

Canadian Flag

other parties in my constituency, but I do not remember anything—

Mr. O'Keefe: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Pugh:—about a proposed change in the flag of—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. O'Keefe: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Pugh:—Canada which would indicate to the people—

Mr. O'Keefe: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have recognized the hon. member for St. John's East.

Mr. O'Keefe: Mr. Speaker, I am a little tired about being told—

Mr. Pugh: Why do you not sit down?

Mr. O'Keefe:—that we are throwing Canada's flag in the ash can. Perhaps the hon. member opposite would read order No. 44(B) where he will see that the Prime Minister's motion—

Mr. Churchill: What is your point of order?

Mr. O'Keefe:—is to the effect that the union jack may be continued to be flown as a symbol of Canadian membership in the commonwealth of nations and of Canada's allegiance to the crown. Surely that is not throwing Canada's flag in the ash can.

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Speaker, I have yet to be convinced that the United Kingdom flag, or the royal union flag is Canada's flag. I recognize and appreciate the tone of the hon. member's voice. He is obviously from Newfoundland, and I can understand his concern, as I understand the concern of the chairman of the committee, about the actions of the government in this regard. If he will ask the members of that committee, and no doubt that information has already leaked out, he may find out what changes were made in that resolution at the last meeting of the committee, and then perhaps he will be satisfied that what I am saying is correct. Perhaps the hon. member will study again the original resolution which was brought forward by the government. What did that resolution suggest? It referred to the red ensign, not to the Canadian red ensign, whereas now you are referring to the union jack. The union jack is certainly not the red ensign and is not Canada's flag. Please

do not try to confuse the issue. The hon. member from Newfoundland should be concerned because of the way this proposed flag was brought forward, and the second rate position into which the royal union flag has been placed, for certain obvious purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I did use the word "ash can". I will not use that word. The Canadian red ensign was turned down by the committee. I have explained this fact to the people of my riding, and that is one reason they demand a plebiscite. They feel they are now getting the real story of what took place at the committee meetings, and are beginning to understand that the report of that committee as it appears on the order paper does not give a clear picture of what took place.

The reason I recommend that three flags be presented to the people of Canada for a choice is that the people wish to have a say in which flag should be Canada's national flag. If the red ensign is turned down as the first choice, then the people will have made that choice. Had the efforts of the committee in arriving at its conclusion been represented accurately—

An hon. Member: Carried.

Mr. Pugh: If what we are presently discussing is carried, that will be marvellous.

After the red ensign was turned down in the committee by all members other than Conservative members, the Conservative members did their level best, as the members of that committee will testify, to produce a flag which would incorporate something symbolic of our past, such as the union jack and the fleur-de-lis. I do not agree with certain statements made by committee members who said that the fleur-de-lis could not form a part of a Canadian national flag because no French Canadian owed allegiance to royal France.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe that the member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Pugh) is entirely out of order. I would like to point out to the Chair that the Conservatives, who claim that this debate is important, at this moment only number 10 out of 95; and among those 10, one voted against the plebiscite, namely, the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer). When they claim that this debate is important and when only 10 are present in the house, it is evident that there is something wrong somewhere. Furthermore, they are always talking about something else than