

CANADA

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

SECOND SESSION—TWENTY SIXTH PARLIAMENT

13 ELIZABETH II

VOLUME X, 1964

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE NINETEENTH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1964,
TO THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF DECEMBER, 1964, INCLUSIVE

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

ROGER DUHAMEL, F.R.S.C.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1964

20220—648½

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, November 19, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

NEW MEMBER

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that the Clerk of the House has received from the chief electoral officer a certificate of the election and return of Max Saltsman, Esquire, for the electoral district of Waterloo South.

NEW MEMBER INTRODUCED

Max Saltsman, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Waterloo South, introduced by Mr. T. C. Douglas and Mr. Reid Scott.

PRIVILEGE

MR. WOOLLIAMS—WINNER OF WORLD WHEAT CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure all members will agree with me that it is a proper question of privilege.

Lawrence Gibson of Carbon, Alberta, in the constituency of Bow River has just been named world wheat king at the age of 19. May I say that in the last ten years we in Alberta have made what amounts to almost a clean sweep of world records for No. 1 wheat: 1955, Robert Cochrane, Grande Prairie; 1956, William Deurloo, Granum; 1958; Miss Gail Adams, Drumheller; 1959, Douglas J. Mackintosh, Granum; 1961, Ralph Eardman, Lethbridge; 1962, F. W. Howarth, Taber; 1963, George Luco, Lethbridge; and this year Larry Gibson, Carbon.

I think this is a good advertisement for the great product of Canada, wheat, which has brought prosperity to this country.

MR. KINDT—WINNER OF WORLD FLAX CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. Lawrence E. Kindt (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, I also have an honour to perform. It is in connection with Mr. Harold Hansen who won the world flax championship at the Toronto Royal and who lives at Ensign in the Macleod riding.

STANDING ORDERS

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN FOURTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. H. Pit Lessard (for Mr. Asselin, Notre Dame de Grâce) moved that the fourth report of the standing committee on standing orders, presented to the house on Tuesday, November 17, 1964, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

NATIONAL FILM BOARD

REPORTED POST-SYNCHRONIZATION OF FILMS IN FRANCE

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Léon Balcer (Three Rivers): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State.

Could he tell us why the government allows the national film board, an agency financed with the Canadian taxpayers' money, to have its films dubbed in France, thus depriving Canadian artists of needed and quite important revenue?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I will inquire to find out if the hon. member's statement is founded and will answer his question later.

Mr. Balcer: Mr. Speaker, may I refer the Secretary of State to a speech made by Mr. Duceppe yesterday in which he gave a lot of details?

[*Text*]

HARBOURS

VANCOUVER, B.C.—PROPOSED LOCATION OF NEW GRAIN ELEVATOR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport regarding the location of a grain elevator site on the north shore of Burrard inlet, which will involve the moving of some five industries located there. I would ask the minister, because of its pressing nature and the existence of a deadline, two things; first, whether he would be prepared to table the report of the national

harbours board on the various locations that were studied, and second, whether he would ask the national harbours board to hear representations from interested persons before any final decision is made.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I do not think there will be any problem in acceding to the second request right away. I will ask the chairman of the national harbours board to receive anyone who has any proper representation to make; I will be very glad to do that. As to the first request, I think the hon. member will realize that I would have to look into that matter before I could give a reply. I do not think I will be able to give a reply until Monday, because I would like to talk to the chairman of the board and I believe he is in Vancouver.

PRINCE RUPERT, B.C.—INQUIRY AS TO PLANS FOR DEVELOPMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he has yet concluded the very careful consideration that he is giving to grain elevators.

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Almost, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Transport and ask whether he has any plans for the over-all port development of Prince Rupert, inasmuch as we can only get the consideration of the Minister of Agriculture.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have not any right in my head, but I could perhaps make some in half an hour if the hon. gentleman would come and see me.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CANADIAN MEMBERSHIP IN ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

[*Translation*]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister.

Could he confirm or deny the report from Brazil to the effect that Canada has asked to join the O.A.S.?

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I am in order in commenting on newspaper reports at this time, but if the report referred to by my hon. friend is the same as the one I read it has no foundation in fact.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Even if, as he says, this report has no foundation, could the Prime Minister tell the house whether the government intends to approach the American states or Brazil to this end?

[*Text*]

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I am sure my hon. friend knows that this is a matter which has been under consideration for a considerable time and is under consideration at present.

CONGO—EFFORTS TO OBTAIN RELEASE OF CANADIAN HOSTAGES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs based on a report in this morning's *Le Devoir* to the effect that the special envoy of the Canadian government, Mr. Robert Thompson, has now left Addis Ababa for Paris without apparently being able to effect the release of the Canadian hostages held in the Congo. It is further reported that Emperor Haile Selassie has expressed his uneasiness with regard to the condition of the hostages, and I ask the minister whether he has any report to make to the house.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): This, of course, is a matter I could deal with later today, Mr. Speaker, but I should say that the United States government has expressed gratitude for the efforts of the hon. gentleman in question.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): As a supplementary question, could the Secretary of State for External Affairs tell us whether the Canadian government has received any information with regard to the safety of these hostages, so that the Canadian government may be equally grateful?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian government is equally grateful; and I must say that the situation in Stanleyville, as my hon. friend knows, is of the

greatest seriousness involving many hundreds of people, including 38 Canadians.

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs?

We have noticed for quite a while the absence in the house of the Minister without Portfolio, the hon. member for St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville (Mr. Dupuis). Could the minister tell us what success his second representative in Africa, the Minister without Portfolio, has achieved?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we shall have the opportunity to answer questions of that kind later on in the day.

[*Text*]

AGRICULTURE

REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE FOR ONTARIO AND QUEBEC FARMERS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry, who is responsible for agriculture in eastern Canada.

Can he tell us if he has received requests for assistance from farmers or municipal councils so as to compensate for losses incurred through bad weather this year?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for having given me notice of his question. As it concerns the Minister of Agriculture I shall ask the latter to reply to it.

[*Text*]

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question I may say that requests for assistance were received from municipal councils on behalf of farmers who suffered crop losses as a result of weather conditions. They were advised that they should make their representations to the provincial authorities, since the responsibility for providing emergency assistance of this nature rests with the provincial governments. They were also advised that the federal government was prepared to reimburse the provincial government for part of the cost of any approved assistance programs established by the province to assist these producers.

Early this fall my department entered into an agreement with the government of the province of Quebec to pay half the cost of the freight assistance program established by the province to assist farmers in securing necessary fodder supplies.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Forestry a supplementary question.

Can he tell us whether the experiments made this summer by the Weather Engineering Corporation in Abitibi were carried out under the ARDA program?

Mr. Sauvé: No, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question following the answer of the Minister of Agriculture. The minister stated that he had communicated with the government of the province of Quebec. Could he also state whether he has communicated with the provincial government of Ontario regarding special assistance needed by farmers in the Ottawa valley?

Mr. Hays: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think it was on August 14, and supplies are now being purchased for these farmers.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Forestry.

Would the minister have an inquiry made on damages done to crops and farmers in the Abitibi and Saguenay-Lake St. John areas through cloud seeding?

Mr. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, this problem does not come within my jurisdiction.

[*Text*]

QUEBEC—INQUIRY AS TO APPLICATION OF ARDA PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Antoine Bélanger (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry. In view of the fact that the minister is about to meet with the provincial ministers responsible for the ARDA program in their respective provinces, in order to discuss the renewal of the agreement concerning that program, does the government intend to enlarge the scope of that

act so it may participate in a wider variety of projects than at present?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, it will not be necessary to amend the act in order to achieve the objective suggested by the hon. member for Charlevoix.

[*Text*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

EFFECT ON CANADA OF CLOSING OF U.S. BASES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of National Defence.

Can the minister tell us if there will be repercussions in the Canadian national defence following the statement made yesterday by the United States secretary for defence that 95 American military bases will be closed down?

[*Text*]

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): I do not think it would be appropriate, Mr. Speaker, to comment on the announcement made in Washington until we have the details here, which we would expect to receive fairly shortly. As far as I know there are no changes proposed which would have a direct effect.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question to that asked a moment ago by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) about the decision of the U.S. government to close some military bases.

Has the U.S. government advised Canada that they wished to close some military bases which they now have in our country?

We would like, of course, to obtain an accurate answer in order to know if it is true that the United States will put an end to such activities in Canada?

Mr. Speaker, must the Secretary of State for External Affairs prompt the Minister of National Defence with an answer?

[*Text*]

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State for External Affairs has suggested that I take the question as notice for him.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question with reference to the answer given by the Minister of National Defence. I put my question to the Prime Minister. The Minister of National Defence received a question as notice on behalf of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Is this an indication of a further cut-back in the Department of National Defence, and are we finally going to have only one minister for the department?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid if there are any cut-backs they will be in the ranks of the opposition.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

PICTOU COUNTY, N.S.—REQUEST FOR ACTION TO RELIEVE UNEMPLOYMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry. I should like to ask the minister whether he has received a telegram from the president of the board of trade of Pictou regarding unemployment in the local shipyard as a result of the recent lay-offs. The minister will recall that a couple of weeks ago I drew to his attention the telegram sent by the union. I should like to ask him whether he has had any success in having any naval refit work placed with this yard.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I have not had the telegram to which the hon. member refers drawn to my attention, but I will be glad to check and find out whether it has been received. I can assure him, however, that we in the Department of Defence Production are seeking ways and means of finding additional work for the Pictou shipyards.

