

not have said "the flag", for there is another flag, just as Canadian, with even more history behind it; a flag which symbolizes much to many Canadians, so much in fact that parliament in its wisdom chose, immediately after adopting the maple leaf flag, to enshrine this flag too as a flag of Canada and specifically as a symbol of the Commonwealth and monarchy.

In the explanatory note to the bill under discussion, the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Nelson) says that his act is designed "to emphasize the unity of the Canadian nation," and the preamble to the bill speaks of "the Canadian nation strong and indivisible under one flag."

It is my contention, Sir, that our very strength lies in the fact that we are a big enough, strong enough, indivisible enough land, one dominion united from sea to sea, that we do have two national flags in essence and in reality. One is the product of a recent parliament and bears no less love and no less respect than the other, an ancient and storied emblem, symbol of past ties which some hon. members despise but of which I, for one, am not ashamed.

Let us remember how young a country we are and yet how strong, rich and prosperous we have become over the few years of our existence as a dominion, when compared to Great Britain, France or China. Then there are all the other reasons why we should not forget our antecedents. I always like to remember, Mr. Speaker, the words found in that noble collection of the English language, the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, where in the "Prayer for All Sorts and Conditions of Men" the great Cramner wrote:

Guard from forgetfulness of Thee all those who are strong and prosperous.

I often think some hon. members would be all too ready to do this, to throw overboard all our past, all our traditions; in some cases they would substitute nothing, in others a mess of pottage. I submit this is the precise defect in the hon. member's bill. He would establish a national flag day, but only to honour one flag.

In the first place, I invite hon. members to consider just how many "days" we want. One of our strengths as a dominion, I think, is our avoidance of the razzle-dazzle nonsense in which the Americans sometimes indulge. We avoid this, partly because of our national character and partly due to another factor I shall mention in a moment. But it seems to me unfortunate, when the post office calendar ignores Victoria Day and Dominion Day—and that is the correct name, for certain hon. members' information—that the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour wants to set up another day.

What will be the cost of promoting it? Will children have another holiday? Will the mails cease to move, or move even more slowly than their accustomed snail's pace? Is this how the hon. member would honour our flag? Surely the honour due to a flag lies in its frequent display. No greater tribute can be paid to either of our two flags than the lump in the throat, the throbbing of the heart or the tear in the eye as we see them in the course of our normal rounds and duties and remember for what they stand and the brave men who died under them.

I know that certain hon. members of the NDP caucus, a party always ready to negate and yell down our cherished traditions in Canada—although I do not think their atti-

Canada Flag Day

tude was so obstreperous under the leadership of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas)—think that the Union Jack means nothing to Canada, and the maple leaf flag everything. But I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that any flag, including the Red Ensign, as the poet put it "dipped in the blood of fearless men", under which generations of Canadians were proud to fight and die can lightly be dismissed from Canada's history or our consideration here today: for the Commonwealth and monarchy, which are but part of this history, are its chief testators today.

The Commonwealth of Nations, which the hon. member's bill ignores, is the great and free association of nations which share a common colonial past, a common free present, a common reverence for parliamentary institutions and, in most cases, an instinctive suspicion of the quasi-presidential type of government to which we have been treated over the last years in this House and dominion. It is a viable third force in a world increasingly bound up by alliances and power groups. Its most utilitarian phase, trade and commerce, may have passed, but perhaps that enables us even more to appreciate its ethereal qualities in the present.

The Union Jack flies freely over the member nations and, the current antics in Australia excepted, the countries and the citizens thereof are not as paranoid as certain members on my left who have a suspicion of anything older than yesterday, the writings of Marx, Lenin and Trotsky always excepted. I think that any bill which is to be passed by this House, if it must set up a day to honour our flags, cannot lightly omit the Union Jack for this reason alone.

There is another reason, Mr. Speaker, and it concerns the monarchy. This House in 1964 specifically designated the Union Jack as a Canadian flag which has special significance in a royal sense. I am very proud to be a member of a party which does not have members such as the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) who yesterday in this House called royal prerogatives and recommendations affronts to hon. members and the public.

If we want to set aside a holiday, how can we do so without honouring the flag which represents our head of state? For it is the fundamental genius of our system that the Crown, intangible yet personified perfectly by our gracious Queen, to whose visits this summer we all look forward, is the ultimate source of law, virtue and honour in this country, separate and distinct from the head of government who must necessarily be political at least part of the time.

• (1740)

The monarchy stands first and foremost in the hearts of Canadians, first in affection, first in their prayers and first in every good and decent act in this dominion. We do not depend on the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), on the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) or even on the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) for our laws and liberties. They are enshrined and protected in that body so mystical and yet concrete, the Crown, and I could not vote for any flag bill which does not recognize the monarchy, the systemization of the Crown, by including the Union Jack in its provisions.