

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Why?

**Mr. Pearson:** Certainly there have been no such memberships granted in the four years this government has been in office except membership of myself as Prime Minister of Canada, which I have always considered as a kind of honorary membership in the United Kingdom privy council.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** An honorary membership?

**Mr. Pearson:** There has been no recommendation made in those four years, and I do not anticipate we will be making recommendations of that kind in the immediate future.

## CANADIAN CENTENNIAL

REPRODUCTION OF COAT OF ARMS ON  
MEDALLION FOR PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION

On the orders of the day:

**Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State):** Mr. Speaker, a week ago the Leader of the Opposition raised a question as to the design of the coat of arms used on the centennial medallion, and characterized it as an emasculated neuter. The use of this particular design, I am now informed, is supported by leading authorities on heraldry. The revised edition of Boutell, for example, states that the shield of arms—and that is what appears on the medallion—constitutes the whole of a coat of arms. The rest of the design, not on the medallion, is considered additional heraldic material and not essential to the coat of arms itself.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. An explanation like this should be made on motions. I would ask that the house revert to motions, because a simple statement of the minister—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The answer by the Secretary of State appears to be commensurate with the question asked. Unless it is beyond the usual limits of answers I do not think we should revert to motions for that purpose.

**Miss LaMarsh:** Mr. Speaker, the government has received similar advice on the question from Mr. Alan Beddoe who, as the house knows, is a former heraldic adviser to the navy. I am sorry the right hon. gentleman is not anxious to have this answer—

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, this is exactly why we should revert to motions. I want the opportunity to answer this—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

23033—960½

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I do not think there should be a debate on this matter at the present time. Perhaps the Secretary of State would like to limit the reply as much as possible. I suspect that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition perhaps will have a supplementary question to ask.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker—

**Miss LaMarsh:** Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman should remember that this design was adopted by order in council and cabinet decision of September 5, 1957.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege because of a statement which is without foundation. The coat of arms of Canada was given at Buckingham Palace on November 21, 1921, in the twelfth year of the reign of George V. That is the basis on which the coat of arms was issued to the government of Canada.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order—

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, what has been introduced—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. We should attempt to have some order. My impression is that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition is rising on a question of privilege and will be stating that question of privilege.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** It will be very shortly stated. The document which was issued respecting the centennial medallion states:

The obverse or front side of the medallion (left), the Canadian coat of arms with the word 'Canada'—

That is not the Canadian coat of arms. It has been denuded to meet the Canadianization ideas of this government which is trying to separate everything—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Miss LaMarsh:** Mr. Speaker, on the same point of privilege I should like to read—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I wonder whether we should go further into the matter. I fully appreciate that the Secretary of State wishes to reply to the suggestion made by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition. However, the right hon. Leader of the Opposition rose on a question of privilege and I have to rule that there is no question of privilege. Having done this, I doubt whether the minister should pursue the question unless she has her own question of privilege.