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

ADVICE ON REMOVAL FROM CITIZENSHIP COURTS OF PORTRAITS OF QUEEN

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State whether he will indicate to the house why he advised the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to have the portraits of the Queen removed from the citizenship courts.

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the assertion made by the hon. member is completely without foundation.

Mr. Churchill: I have a supplementary question. Does the Secretary of State accept

responsibility for the advice given by the under secretary of state to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration as disclosed in the directive tabled yesterday by that minister?

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Speaker, I was informed by the deputy registrar general that he had given a personal opinion.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I wish we could get to the root of this matter. May I ask the Secretary of State whether he disclaims all authority for this statement which appears in the document tabled yesterday by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration:

> I have now received advice from the under-secretary of state which allows direction for a uniform procedure as follows:
> (a) The coat of arms of Canada should be located on the curtain backdrop behind the judge's dais in the court room.
> (b) The Queen's picture should be displayed in the judge's chambers in order that applicants may see it when being interviewed at the hearing.

I ask the Secretary of State whether that is not the advice tendered by his under secretary, and does he not accept responsibility for the same?

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to what I have already said.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question.

In view of the point raised by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Conservative party in this house, could the Secretary of State provide for additional copies of the Queen's portrait, in order to give them some, since it seems to be their wish?

[*Text*]

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question on this subject, and I direct it to the Prime Minister. Now that the government has adopted the practice of giving special assignments to hon. members on the opposition side of the house, and in view of the particular interest in the matter of protocol displayed by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, will the Prime Minister consider assigning to that hon. member a special responsibility in the field of protocol?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): As it happens, Mr. Speaker, very close study and consideration has been given to this matter by the Secretary of State for External Affairs and myself.

FINANCE

RENEWAL OF U.K.-CANADA TAX AGREEMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. According to reports the current Anglo-Canadian tax agreement will lapse on December 31, 1964. Will the minister say what efforts he is making to renew this valuable agreement, or inform the house what course the government intends to follow?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, meetings of officials of the United Kingdom and Canada were held in Ottawa starting on September 28 to discuss a revised agreement. At these meetings a draft for a revised agreement was prepared, and in accordance with usual practice this draft was then placed before the two governments for their consideration. As I mentioned yesterday, I think it was, there has been an election in the United Kingdom in the interim which has no doubt slowed up this matter to some extent.

I should like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to say it is incorrect to suggest that double taxation will suddenly exist or that business firms will be hurt if the new agreement is not ready to be put into operation on January 1, 1965. Both Canada and the United Kingdom have measures in their income tax legislation to prevent double taxation by allowing credits for taxes imposed by other countries, and these provisions will continue in operation even if there is no income tax agreement between the two countries in question.

Mr. Winkler: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister say whether it is his intention to press for the renewal of the agreement?

Mr. Gordon: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

INQUIRY AS TO TARIFF CHANGES RESPECTING TOBACCO IMPORTS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. L. J. Pigeon (Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Does his department intend to increase the tariff on cigar tobaccos which are produced in Canada?

[*Text*]

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as I think my hon. friend knows, government policy on all matters in connection with tariffs and other economic policies are announced at the appropriate time.

LABOUR RELATIONS

ST. TITE, QUE—REQUEST FOR FEDERAL INTERVENTION IN STRIKE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry. Have any representations been made to him on behalf of the workers at G. A. Boulet, Limitée, St. Tite, Quebec, who have been on strike since August 20 because of the refusal by management to bargain collectively with the workers? Is the department taking any steps to look into this matter, inasmuch as this firm does most of its work for the Department of National Defence? Is the department doing anything to make sure that firms which take national defence contracts are providing fair and proper working conditions for their employees?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defence Production has looked into this particular problem. Unfortunately I do not have the details in front of me, not having had notice of the question, but I can say that to my recollection this matter involves an industrial dispute relating to recognition of the employees' organization for bargaining purposes at Boulet and Company in Shawinigan or Grand'Mère. We have not had occasion for some time to place a contract with Boulet and Company, and at the present time they are engaged in processing a contract which was awarded prior to the breaking out of this dispute. As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defence Production has not suffered any prejudice as a consequence of the dispute with respect to either prices or time of delivery.

Hon. Léon Balcer (Three Rivers): As a supplementary question, would the minister consider sending an inspector to that plant to see whether the labour conditions are really as bad as we have been told and, if they are, would he consider suspending this contract altogether?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. gentleman is not suggesting that the Department of Defence Production should in effect start discharging what are the functions of the Quebec department of labour. The responsibility for this resides with the provincial department of labour. I would be glad to have my officers communicate the views of the hon. member to the Quebec department of labour, but I do not think this is a proper area in which the Department of Defence Production should operate.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask a supplementary question. The departments of public works across Canada, federally and provincially, generally require in all their contracts that there be provision for certain fair wages and working conditions. Is such a clause inserted in contracts granted by the Department of Defence Production? Is there such a clause in the agreement with the company in question, and what steps does the minister's department take to police these contracts to see that the fair wage and labour condition clauses are complied with?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Surely this is a question for the order paper.

Mr. Douglas: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, when you say to put the question on the order paper may I point out that we have had questions on it since June, some five or six months ago.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Douglas: Here is a question involving men who are out on strike and who have been on strike since August 20, and these men are working on Department of National Defence contracts. Surely the federal government has some responsibility to see that those working on government contracts comply with minimum labour standards. That is all I am asking the minister to do, to see if these minimum labour standards are being kept and if these clauses are being policed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has made that point at least twice, but I still think it is a question for the order paper.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rémi Paul (Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière): Mr. Speaker, did the Minister of Industry communicate with the minister of labour of the province of Quebec or with officers of that department to try and settle the strike at the Boulet, Ltee industries in St. Tite?

Mr. Drury: I understood the question well, Mr. Speaker, and, to my knowledge, the answer is no.

[*Text*]

BRITISH COLUMBIA—SETTLEMENT OF STRIKE OF HERRING FISHERMEN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Ron Basford (Vancouver-Burrard): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries and ask whether he has any indication of an early settlement of the strike of herring fishermen in B.C.

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise the house that I have just received word from Vancouver to the effect that the association and the union have reached agreement on the basis of $14.48 per ton, plus agreement on a medical plan to be operated by the companies. The association has also reached agreement with vessel owners. A membership vote was being taken this morning in Vancouver, and it is anticipated that the fishery will recommence at noon on November 26.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact that the Minister of Fisheries has no responsibility whatever for these matters?

Mr. Robichaud: Yes, it is, but that does not deny me the privilege of giving this information to the house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Howard: Well, it should. May I rise on a question of privilege on that point, Mr. Speaker, in that I do not object to receiving the information, but persistently you have ruled out of order and ministers have objected to answering questions which do not fall within their responsibilities. I believe we should persist along that line.

Mr. Basford: Speaking to the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, may I say the hon. member for Skeena is just annoyed that he did not ask the same question.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Basford: His party leader just asked five questions relative to a strike in the province of Quebec. I think I am entitled to ask one question relative to a strike in the province of British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Surely we have gone far enough along that direction.

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

REPORTED STATEMENT BY QUEBEC PREMIER ON PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister.

Has he made himself acquainted with the statement made by the premier of the province of Quebec in Toronto last Monday, in which he requested a special status for Quebec, and is it the intention of the Prime Minister to communicate with the premier of Quebec in this connection?

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of reading the statement made by the premier of Quebec in Toronto, and I thought it was a very good, Canadian, constructive statement.

EDUCATION

STUDENT LOANS—INQUIRY AS TO OTTAWA CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reg Cantelon (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance of which I sent him notice. I understand that on Monday and Tuesday there was a meeting of provincial and federal representatives to discuss the administrative details of the student loan plan. Would the minister care to make a statement on the matter?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the hon. member for giving me notice of this question. I think it was on Tuesday I said I anticipated that I would be able to make a statement by the end of the week. I want to include as many up to date statistics as I can and it may not be possible to obtain them until Monday, but I shall be making a statement at the beginning of next week.

INDUSTRY

QUEBEC—POSSIBLE LOCATION OF NEW AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRIES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry?

Would the minister make a statement to the house concerning the establishment of the

Renault and Peugeot plants at St. Bruno, in the province of Quebec? Does the selection of this site meet with the wishes of the federal Minister of Industry?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I think it rests with the General Investment Corporation to make such a statement.

