

*Canadian Flag*

Mr. Sauriol concluded his editorial of June 2 by saying:

The union jack and God Save the Queen are not in England symbols restricted to the crown as such; they are the national flag and the national anthem of the United Kingdom. Mr. Pearson's proposals emphasize the British character of the crown in Canada. These traces of imperialism are bound to create deep uneasiness in the province of Quebec at the present time.

Not only in Quebec, but also in many other Canadian provinces.

At this point, I would like to say that we Quebecers would object just as much to a symbol representing France which is, in the final analysis, the country where we have our roots, whose soil has nurtured our own French Canadian roots—our forefathers came from France—but we would not accept a French symbol as an emblem for Canada. We want to be what we have always been, true Canadians who are determined to remain so, Canadians who want emblems and symbols meant especially for them and for nobody else in the whole wide world.

Then again, the editorial writer in *La Presse*, Mr. Guy Cormier, did not mince his words and put on kid gloves when he maintained, on June 3 of this year, that this political principle, "divide and rule", set down by one of the Prime Minister's predecessors, namely Mr. Mackenzie King, no longer applied nowadays.

Here are a few excerpts from that editorial:

Mr. Pearson, who went to Winnipeg to take the bull by the horns, will not try to come and sell the union jack in Quebec. When he came to Montreal last week, to attend the convention of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Prime Minister did not even refer to the matter. He knows how Quebec feels about the union jack.

He is trying to gain time, time being the best ingredient in which to dissolve a compromise.

But Mackenzie King's recipes are now worthless.

Mr. Speaker, it does not mean that we have no respect for the union jack. When the union jack is presented to Canada as the flag, the emblem of England, we agree, we acquiesce and we recognize it as a flag that advocated and spread the ideas of personality in the whole world, and we are prepared to respect it. But when an attempt is made to impose the union jack as a national emblem, we do not agree at all, not any more than we would agree for the emblem of France or for Frenchmen who would come to Canada and tell us what we should or should not do. We can decide for ourselves. The Prime Minister tried to gain time, because time is the ingredi-

ent which can best dissolve compromise. But Mackenzie King's recipes are no longer worth anything. No, Mr. Speaker, the recipes cherished by Mackenzie King are now worthless in Canada, in 1964, especially when the people of Quebec realize how they were exploited for years by politicians belonging to all the old parties.

The government had to retreat and capitulate. They took their time, letting the resolution simmer on the order paper for weeks.

And suddenly, we are faced with an intervention by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who, with references to support his argument, claimed it would be better to divide the original resolution. The right hon. Prime Minister contributed his patter, half one thing and half another, whereas Mr. Speaker's decision was perfectly in accord with the arguments and quotations put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

It is evident that the ruling made yesterday afternoon was not a spontaneous one, issuing from the debates which took place in this house before five o'clock, but that the whole thing had been orchestrated by a master hand.

Mr. Speaker, we appreciate your ruling, for it now allows us to study this question of a distinctive flag with all due objectivity and without running against contradictory factors which would have precluded us from voting yes or no on the original motion.

However, I shall not go so far as to say that we are entirely satisfied with the choice of a distinctive flag made by the government.

If, on the one hand, the government no longer forces us to vote for legislation which materializes and recalls our subordination to the crown of Great Britain, it nevertheless remains that the flag design bearing three red maple leaves is in itself of British and regal inspiration.

First of all, let us read the text of the resolution:

That the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to establish officially as the flag of Canada a flag embodying the emblem proclaimed by His Majesty King George V on November 21, 1921—three maple leaves conjoined on one stem—in the colours red and white then designated for Canada, the red leaves occupying a field of white.

Here is an admittance, Mr. Speaker. It is not an emblem chosen by the Canadian people in 1964. There is no question of an emblem selected by the Canadian government in 1964. But the emblem is that proclaimed by King George V in 1921. Besides, here is