

French. Since it is not a bilingual district it is important for the minister to tell us why this order was given and why it was given in this particular way, because on the surface it seems a pretty hopeless approach to a problem of this kind.

Is the minister in fact only interested in having the name of the department given over the telephone in English and French and dropping the other language from there on in? This would not seem to make much sense and it certainly is not an objective of the Official Languages Act; it is not fulfilling the intent of that legislation. It is for that reason I asked for this adjournment debate, to provide the minister with an opportunity to explain why this order was issued and why it was issued in the particular form that was brought to my attention.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member bringing this matter to the attention of the House. It is a matter which was first raised with me some weeks ago by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Stafford). The department had some instructions in connection with the use of language which were open to an interpretation that required the use of both official languages fairly universally in Canada. On the instigation of the hon. member I reviewed this matter personally and reached the conclusion it would be better if there were, in fact, a great deal of flexibility in the policy.

Of course, both languages are used in answering the telephone in the national capital region and will continue to be used in many areas where there is a significant minority group that would be served that way, especially where there are demands by people in the region for service in the minority language. The basic position at the moment is that regional directors have a discretion to determine whether in fact a significant body of the public would be served by answering the telephone in both languages.

As I say, I trust in most cases this will really mean that where there is a significant group for whom that kind of service will be of benefit, it will be generally available. In cases where there is need for service in the language of the minority, we are providing service in that language or will be doing so. I agree completely with the hon. member about the need for intelligent application of the rules and the use of both languages so that the policies which we both so strongly support may in fact work for the good of Canada as a whole.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—REMOVAL OF FLAG OF NATIONALIST CHINA FROM PAVILION AT BRITISH COLUMBIA TRADE FAIR

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight on a matter pertaining to my question of last Thursday, June 10, when I attempted to obtain from the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) the real reason for the removal of the flag of Nationalist China from their pavilion at the recent British Columbia Trade Fair which closed on Saturday, June 12, after what I hope was a successful fair.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

We are informed by an article in the Vancouver *Province* of June 8 that the flag of Nationalist China was removed as a result of pressure from Peking, or Communist China, upon our Department of External Affairs in Ottawa which in turn exerted their authority upon the fair, Info-EXPO/71, the British Columbia International Trade Fair. The president of the fair, Mr. Hyland, as a result of this discourteous act was very humiliated and angry when he said, "I think it is a strange type of diplomacy wherein to show friendship for one party"—that is, Communist China—"you have to be rude to another," which is Nationalist China.

Mr. Speaker, I do not ask this question or raise the matter tonight because Communist China has been recognized. This was accomplished last October by the Prime Minister and his government. I believe in the *de facto* recognition of all nations on the face of this earth. I raise this matter tonight to put on the record the Prime Minister's espousal of and obsession with communism. This is so acute that he and the Secretary of State for External Affairs do not mind in the least insulting non-communist countries. Canada is a member of the United Nations and so is Nationalist China. Communist China is not.

I have received quite a bit of information on this incident. I find that the communist, or red flag of China is a red flag bearing five stars. I find that the flag of the Republic of China, or Taiwan, is mostly red with a blue quarter which bears a 12-pointed white sun. Since these flags are dissimilar there was no international impersonation in the flying of the Nationalist flag. I am informed that the fair was flying all the flags of the participating guest countries and these flags were raised by the fair management itself. So there was no obtrusion on the part of Taiwan. I find that the first invitations to this fair were verbally issued by the Premier of British Columbia at a dinner in Ottawa about two years ago during the constitutional conference of 1969.

I am informed that among all the countries invited, Taiwan, or the Republic of China, was the first to accept the invitation and the first to enter into a contract and to pay rent for the premises occupied. As late as last March the British Columbia government confirmed the exhibit. That was six months after this government recognized Red China, which took place in October, 1970. It is not considered in the interests of international courtesy for any country not to accept the invitation and the Taiwan government kept its word, later to be rebuffed and insulted by the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that in relation to this incident the Taiwan government was not flying its flag at the British Columbia fair under any guise of being the government of Mainland China, as was implied in the Prime Minister's answer to my question. I say that they were only trying to promote friendship and what is left of democracy, democratic good will and economic and profitable international trade. It is obvious that to promote his communist interests and biased leanings the Prime Minister would insult a democratic country such as Taiwan, and by doing so it is obvious that he would