[*Text*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

REPORT OF COMMITTEE RESPECTING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Has the right hon. gentleman anything further to say to the house with regard to civil service collective bargaining? On May 14 he told us he did not think the committee dealing with this matter would be able to make a report until the autumn. Now that autumn has turned to winter, has the Prime Minister anything to tell the house?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I have nothing to say at the moment, but I will be glad to look into the matter and see whether I can say something useful on this subject next week.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

ABSENCE OF CREDITISTE MEMBERS DURING VOTE

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to put a question, but to raise a point of privilege.

In today's *Le Devoir*, we may read:

Last night, a vote was taken in the house...

[*Text*]

An hon. Member: You were not here last night.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette:

—with regard to deferring legislation to a joint committee of both houses.

If you will listen to me you will understand why.

The article says:

No member of the Ralliement Créditiste was in the house when the vote was taken.

[*Text*]

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: I do not think this is a matter for shouting "Order, order."

I suggest that we should give an explanation because this newspaper wants and tends to inform the people. Well, Mr. Speaker, yesterday we were in the house, and in the afternoon I stated that we objected to the distribution of poverty in Canada. That is why the members of the Ralliement Créditiste were not in the house when the vote was taken last night at 5.45.

[*Text*]

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

1. Administration, operation and maintenance including payment of remuneration, subject to the approval of the governor in council and notwithstanding the Civil Service Act, in connection with the assignment by the Canadian government of Canadians to the staffs of the international organizations detailed in the estimates (part recoverable from those organizations) and authority to make recoverable advances in amounts not exceeding in the aggregate the amounts of the shares of those organizations of such expenses, and authority, notwithstanding the Civil Service Act, for the appointment and fixing of salaries of commissioners (international commissions for supervision and control in Indochina), secretaries and staff by the governor in council; official hospitality; relief and repatriation of distressed Canadian citizens abroad and their dependents and reimbursement of the United Kingdom for relief expenditures incurred by its diplomatic and consular posts on Canadian account (part recoverable); Canadian representation at international conferences; expenses of the third commonwealth education conference; a cultural relations and academic exchange program with the French community, and grants as detailed in the estimates, $10,826,300.

Mr. Nesbitt: I rather thought the Secretary of State for External Affairs would have a statement to make on the first item of his estimates. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could let us know whether he intends to make a statement at the present time.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): As the hon. member knows, the committee has already spent a full day discussing the estimates of the Department of External Affairs. I see the hon. member for Edmonton West in his place, and I am prepared to deal with the question he raised the other day. Perhaps he wishes to put some further questions in connection with that matter.

Mr. Nesbitt: It was my understanding the other day that the minister intended to make a statement to the committee; he indicated this

would be the case. A great many important events have been taking place in the world, and I know that many of the members of this committee would like to hear some observations by the secretary of state on various matters such as recent events in the Soviet union, China and the like. I had hoped he would give us an up to date statement.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The hon. member is asking me to cover a wide area, but I would attempt to do so if he would put questions. However, in the light of the request made by the hon. member for Edmonton West I would like to deal now with one matter which is of current importance. Perhaps I could speak later on some of the other subjects which the hon. member has just mentioned on the basis of questions which he or others may wish to put to me.

I refer, of course, to reports of serious difficulties which are alleged to exist within NATO. I do not wish to hide from the committee the fact that I have been extremely concerned in the past few weeks that some of our major allies appear to be embarked on a collision course which could have incalculable consequences for the western alliance. Two or three weeks ago it looked as though in this context the storm clouds were gathering over western Europe. In Paris on November 2, the French foreign minister, Mr. Couve de Murville, with his usual incisiveness, described the storm warnings as he saw them; the danger of deteriorating Franco-German relations, the danger to the European common market because of the failure of the Six to agree on cereal prices, and the danger for NATO if Germany and the United States were to push ahead with their plan for a multilateral force of mixed manned ships carrying Polaris missiles jointly owned, controlled and financed by the participating nations.

I may say now, reflecting on the events of these past few weeks, that thanks to the efforts which have been made on both sides of the Atlantic by a number of countries, there are indications that given a little more time—and I think this will be forthcoming—accommodations can be reached with regard to some if not all of these major issues. Nevertheless it would be misleading for me to pretend that everything in the Atlantic world is satisfactory, just as it would be improper to reveal in detail what we know of the elements of other peoples' problems based upon the consultations and discussions we have had in Canada and which our heads of missions in other capitals have had with representatives of friendly governments. We wish not only to keep ourselves informed but to bring whatever influence we can to bear on these problems, in the hope that conciliation may be encouraged and co-operation strengthened among all our allies on both sides of the Atlantic so as to maintain and develop the essential trans-Atlantic nature of the NATO community which is, of course, of such vital importance to Canada.

In the course of the past week consultations took place in Ottawa with the foreign ministers of Belgium and Norway, and we have had discussions, as I indicated a moment ago, with the representatives of other countries here in our capital as well as through our missions abroad. We are by the very nature of our situation, obliged to recognize how much we in Canada depend, as do other NATO countries, on collective security. We live in a world in which the members of the NATO group must proceed with balanced forces to provide for their defence on a purely national basis and through collective effort. We in Canada are therefore, by the very nature of the situation, committed to the doctrine of achieving a balanced defence by making our forces, and therefore our policies, interdependent with those of other members of the Atlantic alliance.

Some of our allies, as we all know, would prefer to see their forces organized on a purely European basis, but not on an Atlantic basis if that means yielding to the United States the final right of decision on matters vitally affecting national security. At the same time we know on no less an authority than that of the French prime minister, Monsieur Pompidou, that a purely European defence—that is, a defence of Europe without the assistance in the final analysis of the United States—is considered a quite untenable hypothesis. In other words there is a large measure of agreement on the basic aims and assumptions of the alliance even in this highly controversial field of how to work out the modalities of military planning and how control is to be exercised and whether the accent should be European or Atlantic.

It goes without saying that we are particularly interested in the evolution of French foreign policy, as is every member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It is quite normal that this should be so. An important part of our population is of French culture, and it is a well established policy of this and of previous governments to develop satisfactory relations with France. For these reasons we in Canada believe that we have some obli-

gation to try to fully understand the basis and aims of French policy. This is not with any intention of playing an intermediary or mediating role, although this we would not shirk. We believe, however, that on certain occasions we could usefully encourage some of our allies to adopt a more sympathetic attitude toward French preoccupations. In particular we understand and support the French view that no hasty decisions should be taken when crash programs are not really required. We also agree with the head of the government of France that it is important that there be a fair balance between the European and North American contributions to the Atlantic alliance.

So if by waiting a little now, as is recommended, the right balance can be established between the contributions which North America and Europe can make to Atlantic defence, we believe that a delay, which in any case is required for the consideration of new British proposals, would be justified. On the other hand we hope the government of France will acknowledge the importance which we attach to the ties which bind us to Europe and display appreciation of the advantages both for Europe and for France of a vigorous and deepening Atlantic partnership.

From our point of view there can be no doubt as to where we stand. We have upheld the trans-Atlantic links with our mother countries in Europe. This is indeed so much a part of our heritage that we can trace the same thread from the time of our reactions to the American revolution through our part in two world wars, to our role in the evolution of the commonwealth idea and the conception and development of NATO. The government of Canada is therefore bound to be concerned that every possible effort be made to avoid any cracks or cleavages within the alliance and to arrest the development of continentalism, whether of the European or North American variety, since such concepts would tend to isolate us and weaken the effective influence which Canada can exert internationally. The serious potential consequences for our defence and for our economic prosperity, and in the long term for our political independence, must be recognized.

Mr. Chairman, we in Canada believe that NATO has served a very useful purpose, not only for the defence of its members but for the peace of the world. One of the consequences of the so-called disarray which exists is the fact that it has been a successful defensive alliance providing defence for its members and serving to contribute substantially to the peace in the world.

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

There are differences as to the nature of the military organization of NATO, one group taking the position that only by an integration of forces can we hope to pursue the effective development of the organization, and the other taking the position that the alliance should be based on the contribution made by individual national military bodies co-operating together for the purpose of common defence. NATO is an organization made up of freedom loving nations, and because they are free nations they suffer the disability of the consequences of that very freedom. There is not the same dissentient expression in bodies that are not made up of free nations.

We are thus the inheritors of some disadvantages which arise out of the very strength that gives meaning to the concept of freedom which each of the 15 nations in the NATO alliance enjoys. I think nothing is to be gained by failing to recognize that there are differences of view as to the kind of military organization that should be pursued in NATO. There is public discussion of this, and there have been discussions at the ministerial meetings of the council itself. These discussions have reflected efforts to see if some compromise arrangement could not be arrived at.

As I said in answer to a question put to me by the Leader of the Opposition a few days ago, it would be a matter of the greatest regret if as a result of these differences in the concept of organization there was to be any slackening in the unity or the integrity of NATO itself. This I think can be avoided, but it is only correct to emphasize that some feel that in order to avoid a confrontation of a serious nature we should seek to arrive at some modus vivendi among the various partners. The new British government has informed its allies that it is engaged in a thorough review of British defence policy, including an examination of the proposals for a multilateral force. As this review progresses I have no doubt it will be discussed by the British government with its NATO allies. We for our part will look forward to the visit to Ottawa on December 9 of the British prime minister and his foreign secretary. We believe this will provide the opportunity for the two commonwealth members of the western alliance to have a direct bilateral exchange of views on the range of problems covered by the British review.

