

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, March 25, 1955

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

(Translation):

## PRIVILEGE

MR. POULIOT—CORRECTION OF CERTAIN PRESS REPORTS

**Mr. Jean-François Pouliot (Temiscouata):**

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Three French-language newspapers, *Le Droit*, *Le Soleil* and *La Presse*, have printed a summary of a speech delivered by me in Toronto, last Tuesday, regarding the Canadian flag. Now one of the paragraphs is not accurate, and the same inaccuracy appears in all three papers and probably in other Canadian Press dispatches.

The member added that, if Canada cannot have any national flag, the red ensign should at least carry a larger maple leaf and be rid of its outdated emblems.

*L'Action Catholique* of March 24 published another dispatch which is even more inaccurate than the one I have just quoted.

Toronto—Mr. Jean-François Pouliot, Liberal member for Temiscouata, asked for a "distinct and official" Canadian flag without the maple leaf. He told the Toronto junior board of trade that the union jack could fly next to this new national flag, but that it should not eclipse it.

The reports published by the *Toronto Telegram* and the *Ottawa Journal* were far more accurate. Briefly, here is what I said:

(Text):

I do not want the union flag to be minimized as a fraction of the flag. If we are to have it, let us have it full-size, but let us also have a truly Canadian flag. Both could be hoisted together.

**Some hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. Pouliot:** I continue:

Is it not the time to have a distinctive and official Canadian flag bearing only one emblem, a large maple leaf, which will tell all the other nations of the world that Canada is the greatest of them all?

(Translation):

**Mr. Speaker:** I should not want the intervention of the hon. member to create a precedent and, if I did not call him to order before, it was because I had doubts as to his right to raise the question of privilege in this house for the purpose of correcting newspaper reports of a speech he made outside the house. The hon. member, being an expert in procedural matters, may not share

my doubts on this point; at any rate, I should like to make these remarks in order that this case be not considered as a precedent.

(Text):

## VETERANS AFFAIRS

First report of special committee on veterans affairs.—Mr. Tucker.

## PRIVATE BILL

FIRST READING—SENATE BILL

Bill No. 281, to incorporate St. Mary's River Bridge Company.—Mr. Nixon.

## TRADE

OIL—INQUIRY AS TO ACTION ON UNITED STATES RESTRICTIONS

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. Donald M. Fleming (Eglinton):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the representations made to the United States Senate finance committee as to the views of the administration in relation to the quantitative restrictions on the imports of crude oil from Canada and elsewhere, may I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce if the Canadian government will make it abundantly clear to the United States administration that the proposal to have these restrictions enforced by individual producers is no more acceptable than is the proposal to have the restrictions imposed by the government and that if this type of proposal is persevered in it is likely to disturb very seriously Canadian confidence in our trading relations with the United States?

**Right Hon. C. D. Howe (Minister of Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, the proposal of the administration antedates the legislation that was introduced in the United States congress. Both proposals were known to this government when our protest was filed and I think the subject matter of our protest deals adequately with both proposals.

## INCOME TAX

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF TERM USED BY INCOME TAX APPEAL BOARD

On the orders of the day:

**Hon. J. J. McCann (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, with reference to the question asked on March 21 by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Hahn) who inquired what the income tax appeal