

*Canadian Commonwealth Flag*

subamendment moved by the Cr ditistes and I will tell you why: I have listened to the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Gr goire) and the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) who denied the principle of the resolution submitted to the house concerning a second flag.

They said that this measure was ridiculous and useless, and now, after having denied the very basis thereof, they are tacking on an amendment.

Mr. Speaker, how could something which is radically unsound be improved by tacking something on, namely the proposed amendment—

**Mr. Gr goire:** Sometimes, there may be something wrong in the head, while the feet are still good. That is your case.

**Mr. Paul:** As far as the hon. member for Lapointe is concerned, neither the head nor the feet are good.

What do we read in this amendment? Nothing, except that they dare not rise and say: We are against a second flag. They try to please their Social Credit friends in other provinces by introducing an amendment so that the Prime Minister, at the next meeting of commonwealth members, may suggest that the British commonwealth of nations endorse a flag to which all the nations could agree. In my opinion, it is a devious means to encourage the adoption of the union jack, of a second flag, which is quite wrong and does not deserve any more consideration and support than the main motion itself.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate—

**Mr. Gr goire:** Why can't you talk sense.

**Mr. Paul:** I always talk most intelligently and, above all, sensibly.

I always hear that voice preaching in the desert.

They realize the mistake they have just made in trying to introduce an amendment whereby a second Canadian flag could be indirectly adopted. If it was not the union jack, then another would replace it as a second flag. And what would it be called? What would it represent? The Cr ditiste members could not care less, but they accept and recognize the principle that we must have, according to them and according to the Liberal party, a second flag in Canada.

I say the proposed amendment is quite unacceptable. I would be very much surprised if the majority of my colleagues were to support it, since it is illogical, ridiculous and

stupid. It is just as stupid as the main motion itself.

I have no doubt that hon. members opposite, especially those from Quebec, will recall that freedom of expression promised by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) last June and that, when the time comes for them to vote on the main motion, they will have the courage and especially feel free—as we did in our party when it was time to vote on the sixth report—to vote according to their convictions. Such a freedom will not be denied them, I am sure, because the Prime Minister would not find it easy to go back on the solemn word he gave in this house.

Then, at last, it will be possible to have just one flag around which could rally—and I do not mean Ralliement Cr ditiste—all the men of good will who live in this great country of ours, so we could improve our standing among the free nations of the world.

One may wonder if this second flag will not raise a question of international law.

I would appreciate if the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) who last summer during a mission connected with his department, visited Europe and particularly Great Britain, would tell us if Her Majesty the Queen was consulted concerning the adoption, by Canada, of a flag which is hers as well as that of Great Britain, namely, the union jack?

What would happen if the Governor General were to refuse to assent to the order in council which will give Canada a second flag? Can the Governor General, on his own and according to international law, give Canada a flag which already belongs to the authority he represents and to Great Britain? What will happen then?

The government would have to submit to Her Majesty the Queen the matter now under consideration and if it were approved and accepted by Her Majesty the Queen, the Governor General could sign the royal proclamation.

But let us suppose that he refused to sign it? Suppose that the Governor General would resign. Anything is possible, Mr. Speaker.

[Text]

**Mr. Caouette:** Ask John.

**Mr. Paul:** Pardon?

**Mr. Caouette:** Ask John.