Shortly thereafter the Minister of National Defence and I will go to the NATO ministerial meeting in Paris. There we will have the opportunity for further conversations with the French government, continuing the series of

Franco-Canadian ministerial meetings which began over a year ago. It is my expectation that the whole subject of how to ensure a greater sharing in the direction of the alliance will be thoroughly aired at the NATO ministerial meeting and at consultations which will take place at that time.

Any development that could create a special group within the western alliance to the detriment of a broadly based trans-Atlantic NATO alliance is bound to be of concern, I wish to re-emphasize, to this country. By the same token any development that could start an irreversible trend toward the break-up of our alliance or to an alliance based on continentalism of either a North American or European variety will be contrary and prejudicial to our national interests.

The smaller countries of the alliance, because they must depend on collective security for their defence, have special cause to seek a way out, and this was emphasized to us in the talks that we had with Mr. Spaak and Mr. Lange here last week. The extremely useful discussions that we had gave us an opportunity of emphasizing the large area agreement that does exist on the basic aims of the alliance, even though in this highly controversial field, there are divisions of view as to how we should conduct the strategic planning of the organization. These discussions reinforced my view that special efforts would have to be made to convince our allies that a fresh examination is essential if the alliance is to avoid a perilous division over certain aspects of its policy.

We have asked our allies who have supported proposals for a multilateral force whether the present form of the proposals is necessarily the only way to deal with what all of us recognize to be necessary, a means of giving the European members of the alliance a greater degree of participation in the strategic arrangements of NATO. There is always a danger that a formula appropriate to one period can harden into policies which are too rigid to another.

We should ask those who do not like the multilateral force and the proposals based on it, and who suggest that our alliance does not correspond to the realities of 1964, what is suggested as an alternative. I am sure there is no member of the alliance that would not welcome constructive counter proposals. Since all members of NATO recognize—and this was fully apparent at the last NATO ministerial meeting at The Hague—that the need for the alliance remains undiminished. It follows that we can neither afford to split the alliance in two nor plunge it into a course against the will of a major member.

It is to the avoidance of these extremes that the Canadian government is devoting its most careful attention at this time in the discussions we are having. It is traditional for Canada to look for a compromise when friends disagree. As I suggested a few weeks ago, we believe there may be an alternative course that has not yet been sufficiently explored. We have wondered whether we could not make use of the existing machinery within the alliance to bring about a greater sharing in the military direction of NATO.

In the next few weeks, when all NATO countries will be preparing for the December ministerial meeting, we shall be exploring—indeed we have already begun to do so—with our friends general lines of approach designed to meet the situation that has developed and which has been developing for some time, in the hope that we can strengthen NATO. The usefulness and the necessity of NATO in this nuclear, interdependent period continues to be so obvious, I am sure, to anyone who fully appreciates the difficulties in the world situation.

The world situation has featured a number of important develpoments within the past few weeks. The changes in the top direction of the government of the Soviet union have naturally evoked conjectures. We have been given the assurance both here in Ottawa and by the government of the Soviet union in Moscow, that these changes do not involve any change in foreign policy; nor do they mean a reversion to the Stalinization of an earlier period.

In addition we have been faced with the critical but notable fact that the Chinese people's republic has successfully detonated an atomic bomb. While this was anticipated and to a great extent discounted, particularly in the western world, no one can be oblivious to the fact that it has produced a very important reaction in the continent of Asia itself. This additional factor is one which will be noted not only by NATO members but must be noted by nations all over the world. We in Canada are of the view, as we were of the view before this event took place, that in the 18 nation group meeting in Geneva which is discussing the problems of nuclear and conventional disarmament, there was an opportunity for all countries, particularly the major countries which obviously have such influence on the state of international tension, to join in conclusions and ultimately in the discussions which have taken place.

Mr. Churchill: You would have to have the discussions before the conclusions.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Yes. We have asked China to join in supporting the nuclear test ban treaty which was solemnized in August a year and a half ago. The Chinese people's republic have refused to join the 107 nations who have acceded to this pact. I suggest that one of the first steps that the Chinese people's republic might take would be to readily accept the nuclear test ban treaty provisions, and this might well serve as a means of bringing that important country into the disarmament discussions. The conclusions of these discussions cannot be complete without the participation of a country of the importance of China.

Mr. Douglas: Could I ask the minister who invited mainland China to become a signatory to the test ban agreement?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): There was no invitation. Most of the nations which signed the pact urged China to join. In this house when we announced that we had signed the pact, I expressed the view, as I express it again, that since China had announced its intention to build up a nuclear capacity it should join the partial nuclear test ban group before it undertook to add to the contamination of the air by nuclear detonation.

China has said that she does not propose to join the nuclear test ban arrangement. She has called upon the nuclear powers to hold a world conference for the purpose of entering into an agreement for the prohibition of the manufacture of nuclear weapons. We believe that this is one phase of disarmament that ought to be discussed in the context of the wider agenda before the conference that has been under consideration in Geneva.

Finally, I think we should now recognize that we have to go one step further than the efforts which were made at the United Nations and elsewhere to try to achieve non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Canada was one of the countries which subscribed to the limited but important resolution introduced by Ireland at the general assembly in 1961. Canada is one of the countries that from the beginning has had a nuclear capacity. Canada, however, committed herself completely in 1946 to the use of this new found energy for peaceful purposes only.

There are some 20 countries in the world which have, in varying degrees, a nuclear capacity but are not now manufacturing nuclear weapons. It might be that it would be useful to suggest, as a contribution to the non-proliferation of such weapons, that these countries, including Canada, should give further meaning to and strengthen the formula provided for in the Irish resolution. This is a matter that likewise is now being given consideration in some of the consultations we have had.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the minister would answer one question. Is Canada now actually engaged in negotiating itself out of the nuclear weapons field, as promised by the Prime Minister? Are negotiations actually taking place?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, we have dealt with that subject on other occasions, and I should like to complete my statement at this time.

All these important matters, and they are vital, affect us and every other country in the world now as perhaps they have not affected us for a long time. They arise at a time when we are concerned about the future of the United Nations itself. We have had questions asked from time to time on orders of the day about the financial situation of the United Nations. Canadian foreign policy is predicated upon support for the United Nations and for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We take into account in the formulation of our policy our relations with the United States and our membership in the commonwealth. It must be obvious to everyone that while there is not at the moment a critical world situation, in the sense of one overwhelming issue which threatens the peace of the world by itself, there are a number of problems which have arisen, and I referred to one of them—the situation in NATO—which have caused great concern on the part of those who look forward to the establishment of conditions which will provide some guarantee for a more steady and certain peace.

One of these is the financial situation of the United Nations. The general assembly will open on December 1 next, at which time we will be confronted with the fact that a number of countries, including the Soviet union, are indebted to the organization in amounts greater than the assessments on those countries for the two previous years. This means that under article 19 of the charter that country and other countries in a similar position could lose the right to vote.

The Soviet union has said that it will not pay any money toward past peace keeping operations. The United States, for one, takes

the position that the Soviet union must pay up the moneys that it owes or lose the right to vote, and has intimated that it proposes to call upon member states of the organization to take steps to give meaning to article 19.

It is obvious that every country in the United Nations has an obligation to pay, in accordance with established assessments its portion of money required to maintain the organization. We hope in Canada that the seemingly inflexible position taken by the Soviet union will be recognized as deserving of a change in attitude in order to enable that country to play the role which, as an important power in the world, it must be expected to play. It will be a matter of the greatest regret if this problem is not resolved, and the Canadian government, while it shares the same interpretation as the United States and as the government of Britain, with regard to the default consequences under article 19, hopes that the discussions at the United Nations will enable a compromise to ensue. Nothing would be more disastrous for the world than if the United Nations were to flounder or become ineffective—yes, if it were to disappear—because of the refusal of a group of countries to accept the responsibility which, in the judgment of the international court of justice, is applicable to all countries.

Mr. Chairman, those are some of the considerations that I am sure all members of the house have before them as they begin a discussion of the estimates of the Department of External Affairs. I believe that an opportunity could be afforded during the discussion of these estimates to cover other subjects, or to seek further clarifications of the items I have mentioned in my opening statement to this committee this afternoon.

Canada is one of the middle powers of the world. By that of course, I do not mean that we are unaligned or neutral, because we are not neutral and we are aligned. We are aligned with the nations of the west with which we have bound ourselves together in a common defensive alliance, not for the purpose of waging aggressive war but for the purpose of being strong enough to resist aggression. By the very acceptance of the organization itself we have undertaken to do what experience has shown the organization can and has been able to do; that is, maintain the peace in this very troubled time.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister a question. In order to resist aggression would the minister advise other countries to adopt Canada's attitude of acquiring nuclear arms, against whose proliferation the minister offered some objection?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member knows the very fault of his question, and I am sure he does not really expect me to accept it as seriously as his manner suggests. Canada is a country that is opposed to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Canada is a country that has a nuclear capacity, but throughout its whole nuclear history Canada has used this capacity for peaceful purposes and urges other nations to follow suit. All that Canada has done as a member of NATO, in reaching an agreement with the government of the United States with regard to the storage of nuclear weapons in Canada for Canadian forces and for American forces, is to live up to a commitment solemnly entered into by a government of which my hon. friend was a member.

