

Business of the House

to submit some new, distinctive design and then, perhaps, the House of Commons should decide.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I only desire to say a few words on this matter. There can be no question but what there is a great deal of interest in Canada in the question of a distinctive Canadian flag. I think I can say also that there are a great many ideas as to what that flag should be. I know that there is hardly a week goes by that I do not receive letters on this matter and a number of designs. In the main, each one is different. All these people are sincere, and everyone seems to have a good, basic reason for suggesting his own design.

I believe that the committee which met in 1946, I believe it was, endeavoured to give serious thought to the entire question. Although I was not here at that time, I have read parts of the report and, basically, I thought that the committee had come up with a fairly good design and with very sound reasons for that design. However, I understand that for certain political reasons the entire matter was dropped. I am told that the report itself was actually never submitted to the House of Commons at all. Perhaps we would not be facing this issue at this moment if it had been submitted to the House of Commons.

I believe we have to realize that there are strong sentimental feelings connected with history and tradition mixed up in nearly everyone's mind when they think of a specific Canadian flag. I know that from the viewpoint of those who would like the fleur-de-lis there are good reasons for wanting that. From the viewpoint of those who want certain colours, there are good reasons for wanting them. From the viewpoint of those who want the union jack, there are excellent reasons for wanting it because of tradition and history. Because of the fact there is this great feeling, I believe that, although action along the lines suggested would be welcomed by the majority of the people of Canada, there has not been a condensation of thought on a reasonable and logical basis as to the design of the flag. I believe that evidence of this fact is seen in the answer given to a question by one of the ministers the other day to the effect that there are between 1,300 and 1,400 designs already on file.

Although we agree in principle with what is being suggested at the present time; although our own organization on a national

basis and provincially has passed resolutions in favour of a specific Canadian flag, we do think the hon. member has made a contribution in again focusing attention on this matter. I am certain that as a result of his action interest will continue to grow. I can only add my words to those of the previous speaker, that I think we should let it go a little while longer and that will pay off in dividends because it will enable the eventual discussion to be based upon a consolidation of thought, of sentiment and tradition. This will enable us to evolve a flag that is not based on a contest or a competition but on the opinion of the majority of the thinking people in Canada. This will enable us to work out a proper flag to fly over the men and women of this country in peace and in war, a flag that has meaning for the people who make up this country. We support this motion in principle and we think the member has done a good job in bringing it forward. We think that eventually the problem will be resolved to the satisfaction of all.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Pearson: Will the house leader tell us the business for Monday and Tuesday?

Mr. Green: Monday will be private members' day and on Tuesday we shall commence with item No. 5 on today's order paper, the Trans-Canada Highway Act resolution; then item No. 4, the Fisheries Improvements Loans Act resolution; then second reading of the bill to amend the Northwest Territories Act; then item No. 12, which went through today, the resolution concerning the National Defence Act and we will take up the bill on Tuesday; then item No. 2, the second reading of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority Act; then item No. 6, which was the National Housing Act resolution and which will be in the shape of a bill; then, the resolution concerning parliamentary secretaries and the resolution concerning the Federal-Provincial Tax-Sharing Arrangements Act. This will be the business on Tuesday and Wednesday. Thursday, by agreement, there is to be a debate on the motion to refer the estimates of external affairs to a standing committee. I am not sure yet about Friday, but on the following Monday there will be a supply motion.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.