

*Inquiries of the Ministry*ELIMINATION OF REFERENCE IN RESOLUTION TO
UNION JACK

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. L. J. Pigeon (Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Does he propose to remove the last part of the resolution concerning the union jack, so as not to induce members to scuttle the debate by making lengthy speeches?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: This question is out of order.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise simply to ask Your Honour this. What is wrong with that question? The hon. member is asking whether the Prime Minister intends to break the resolution into two. I know we want to do everything we can to assist, but I do not understand the reason for that ruling. I am sure it is a very good reason, but it is not apparent.

Mr. Speaker: The initial and apparent reason is that the same question was asked on Friday, I think, or if not Friday on Thursday. It is a repetitive question or a repetitive statement.

Mr. Diefenbaker: But I think we are entitled to an answer, are we not, on a matter so important as this? Repetitive questions sometimes arise from the failure of a government to give answers of any kind.

INDUSTRY

REPORTED REMOVAL OF PLANT FROM NIAGARA
FALLS TO BRANTFORD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare and ask the hon. lady whether she has conferred with the Minister of Industry concerning the loss of an industry in Niagara Falls, namely, the Dow Corning silicones industry, which has decided to locate in the designated area of Brantford?

Mr. Speaker: Order. It seems to me this is a question for the order paper.

to ensure the success of their request, I feel that the situation has become urgent and, considering the urgency of the situation at the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary and especially the fact that the other prisoners have expressed their sympathy, I would ask the Minister of Justice to have an investigation carried out.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have given a ruling, and the hon. member has the privilege of debating this at 10 o'clock if he wishes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I ask this matter be taken up at ten o'clock, at which time we will not be deprived of our right to raise this issue.

[*Text*]

CANADIAN FLAG

SUGGESTED POSTPONEMENT OF DEBATE
TO HOLD PLEBISCITE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Will the Prime Minister set aside the flag debate in view of the growing demand among Canadians for a national plebiscite, as evidenced by the 18,000 signatures affixed to a petition delivered to his office this forenoon?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I hope the debate will proceed in a few moments, when this will be one of the matters I will talk about.

Mr. Coates: As a supplementary question, is not this an indication that the Prime Minister does not care—

Mr. Speaker: Order. That question is strictly out of order.

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): I have a question for the Minister of Justice, just a point of clarification. Is the flag which flies over the parliament buildings while parliament is in session recognized as the flag of the nation?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): This calls for a legal opinion and therefore goes against a rule of this house.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.