I say to my hon. friend in the kindest but in the firmest way that I am sure that with the experience he has had in government he will recognize how important it is for Canada, in its relations with United States, to be able to share its defences not only with the United States, but with Europe, thereby establishing for Canada and for the other members the beginning of an Atlantic partnership that can be so important for those countries, and also for the peace of the world.

Mr. Churchill: While the minister is in the full flush of oratory perhaps he would answer another question, but first may I say I have never raised any objection to assisting our allies in any way whatsoever. Is his statement not tinged with hypocrisy when he proclaims to the world that proliferation of nuclear weapons is a bad thing while at the same time Canada is setting an example by using atomic weapons? Would it not be better to leave out the first part of the statement, this advice to other nations?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Apparently my hon. friend and I have different interests in this matter. I would hope that he would share my concern as external affairs minister for situations in the world that threaten its peace.

Mr. Churchill: I want to help you.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I am not going to be influenced by, I regret to say the shoddy

and rather parochial questions which my hon. friend has put. I think these matters are too important to be used for the purpose of satisfying one's political hobby no matter how inefficient and amateurish one may be in the discharge of that hobby.

Mr. Churchill: I am thinking of the good name of Canada and her prestige abroad.

An hon. Member: Since when?

Mr. Churchill: Always; and I have shown it by my actions, too.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, we were all very interested to hear the statement by the minister. He made certain remarks of particular note, however, which I think may require a little further clarification. First of all, I think we all share the minister's very justifiable apprehension concerning the future of the United Nations itself in the light of the non-payment to date by the Soviet union and her satellites and France of lawful United Nations dues.

This brings to mind a very interesting conversation I had with the late secretary general about a week before he was killed. On that occasion he said to me "You know, the league of nations was a success". When he noticed some surprise on my face he went on to say "After all, it was a success because it was the first organization of its kind in the world. It failed for reasons we all know, and the United Nations as we know it will probably fail in due course. Then a third organization will be set up, and then a fourth." He said "After all, one has to look at these matters over the long range".

If what the minister fears takes place the present form of the United Nations may terminate, but certainly a third form would arise out of the ashes like the phoenix. I think this is something we can expect to take place, because after all organizations of the type of the United Nations, even in the form as it exists at present, have become a necessity of the world and I think most countries realize this.

I was very interested to hear the minister's observations about nuclear weapons, and my reaction was much the same as that of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. If I heard the minister correctly, and I am sure he will advise me if I did not, he said that Canada first committed herself to the acquisition of nuclear weapons in 1948. This is certainly an interesting revelation, because from what we have heard from members on that side of the house we were led to believe that this commitment was not made until more recent years. This is certainly most interesting information.

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

Regardless of what the minister may say at the present time about Canada not really being a member of the nuclear club, it is not always what is true but what appears to be true that matters. Certainly many of our colleagues in the United Nations and elsewhere have said to me very bluntly: It is all right for you people to talk and support the Irish resolution, the Swedish resolution and others, but after all you really are a member of the nuclear club. We know there is some technical business about who presses the button at the last moment, but you really are a member. Whether we like it or not, this is the general feeling abroad.

Another of the minister's observations concerned the great interest that Canada has in the foreign policy of France. I agree that this is certainly a matter of the greatest interest to Canada, particularly inasmuch as of recent date there has been at least the appearance in this country of a rather undue interest on the part of France in our domestic affairs. I remember that on one occasion I brought this to the attention of the Prime Minister who promised to look into the matter, but so far we have not had any reply from him.

I would refer to the event a few weeks ago in the city of Three Rivers when, as I recall, the rapporteur of the foreign affairs committee of the French national assembly advised members of the St. Jean Baptiste society that independence for Quebec and separation from the rest of Canada would be a very good thing. We had another incident at the time Air Canada was contemplating the purchase of aircraft. Apparently several types were being considered and certain suggestions were made in the press that the ambassador of France was taking a rather active part in the matter by encouraging some students in Montreal to try to put pressure on the government to purchase the Caravelle aircraft. Again, we have also seen the story, reported in the French press, about the possibility of setting up a high powered radio station on the island of Miquelon in order to promote French cultural activities in Canada.

These reports may or may not be entirely accurate, but certainly they give the appearance of a very close interest by the present government of France in the internal affairs of this country. If these matters have not already been carefully looked into I should hope they would be, because interference of this kind is not necessarily entirely welcome.

Returning to the United Nations, I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to congratulate the minister, something I think we should all do.

Mr. Churchill: Don't do that.

Mr. Nesbitt: My colleague from Winnipeg South Centre says "Don't do that".

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Be very careful of the Scotch character of my hon. friend.

Mr. Nesbitt: I think that at least on this one occasion we can offer the minister sincere congratulations on the holding in Ottawa of the recent conference on peace keeping operations. This was a matter which had been discussed between ourselves and our friends at the United Nations for a number of years, and I am delighted the minister was able to bring these conversations to a successful culmination. From conversations I had with a number of the delegates I knew, through my previous association with them, I learned the conference was a success and I think the minister, the government and the country generally are to be congratulated on producing a "first in history", if one wishes to put it that way, and on having advanced significantly the progress of international peace keeping.

This is something which received acclaim in the world press, and I think that was good because latterly in the world press Canada's image has been rather like that of the Cheshire cat in "Alice in Wonderland", gradually beginning to fade until nothing was left but the grin. One has only to look at the last few months Sunday editions of the New York *Times* and London *Times* to note how little Canadian activity has been reported. There are two possible explanations for this, one that the government is not doing very much or, second, if it is, it is keeping things under wraps and not communicating them to the press abroad—something which is not helpful to our image abroad.

Members of the Liberal party used to blame the previous government for presenting a poor image abroad, but recently instead of a poor image we have not had any image at all. I am glad to see that the peace keeping conference has helped restore our image somewhat. Perhaps the grin on the cat will start to develop into a head again.

I am glad to note the minister dealt extensively with NATO, but there are a number of questions he did not answer and which are in the minds of most people. There have been disturbing reports recently about Turkey, which is the eastern anchor of NATO, contemplating leaving the alliance because of certain trouble she is experiencing. These reports appeared in both the Canadian and foreign press and I would ask the minister to give us some information on the matter. Is there any substance to these rumours in the press, or have Turkey's problems been dealt with?

On the question of the M.L.F. a very interesting bit of news has just come over the wires which I am sure the minister has received, to the effect that the conference of NATO parliamentarians is apparently giving moderate approval to the principle of M.L.F., something which may be hopeful. The news report reads as follows:

> Legislators from 15 North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries voiced belief today that a multilateral nuclear force could "make a substantial and lasting contribution to western unity and purpose".

This would seem to be an adjunct to what the minister told us this afternoon, that some arrangement along this line would seem to be meeting with some measure of success, particularly in view of the approach being taken to this problem by the new government in the United Kingdom, which I understand has a plan up its sleeve that it is communicating to its allies. I wonder if the minister is in a position to give us some details of the proposed United Kingdom plan? It may be that they are as yet confidential, but as I understand it one of the details in the plan is that Britain would not have a nuclear deterrent of her own and would throw in her lot with NATO, provided she had some sort of veto over the use of nuclear weapons. Could the minister elaborate on this?

Dealing with the organization of American states, I am going to leave most of my observations on it to one of my colleagues who will be speaking a little later in the debate. However, there are one or two things I would like to ascertain.

When the minister's estimates first came before us last May 22 he told us at that time that Canada was going to send an observer to the organization of American states and he certainly intimated, as will be seen on reading page 3497 of *Hansard* for that date, that he was giving serious consideration to joining that organization. According to news reports the minister said the same thing in Banff a few weeks ago, and during the meetings of the committee on external affairs—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Would my hon. friend read what I said at Banff? I did not say that at Banff.

Mr. Nesbitt: I do not have the newspaper clipping in front of me, but certainly that impression was created. I said the reports in the press created the impression that Canada might be going to join that organization, and the minister also gave that impression to the committee on external affairs during the meetings of that body.

Whether or not we should join the organization is a matter of debate in itself. I for one would have very grave doubts about the wisdom of joining it, and I think most of the reasons are fairly obvious. As I say, this matter is going to be dealt with fully by one of my colleagues, but may I point out one of the arguments advanced in favour of joining the organization is that geographically we are in the same unit. That may have been true in 1492 but the jet age has made things rather different, so that geographically our interests today are much closer to western Europe, Japan and the Soviet union than they are to Latin America, and certainly our present associations with Latin American countries are very satisfactory.

