

So far as this motion goes I am absolutely opposed to the appointment of the committee. I stand against it; I appeal to my colleagues of the Toronto district to record a vote on this motion to appoint a committee. I consider this is a matter for the provinces entirely; it is a matter of "property and civil rights", which come within the legislative authority of the province. This is a matter of property and civil rights in the provinces, because definite promises were given to the maritime provinces, Ontario and Quebec, when they entered confederation on a definite charter and understanding. The flag was the union jack, and we have no power to change it.

There is a large representation in this chamber from Ontario. In fact, one newspaper has said that the party to which I belong has become an Ontario party. I do not admit that, because in my view we are and always have been a national party. But under this resolution there should be power to make investigations and hear depositions. It would seem that this committee can do nothing but pick a design from among fifty or sixty designs for a new Canadian flag. In doing that, it is to represent the House of Commons. But, according to what the minister has said, the house having decided on the principle of a national flag, we can do nothing further when that report comes back but decide on the new design solely.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the hon. member who has just spoken that this resolution does not introduce any new element. Some days ago the house decided as to the principle of the resolution, and his own party—very wisely, I think—with the exception of the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church), voted for it. This resolution simply nominates the personnel who are to serve jointly upon the committee with members from the other house. However, the powers given the committee were stated definitely in the earlier resolution. The committee will consider the design for a flag and will then report back to the house. Then the house may either accept or reject the report of that committee, or adopt whatever course it may consider fit and proper.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. CHURCH: On division.

Motion agreed to.

47696—142

DOMINION ELECTIONS

ALLEGED IRREGULARITIES IN FEDERAL CONSTITUENCY OF MELVILLE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State (Mr. Martin)? Has any report been received by the chief electoral officer regarding alleged irregularities in the federal constituency of Melville last June? If so, will the minister table a copy of the report.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Secretary of State I understand and as the member concerned, I wish to state that the report following an investigation held respecting a certain poll in the constituency of Melville was received by the chief electoral officer this morning. I learned just before coming to the house that the report has been received and is thirty some odd pages in length, and that it will have to be copied before it will be possible to lay a copy of it on the table.

Mr. HOMUTH: Are you still a member?

Mr. GARDINER: I am still a member, yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE: And he will be a member, too.

Mr. GARDINER: I do not think the purpose of the investigation would be properly served unless this were made public; and of course the proper way to make it public is to place a copy on the table of the house.

CANADIAN ARMY

DEMOBILIZATION—EXTENSION OF SERVICE BEFORE DISCHARGE PENDING EMPLOYMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence. Press reports indicate that there has been some change in the demobilization programme by which men eligible for discharge may remain in the service for an extended period, pending their finding suitable employment. Will the minister give the house a statement respecting this change?

Hon. DOUGLAS ABBOTT (Minister of National Defence): I am obliged to my hon. friend for asking the question, because the press reports to which he has referred would appear to have given rise to some misunderstanding. There has been no change in the