

Inquiries of the Ministry

8. The committee received and discussed a motion that it submit to the House of Commons two reports as follows:

Report No. 6, being the report herein, dealing with the national flag and final report No. 7 dealing with a flag to symbolize Canadian membership in the commonwealth of nations and Canada's allegiance to the crown. This motion was carried by a vote of nine to five (9 to 5).

It was moved and seconded that the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag be now adopted. The motion was carried by a vote of ten to four (10 to 4).

Respectfully submitted,
H. M. Batten,
Chairman.

[*The Clerk Assistant proceeded to read the seventh and final report as follows:*]

The special committee on a Canadian flag has the honour to present the following as its seventh and final report.

Following its decision on the recommendation regarding a national flag for Canada, your committee then considered the question of a flag to symbolize Canada's membership in the commonwealth of nations and her allegiance to the crown.

It was moved "That the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to provide that the Canadian red ensign may continue to be flown as a symbol of Canada's membership in the commonwealth of nations and of her allegiance to the crown". An amendment was moved to substitute the words "royal union flag, generally known as the union jack" for the words "Canadian red ensign".

The amendment carried by a vote of seven yeas, two nays and five abstentions. The motion as amended then carried by a vote of eight yeas, one nay and five abstentions.

Your committee, therefore, recommends that the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to provide that the royal union flag, generally known as the union jack, may continue to be flown as a symbol of Canada's membership in the commonwealth of nations and of her allegiance to the crown.

It was moved and seconded that the seventh and final report of the special committee on a Canadian flag be now adopted. The motion was carried by a vote of eight yeas, one nay and five abstentions.

Respectfully submitted,
H. M. Batten,
Chairman.

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Léon Balcer (Three Rivers): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the leader of the house or the chairman of the flag committee when it is intended to move concurrence in the report that has just been presented to the house?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as leader of the government perhaps I could answer that question. It will be recalled, I think, that on September 10, when I reported to the house in regard to

the discussions held by the party leaders on the procedure to be followed in setting up the flag committee, I said at that time that once the flag committee had reported to the house I would invite the party leaders to meet me again and we would discuss the procedure to be followed in the light of the report. I have already invited the party leaders to meet me tomorrow morning. However, it is not convenient for one party leader to be here tomorrow, so I hope we will have the meeting on Monday morning.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION**PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED IN DEALING WITH AMENDMENT METHOD**

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question will not have to do with the flag committee or anything of that kind. We have had a full revelation from the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra; therefore no questions are necessary.

I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question in regard to the repatriation of the constitution. When the address is placed before the house to embody the proposed amendment, will the British North America Act in its present form be brought before the house and dealt with section by section, or how does the government intend to bring about the right of the parliament of Canada to deal with the amendment of its own constitution?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will be making a statement on this matter, or if I am not in my place the Minister of Justice will be making a statement very shortly on the procedure to be followed in this matter.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is related to the question just asked by the Leader of the Opposition, and it is likewise to the Prime Minister. Is there any difference between the proposed constitutional amendment agreed to by all the provinces with respect to the delegation of powers to the provinces and the proposal of the Conservative administration in 1960, which is generally called the Fulton formula?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, in so far as the delegation of federal powers to the provinces is concerned there is no difference.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.