

Mr. Speaker: Order. I take the liberty to remind the hon. member that he must limit his remarks to the urgency of debate as much as possible.

Mr. Caouette: It is precisely to explain the non-urgency of the debate, Mr. Speaker, that I am calling on your indulgence to tell you that, throughout the world, it is not the coat-of-arms of Canada which prevails but the maple leaf. That is what is recognized as the emblem of Canada.

Since the minister has told us that he will make a statement within a few days, I do not think that it is urgent to discuss the removal of the coat-of-arms of Canada on the old trucks of the Post Office Department which are seen in Ottawa.

• (3:00 p.m.)

[English]

Mr. Terence Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I think the arguments advanced by the Postmaster General give a clear indication of the urgency of this debate. This matter involves a question of the responsibility of government respecting one of the rights of parliament, or whether this government can tamper with whatever it likes without regard for the rights of this house.

The Postmaster General has said that he intends to make a statement about this matter. I suggest that the approval of parliament should have been obtained before the minister had the right to do what he has proposed. Apparently he felt he could tamper or do whatever he wanted without regard for his responsibility to the house. I suggest we debate this matter of urgency now, because it involves a question of the rights of parliament and the authority of the minister.

Mr. Speaker: I wish to thank hon. members for their enlightening remarks which have assisted the Chair in reaching a decision on the motion proposed by the right hon. Leader of the Official Opposition. On a number of previous occasions this type of motion has been moved under standing order 26, and members have been referred to citation 100 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, paragraphs 3 and 8. Paragraph 3 refers to the urgency of debate as being not necessarily the urgency of the matter which is being proposed for discussion. That paragraph reads as follows:

"Urgency" within this rule does not apply to the matter itself, but it means "urgency of debate", when the ordinary opportunities provided by the

23033-561

Announced Removal of Coat of Arms

rules of the house do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough and public interest demands that discussion take place immediately.

A portion of paragraph 8 of the same citation reads as follows:

What I think was contemplated, was an occurrence of some sudden emergency—

There are really two matters which have been raised by the statement of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition. The first was an alleged action either taken or to be taken by the Postmaster General and the second related to, to use the right hon. gentleman's own words, the general question of the alleged creeping republicanism.

As far as the first cause for complaint is concerned, the Postmaster General has said that he proposes to make a statement. I suggest it is rather difficult to discuss a situation before it has been made clear to the house and to the public by whatever statement the minister proposes to make. In respect of the second matter, and this is the general complaint raised by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition, it does not seem to me to be an occurrence of sudden emergency. To paraphrase the words of that right hon. gentleman, this is a long standing attitude of the government.

In view of what I have referred to I suggest to the right hon. Leader of the Opposition and hon. members of the house that there is no justification for adjourning the ordinary business of the house in order to proceed with a consideration of the matter brought to my attention by his motion.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I would not like this incident to be disposed of without replying to the suggestion that the Department of Labour or the minister by any action has voluntarily dropped the coat of arms from the *Labour Gazette*. Such is not the fact.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Apparently these gentlemen do not want a debate, they just want to explain. If explanations are to be made there is a time for them to be made. My point related to the reported action of the Postmaster General. If the Minister of Labour feels he has been particularly hurt by some of his colleague's actions, that is just too bad for him.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Surely the Chair should be allowed to hear what the