

Business of the House

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Does the house give unanimous consent to allowing this bill to retain its position on the order paper?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): There is not unanimous consent. Before I declare the hour for the consideration of private members' business ended I should like to point out to the house that with regard to the bill we have been debating there is some doubt in the mind of the Chair as to whether the bill is in order. The Chair has not intervened, for the simple reason that the Chair was not of any definite decision, and neither was the matter raised by any hon. member who spoke in the debate. I bring this to the attention of the house because I would not want the house to use this debate, when there is some doubt in the mind of the Chair, as a precedent for another debate, when there was no doubt in the mind of the Chair.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, may I say a word on this matter before we leave the subject? I was quite prepared to debate this point if it were raised. I think hon. members will agree that the topic about which I spoke was the eligibility of veterans under the existing provisions. In other words, the money has been provided; the question is just those who are eligible to partake of that money. It has nothing to do with money matters, as far as I am concerned; this question is the eligibility of veterans to partake of money already provided by parliament.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at ten o'clock p.m. this day are as follows:

The hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), immigration; John Thomadakis, opportunity to obtain legal counsel: No. 2, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan), national defence, Halifax; dismissal of civilian cook: No. 3, the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), administration of justice; continuation of studies by F.L.Q. members in prison.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

[Mr. MacInnis.]

CANADIAN FLAG**OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN**

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Pearson, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker:

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 between vertical sections of blue on the edges of the flag.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, when the house adjourned at five o'clock I was saying that a great many Canadians who want to see Canada free at last from any colonial signs also want Canada to be recognized as a sovereign, independent and free nation.

If so, why did the Prime Minister, after indicating a clear track in Winnipeg, suddenly resort to a switch if not to please some fanatics still existing in our country, not only on one side but on both sides, because I have always considered that those who wanted to see Canada connected with foreign affairs as well as those who do not want to see anything but their own personal interest, are hindering national unity.

Throughout Canada, the press was critical of the government's action. I should like to quote an editorial which was published in *Le Devoir* and which was written by one of French Canada's most moderate newspapermen, a man who has no hallucinations, Mr. Paul Sauriol. This is what he had to say:

Dividing the resolution would make it possible for the government to get out of a mess. A resolution on a distinctive flag and on the anthem O Canada would surely be carried.

Here, I must congratulate Your Honour for the decision you took yesterday with respect to the resolution. Perhaps it would not have compromised national unity in the long run, because personally I do not feel that the flag issue can strengthen national unity in Canada. There are other factors which will help to strengthen Canadian unity and not just the adoption of a flag or a national anthem. But separate resolutions will help us to consider the matter objectively.

As for the resolution on the union jack and God Save the Queen, they are not essential to the election promise concerning those British symbols. In any case, separate resolutions would help to indicate the subordination of the old symbols to the new ones.