During the regime of the former government diplomatic missions were set up in all the Latin American countries. Last year we had a trade with Latin America amounting to $650 million, but we are not caught in the rather awkward position of being a member of the organization of American states. If we were a member, I ask what would be our relations with Cuba, and what about our trade with the People's Republic of China? Then there is the more obvious argument, that if we were a member of the organization we would be expected to pull United States chestnuts out of the Latin American fire, and vice-versa, and so far as I can see all we would get would be burned fingers. As someone said about Ireland and the commonwealth, it is a question of how to be a member without joining.

Then there is the question of the commonwealth. Everyone is in favour of the commonwealth, and recently the government made some observations on it, but it seems to be all talk and not too much action. The setting up of a commonwealth secretariat, probably in London, seems to be making progress. I think it is a good idea as a sort of post office for exchanging ideas. At present we have certain scholarship and student exchanges among commonwealth countries, and I suggest we should give consideration to an exchange of teachers and university professors between Canada and other parts of the commonwealtth. In that way we might learn a little more about the real thinking in other parts of the commonwealth.

Mr. Baldwin: Exchange ministers.

Mr. Nesbitt: That might be a good idea too.

Mr. Douglas: We could get two for one.

Mr. Nesbitt: Then there is another suggestion which has been made at different times. It might have had application in the case of Cyprus, but it might be reasonably useful in certain parts of Africa in the future. I refer to the possibility of building up a commonwealth peace force to deal with problems of peace keeping in countries associated with the commonwealth. We can all think of examples of situations which might arise in Africa in the near future.

These are matters of a positive kind. But disturbing things have been happening in the commonwealth of late. First, there is the declaration of Ghana and Tanzania made in the course of the recent conference in Cairo. There have been several reports in the press but the one to which I call attention particularly appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of October 14:

> Indonesia and its supporters urged the Chinese view of the world struggle, that the first problem is the destruction of capitalism by force.
>
> President Sukarno was supported by representatives of Tanzania, Ghana—

Then the report goes on to mention a number of other countries. This, I fear, is a dangerous point of view to be taken by some members of the commonwealth. I hope the minister and his colleagues will do everything possible to persuade Ghana and Tanzania that this is hardly the type of approach to be taken by members of a commonwealth supposed to have the same principles and the same ideals.

We can perhaps understand why Tanzania, in particular, should have taken this attitude. It is my understanding that some time ago the government of that country through its Prime Minister Mr. Nyerere made a request to the Canadian government that military instructors should be provided for its armed forces. It is again my understanding that Canada refused to supply a military contingent to train the army of our newest commonwealth brother. It seems to me there is a considerable lack of co-ordination between the Secretary of State for External Affairs and his colleague the Minister of National Defence. After all, defence is really—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I do not wish the hon. member's words to get to Tanganyika and have the effect which they will have unless challenged. A military survey mission has been in Tanganyika. It has returned to Ottawa; it has made its report and the government is now considering the assistance which is to be given to Tanganyika.

Mr. Nesbitt: I am glad to hear that. It is most encouraging, but the minister will acknowledge I did say it was my understanding that some months ago we agreed to train some officers of the army there, but we were unable to go further than that. As a result, Mr. Nyerere had to turn to red China to get military instructors and we all know that when red China sends military instructors they do not go entirely for the purpose of giving instruction in military affairs. A dangerous situation could develop in east Africa as a result of this. As somebody put it, "there is another country gone down the red drain" and I would hate to think that our government was in any way responsible. I am sure the minister made a request to his colleague the Minister of National Defence. Perhaps, in all fairness, the necessary armed forces were not available. But surely there should be co-ordination between the two departments. After all, a defence department is only there to carry out, in certain ways, the foreign policy of this country. If our foreign policy is to assist other nations of the commonwealth to develop their peace keeping machinery, and so on, while the "hardware" technically comes under the Minister of National Defence it would seem unwise to me that the minister of defence should so alter and reduce our armed forces that they should not be available when the Secretary of State for External Affairs requires a small part of them for a specific purpose. The result, in this case, is that a country like Tanzania has to turn to red China for assistance. I suggest this might well be kept in mind for future reference. It seems to have gone down the drain now. I am glad that the mission has been sent, and that it has made its report, but I suggest it is a litle late in the day, because red China has volunteered to send military assistance to that country.

The next place of interest in the commonwealth to which I intend to refer is Malaysia. As far as I understand it, we are attempting to send aid to Malaysia in its struggle against the unprovoked aggression of Indonesia. At the same time we are still providing hundreds of thousands of dollars from the pockets of Canadian taxpayers free to assist President Sukarno. Let me make one thing clear. My colleagues and I in no way disapprove of training Indonesian students in Canada. This is a long range program and its objectives are in the future; these students will be trained long after Dr. Sukarno is dead and gone and his policies, we hope, with him. Indeed, there would be no objection to training more of these students. But giving wheat and flour to Dr. Sukarno to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars is a different matter. It is true that the aid provided is in the form of food only, but if Dr. Sukarno would spend more time looking after the economy of his country and less in directing unprovoked attacks against his neighbours he would not have his present food problem. Moreover, these gifts enable him to save large sums in foreign exchange which he is then able to use to carry out attacks against his neighbours. In short, the present policy seems to me to be two faced; it does not make sense. No matter how thin you slice it, it is still boloney.

There is another matter I wish to draw to the minister's attention and it follows from Canada's membership of the commission in Viet Nam and Indochina. I refer to the atrocities being committed by both the North Viet Nam and the South Viet Nam forces. I realize that Canada possibly does not have much influence in this part of the world but it is a fact that we are a member of the control commission in that area and if we can use our good offices to prevent these atrocities taking place, so much the better. I know the faculty and students of Queen's University has been making commendable efforts in this regard. It would cost us nothing to try. We might not be particularly successful, but certainly there is no harm in trying.

Then there is the question of the People's Republic of China. It is common gossip in the corridors around here that the government intends to recognize the People's Republic very soon. It has not been denied, neither has it been confirmed. If this rumour is true, I wonder whether the minister could tell us if the government still holds to its former view, namely that recognition would be subject to a rider that Taiwan be permitted to maintain its independence or to carry out a plebiscite as to its future.

Finally, I should like to turn to the affairs of the United Nations. As I mentioned earlier, all of us are greatly concerned about the financial impasse which has arisen within that body. Whether or not the United Nations terminates its operations or carries them out in a greatly weakened manner is largely out

of our hands, although I understand that the Canadian ambassador and the delegation presently in New York have been doing their best to make a compromise arrangement possible.

In regard to the United Nations, Mr. Chairman, and in the hope that it does continue—I believe all of us certainly hope that it does—there are one or two suggestions I would like to make to the minister. One is this. There has been a very successful operation of the United States of America in keeping a permanent representative at the United Nations, one who is basically non-political and also non-civil service. I refer to, latterly of course, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, and prior to that Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge; and there was formerly a senator from Vermont whose name escapes me for the moment.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Austin.

Mr. Nesbitt: Yes, Senator Warren Austin. These people did a very fine job. Now I see that the United Kingdom is making the same kind of approach in appointing Sir Hugh Foot, who has a great reputation at the United Nations and elsewhere, to a similar type of position. I would suggest that in view of our very great activity at the United Nations over the years Canada might consider the appointment of a similar kind of person who is not of a political nature or necessarily a member of the Department of External Affairs, but some distinguished Canadian. This would not preclude anybody from being appointed who may have had a political association or been in the Department of External Affairs; but I think if there were appointed somebody of the calibre of the men I have mentioned it would be very helpful to us, because they would be there for some time and would give our representation and work at the United Nations some continuity. I do not wish to deprecate by any means the very fine work done by our previous ambassadors to the United Nations.

When the general assembly of the United Nations meets next month I would hope Canada would have more projects to launch than she did last year. To be fair, last year the present government had not been long in office and it had many things on its mind; for example, those 60 days of action which they had to carry out at home. Therefore perhaps foreign affairs were a little neglected. But the minister has now been in office for some time, has been working very hard, and I would hope there would be a number of good, Canadian projects launched at the United Nations this year. For example, there was a project put through unanimously, eventually, at the United Nations several years ago with regard to the collection of radioactive fallout data from around the world. This data was to be collected, analysed and collated by the United Nations organization, and Canada at that time agreed to analyse the data collected by countries that did not have the facilities with which to analyse it. Burma, Ghana, Pakistan, I believe, and others, agreed to send these samples to Canada for analysis. I do not know whether this has been done or whether there have been sufficient facilities provided to undertake this work. Perhaps the minister could tell us about this. This type of thing is of particular importance now that the People's Republic of China have exploded a nuclear weapon and the fallout is coming down all over the world, even in this country. I believe this is something we should certainly continue to push at the United Nations.

