr. Woolliams: It takes some doing.

Mr. Grafftey: It certainly does.

Mr. Pickersgill: Which way will you vote?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: May we have order in the house, and may I bring to the attention of the hon. member who has the floor that this time the noise is coming from his side of the house.

Mr. Lambert: It is a good exchange. I am competing against a lot, Mr. Speaker, but, as I was saying, what right have we to take over the flag of another country?

I think hon. members opposite should read the comments that appeared in part of the British press, in regard to this whole flag question. They were not very complimentary to Canada.

In résumé, Mr. Speaker, I say that if the government had real faith in its original flag proposal there would not have been any need for this second resolution which, after all, was brought in only after the flag committee had reversed itself. At the very beginning in the committee there was a unanimous resolution that the committee would discuss one flag and one flag only, but the time came when it swung around on this because someone had to deal with the second portion of the original resolution which had been divided by the Chair.

This is not our flag to take, although it is a very respectable, and I would say beautiful flag. But it will have no greater attraction, in fact even less attraction than the red ensign in many parts of the country. How can one distinguish between public occasions so as

to decide an occasion on which not to show loyalty and devotion to Her Majesty? On all public occasions, then, we will have the two flags flying. I was talking to a man who controls a large building on which there are two flagpoles. He said to me: Which flag am I to put at the front and which am I to put at the back; which is to have precedence, and when?

If the government had shown faith in its flag proposal it would have asked the house to adopt one flag; it would have left the other off. The second portion of the flag proposal is an admission of weakness in the premise for the first. I am sure that Her Majesty and all others concerned would have more respect for us had we said: All right, we will have one flag; we may have disagreed as to the nature of that one flag, but the disagreement has been resolved or is in the process of being resolved, and we will stick by it. I have just as close a connection with the United Kingdom and just as much devotion for Her Majesty as anyone in this house, but I think I show greater respect when I say we should not take over for our own use a flag which is the flag of Great Britain. I would hope that the flag of Canada would itself show devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty. We do not have to go about wearing that like a badge on our sleeves. This is something which flows from our actions, from our support and recognition of the crown as part of the parliament of Canada. In my opinion it was unnecessary to bring this second flag forward.

Those are the observations I wish to make on this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Guy Marcoux (Quebec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, to begin with I should like to state that I am not one of those who speak for hours on many occasions, and who, then, turns around and accuses others of making lengthy remarks. In fact I controlled myself for a while, but I found out that it was not to much avail.

We had before us the sixth report of the committee which was passed a few days ago.

We are considering now the seventh report about which, in my opinion, the members expressed their views in a rather substantial manner, especially since they had made them well known during the consideration of the sixth report. I believe that the best way to make one's opinion known, with regard to a committee report, is through a vote.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) stated a while ago that he was anxious to know what the Que-