The Chairman: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired; unless he has the consent of the committee to continue beyond his time.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the members of the committee, and I will terminate my remarks in about three minutes. The second matter I would like to raise in this regard is the question of the pay of Canadian troops in Cyprus. This matter has been brought before the house on other occasions by my colleague, the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), who asked questions of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Unfortunately the hon. member cannot be here; as hon. members know, he is co-chairman of the defence committee, which is meeting at the moment. He points out that Canadian troops in Cyprus are being paid at a rate which is so much lower than the other members of the United Nations force, which are being paid United Nations rates of pay. We are helping to contribute men to this force and to the pay of the armed forces of other countries serving in the United Nations force, but they are apparently receiving several times the rate of pay that our men are receiving. This is causing a considerable problem. I wish the minister would elucidate this or tell us that some adjustments will be made to the pay of our armed forces in that island. This situation seems very unfair, to say the least.

I would like to leave the subject of foreign aid to one of my colleagues who will make some remarks in this connection later in the day. Finally, Mr. Chairman, I make one suggestion to the minister and I do hope he will take it seriously, because great confusion must exist in this respect in countries which are close friends of Canada and want to help us. I refer to the great confusion of mind that must take place with senior officials and ministers of foreign governments when they wish to bestow honours on Canadians. I was wondering whether the minister would send a directive to our embassies abroad so they could tell foreign governments which are friendly to this country which Canadians would be eligible to receive decorations from abroad and which would not. For instance, I would refer to the fact that the premier of the province of Quebec recently received the Grand Cross of the Order of the Phoenix, or some such decoration, from His Majesty the King of Greece. This is quite acceptable and I am not suggesting that Hon. Mr. Lesage should not be so honoured; as a matter of fact, I favour it. But it seems strange to me that a Canadian who is a British subject and has been given an award by Her Majesty the Queen is not allowed to accept it without giving up his Canadian citizenship. The government's policy seems to be that there is one rule for the elite, namely the Liberals, and another for everybody else. I wish some clarification could be made in this regard, not only at home but abroad, so that when friendly foreign governments wish to bestow honours on Canadians they will know who can accept them and who cannot. They would know they can bestow them on certain Canadians, members of the government party or their friends, and not others. I hope the minister will make this clear to our friends abroad.

Mr. Baldwin: They need them more than we do.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, I would like the remarks that I wish to make for the New Democratic party in this debate to be made in the spirit of a statement made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs to the special committee on defence in July of 1963. He said then that the foreign and defence policies of Canada were inseparable. He also went on to say that in the nuclear age all states must have but a single objective in their foreign and defence policies, namely the preservation of peace. I want to test the international policies of this country on the basis of whether we are making or are not making a maximum contribution to the preservation of peace. As the late President Kennedy put it, peace is the rational end of rational men.

I must say that I found a huge and glaring gap in the remarks made to us this afternoon by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. After referring, almost in passing, to the explosion of a nuclear bomb by the forces of the Chinese people's republic, he then said absolutely nothing at all about a subject—at least, I did not hear him say anything—which surely is one of immense importance to the future preservation of peace. I refer to the ending of the diplomatic and international isolation of the People's Republic of China. I hope the Secretary of State for External Affairs will not think I am being unkind when I say that Canadian policy has indeed been consistent in this field—it has been consistent in its ambiguity and procrastination. The minister himself has made many enlightened statements in regard to this matter. He has pointed out how futile was the attempt to isolate the Soviet republics in the period before the last war. He has pointed out that discussion of disarmament is rendered futile by the absence of a government which represents one quarter of the population of the world.

The Prime Minister himself has said that the continued diplomatic isolation of communist countries is not the policy of Canada. Yet despite this we find in the words of the minister no statement whatever in regard to this matter. As the assembly of the United Nations is about to meet and the relations of the rest of the world with the People's Republic of China are bound to be in issue, I think this house is entitled to hear from the Secretary of State for External Affairs what is the view of Canada in this regard. Nearly a year ago, on November 28, 1963, he said this—I am not sure whether it was in parliament but I know he will remember the occasion:

> We must carefully consider whether the degree of isolation which now surrounds communist China is healthy, whether it promotes international peace or tends to intensify the threat to it.

That was said a year ago. I know there are matters of timing involved in actions in this regard, but I suggest it is a tragedy that the western world has waited and now says to China: "We will admit you to the society of nations, now that you have exploded a nuclear device". It seems to me that to say that China can come into the club, now that they have developed this what I would call phony prestige involved in detonating a nuclear device, is very regrettable. Surely in-

ternational affairs are not to be based on saying that we will treat one quarter of the human race as a pariah until they are able to show us that they can threaten us with destruction in the same way as we have threatened them. I suggest it is a matter of deep regret that Canada has not before this shown the wisdom to go perhaps a little ahead of some of her allies and neighbours.

I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, what the government is afraid of in its hesitation in this matter. Is it afraid of the Canadian people? Canadian public opinion, according to all the polls I have seen, has increasingly supported this idea. When the party of which I am proud to say I am a member was in favour of the recognition of the People's Republic of China a good many years ago we were sometimes denounced by people who did not understand the basis of our action. Now this view has grown and grown. Recognition of the obvious sanity of it has grown and grown, so we cannot be afraid of public opinion in Canada.

Are we afraid of the views of the United States of America? I know there are strong feelings in the United States on this subject. I realize that during election campaigns is not a good time to state our view on this matter clearly and unequivocally. But I believe that it would be an act of friendship to the United States for Canada to make it absolutely clear that this policy of attempting to exclude from the United Nations the People's Republic of China is dangerous to the interests of the United States, and is indeed based upon a total misapprehension of conditions in the world.

The people of China refer to people in the United States or to the United States government as though they were scarcely human; and vice-versa. This of course is a delusion. The people of China have experienced a revolution, and like others who have experienced revolution in the course of their history they are sometimes violent in their language, and very defensive because of their fear of counter revolution. Yet the actions of the western world have exacerbated and exaggerated hostility which in the case of the People's Republic of China, I would remind the committee, is extremely natural. After all, if we were part of a country that had suffered from the humiliation of centuries of western aggression and imperialism I think we would be a little sensitive and a little difficult to get along with, too. Yes, we must surely end this era of isolation if we are to have peace throughout the world.

[Mr. Brewin.]

The explosion of this bomb only points once more to the fact that the survival of the human race depends on getting rid of the sort of attitude of mind which says that we do not recognize the government of one quarter of the human race; that we exclude these people from the category of human beings because we do not like the type of government they have. Of course we are not fond of the type of government they have. After all, it has happened before during the course of history that great nations have had governments which were aggressive. But in the course of time these revolutionary impulses died down. Surely our policy should be directed to softening the effects of this revolutionary attitude and not directed toward continued isolation.

Mr. Fred Nossal, who I know has had some experience himself in China, wrote an excellent article in the *Globe and Mail* magazine for November 7, during the course of which he said this:

> But to keep them—

He is referring to the People's Republic of China.

> —isolated from global discussions, to treat them as international lepers, would only make the Chinese more determined than ever to go their own way.

I think that is a very wise statement.

I hope that the Secretary of State for External Affairs will be able to tell us, perhaps during the course of this debate, that at long last the period of equivocation is over and that as far as Canada is concerned we are not a satellite which cannot speak our own mind; that we will speak our own mind; and that our mind is that this great country, albeit a country the government of which we do not approve, must be drawn into the society of nations without further delay.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Oxford referred to another matter which is connected with what I have already said about our relations with the People's Republic of China. He referred to the fact that some students from Queen's University had brought to his attention a resolution they had passed concerning the situation in Viet Nam. I have no doubt that they also called it to the attention of the minister. In this resolution they called to our attention certain pictures of tortures which were taking place in Viet Nam, reminding us in a vivid way of the suffering and the hell to which that country has been subjected by the continuation of war. In their resolution they asked Canada to call upon the human rights commission of the United

Nations organization to investigate the atrocities committed on both sides. Then they went on to say that Canada, as a member of the general assembly, should—

—urge that the United Nations, in its role as the leader in the struggle for world peace, take measures to initiate a peace settlement which effectively guarantees the right of self-determination for the peoples of Viet Nam.

I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that it is easy to pass resolutions which say there should be a peace settlement which effectively guarantees the right of self-determination; that would clearly be the objective of all of us. I fully realize that in this regard passing resolutions and announcing desirable objectives is a relatively easy exercise. It is very much harder to find out how to achieve these desirable objectives which are stated in the resolution.

In view of the fact that Canada is a member of the international control commission, as the hon. member for Oxford reminded us, and because Canada has assumed this degree of responsibility, I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs, if he participates in the debate later, whether he will say what Canada is doing to end this tragic war, which as far as I can see is getting worse all the time. France, which after all was a great imperial nation, found it impossible to maintain a position in Viet Nam. Is the United States going to achieve something there, or is the only answer really to work out, as part of the recognition of the People's Republic of China, an agreement to neutralize this particular area? I do not always agree with the views of Mr. de Gaulle.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. gentleman a question? I am following his constructive speech with very great interest. Do I understand he is now suggesting that we work out an agreement with the Chinese people's republic for the neutralization of Indochina as a condition preceding the recognition of that regime, or its admission into the United Nations?

Mr. Brewin: I think that the neutralization of Indochina obviously concerns more countries than just two. I think the 18 nations now represented at Geneva would be parties to such an agreement; but I say a preliminary to the working out of some such neutralization arrangement may very well be the drawing of the Chinese people's republic into the United Nations, where there is a forum in which these matters could properly be discussed, with a view to developing a final arrangement. I would not suggest for a moment that we make that a condition of recognition, but I do say that it would possibly be an advantage, or be a by-product of extraordinary value if it could be brought about in that way.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs referred to what I might call a crisis in NATO, and I should like to say a few words in that regard. It is my personal view, and I think I speak if not for all, then for most of my party in saying this, that western unity in NATO still remains not only desirable, but a necessary basis for moving on to what I think is vitally important, and that is the extension of the detente in Europe. The massive confrontation of nuclear power in Europe, and particularly confrontation of tactical nuclear weapons in the front lines of Europe, constitutes a danger not only to Europe but to the whole world. I suggest, in other words, that the strategy of NATO has been basically unsatisfactory and should be changed.

I would ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs to expand on some remarks he made in an address to the Atlantic treaty association at Ottawa on September 15, 1964, and in which he said the following:

As far as the alliance itself is concerned, there is still a long way to go toward completion of the review of NATO defence policy which ministers required at the Ottawa meeting in May 1963. While I would not wish to overstress the problems of the alliance in that regard I cannot escape the feeling that the long term effects of not achieving some agreement in the fields of strategy, military integration, nuclear control, command structure and cost sharing are bound to detract from our effectiveness as an alliance in using the forces we have at our disposal. I believe that the time has come to face these problems and honestly to deal with them with the requisite boldness and imagination. In particular I believe that they point to the need for some re-thinking first with regard to a greater sharing in the military direction of the alliance, and second, in regard to the relationship between the civilian and military arms of the alliance.

I should like the minister to give a little more clarification of the situation in this regard. First, is it a fact as he suggests that the review of NATO strategy and NATO defence policy has still a long way to go before completion? If so, what view is the Canadian government taking on the issue of NATO strategy which is proposes to urge within NATO?

The minister referred to the support of the multilateral force. I understood this government to make it very clear in the past that it did not support Canada's participation in the multilateral force. We have not been told the reasons for that view, and I should like the minister to do so. I understood him to say

that those who did not like a multilateral force should suggest some other clearcut alternative. Would the minister make it absolutely clear again, if he speaks about this matter, that Canada is not supporting the multilateral force? I urge him to do so because the subject needs clarification, and because I think Canada's full weight should go in a different direction.

The multilateral force is a device intended no doubt by the government of the United States to deal with the problem involved in a possible extension to West Germany of an independent strategic nuclear force. After all, if Britain and France have good reasons for wanting an independent nuclear force, so may Germany.

The multilateral force, as I understand it, is a device proposed to prevent the nuclear rearmament of Germany. In my view, as far as I have been able to understand, the multilateral force has no military value, and its political value is more than dubious. In fact my own view is that the participation of West Germany in the mutilateral force is likely only to increase the urgency and desire for independent control. The purposes of allied control of the strategy of NATO are not served adequately by this multilateral force.

Will the minister inform us whether he intends to put the full force of the policy of the Canadian government behind the effort which I understand is to be developed by the new prime minister and government of Great Britain, to see whether it is possible to work out within NATO, not only a more rational strategy which would not primarily depend on tactical nuclear weapons, but in addition a form of consultation which would make it clear that the whole alliance is deeply concerned with a strategy which is to determine the fate of Europe? It would be interesting to hear the minister clarify where Canada is going to stand on these particular points in the councils of NATO.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I made it very clear that Canada has no intention at the present time of joining the multilateral nuclear force.

Mr. Brewin: Would the minister go one step further, and I do not ask him to do so now, and tell us the reason behind that attitude? We need some public enlightenment on matters of this sort, because they are being discussed and are very complex, and relate to the whole field of NATO strategy. Would the minister tell us what he thinks is the alternative? He has said that it is not good enough for us just to say we do not like the multilateral force. May I ask the minister to inform us of at least the lines along which he is thinking about the problems of NATO, and how he believes the problems involved in the controlling of nuclear forces can be solved if the multilateral force is to be rejected by the alliance?

[Mr. Brewin.]

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with one other matter, the matter of peace keeping forces, and I want to take the opportunity we now have of discussing international affairs to say once again that in our view one of the greatest contributions Canada could make, probably the greatest, is in the field of contributions made to peace keeping forces through the United Nations. I would be less than fair if I did not congratulate the minister and the government upon the part Canada has played through them in the past, particularly in Cyprus, under considerable difficulties. I want to say further that in that particular field of peace keeping I hope this tremendously worth-while development in international affairs will not be dissipated by the financial difficulties discussed at the United Nations. It seems to me the minister himself said on one occasion that, while no one can be certain of these things, if it had not been for the intervention of peace keeping forces in Cyprus we would very likely have had a war between two allies in NATO, which might well have escalated into a major conflict. If this is so, and I believe the minister is right in saying it is so, then it seems to me important that the public in Canada and the public throughout the world should recognize that the very minute contributions, financially speaking, that we and other nations have made to peace keeping forces have in fact been a major element in preserving the peace of the world and that any further contribution we may be called upon to make in this field is not only the right thing to do but the essential, the wise, the intelligent thing to do on the basis of self-interest as well as idealism and consideration for the future.

In that connection, Mr. Chairman, I have been a little disappointed and surprised—I would ask the minister to deal with this point at some time or other—to see that the move, as I see it, that the Soviet union made toward recognition of the importance of peace keeping forces under the United Nations in the statement made on July 10, 1964, has not been more fully explored. The minister is very familiar with that statement. In that statement the Soviet government maintained its insistence that peace keeping forces under the United Nations should be under the control

of the security council, but at the same time they recognized that if such forces were under the control of the security council the Soviet union would be under obligation to support them and, for the first time so far as I know, they recognized that these forces would have to be contributed by the nations that were not permanent members of the security council, in other words the smaller nations. As I understood it, they were ready to recognize the value, for the first time so far as I know, of peace keeping forces financed by the United Nations and composed of units made available by other than the great powers. It seems to me this is a recognition, of the value of peace keeping forces. It is quite inconsistent with the view often taken by the U.S.S.R. in the past which insisted that under article 7 of the charter such forces must be those of the great nations. The new Soviet attitude, has not to my knowledge been adequately explored.

The minister referred to nuclear strategy and got into some sort of debate and questioning with the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. In respect of that matter I want to say to the minister that it may well be that he can justify what he said, namely that this government adopted that nuclear strategy in order to fulfil commitments made by an earlier government. But I remind the minister that a review of that was promised, that a suggestion of renegotiation was made—

Mr. Douglas: Promised.

Mr. Brewin: A promise of renegotiation was made, my hon. friend reminds me—and that instead of that we merely have a continuation of this sterile, dangerous reliance upon a strategy based upon tactical nuclear weapons. This is not a defence debate and I do not propose to enlarge upon my reasons for saying that, but I should like some clarity, if that is possible, from the minister with regard to whether within the councils of NATO this government proposes to seek not to add more to the tactical nuclear strategy but to withdraw from central Europe this massive confrontation of tactical nuclear power which I suggest the best opinion, in Europe as well as on the North American continent, recognizes to be a positive danger to peace rather than the reverse.

In the long run we will only solve these problems through detente, through disarmament, but we have to ask ourselves these questions. Are the policies propounded and put forward by this country frank and clear enough and are they fully designed to ease the dangers to world peace in the present situation? I will be happy if the minister will elaborate on some of the things he has already said, and satisfy the house that in these fields Canada is really doing all it can and not just floating along with the tide.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, we appreciated the information contained in the remarks made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs a few minutes ago when he spoke about the problems that had developed within the NATO alliance and the efforts that were being made to resolve those problems. So far as this party is concerned, we express the hope that these efforts and deliberations will in fact result in success, at least to the point where they keep NATO in the strong position it has been for the very vital purposes to which other hon. members have referred this afternoon.

While we appreciated the remarks of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, we were somewhat disappointed at the lack of information concerning the matter of recognition of red China and also with regard to the financial difficulties that have arisen in the United Nations recently. I think we in the house have a right to know what the attitude of the Canadian government is going to be respecting the matter of recognition of red China by this country, and its admission to the United Nations, particularly because of certain statements that have been made recently by the Prime Minister and by the Secretary of State for External Affairs himself. He has made public pronouncements on more than one occasion over the past few months to the effect that we could no longer tolerate, although that is perhaps too strong a word, the exclusion of the People's Republic of China from the councils of the world. I do not have the press reports or the exact date here but early in October the Prime Minister indicated in a speech that it was his feeling it was desirable at this time that some way should be devised of having direct negotiations with this very large country.

On a number of occasions during the question period members of the house, including myself, have asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs what the Canadian government proposes to do about giving effect to these opinions that have been expressed. Each time he has referred us to his famous speech of May 22 last. He has stated that the opinions he expressed at that time were complete and that if hon. members would read that speech the answers to their ques-

tions would be apparent. I have that speech before me, Mr. Chairman, and I read it carefully again today. In the first place, I should like to suggest to the minister that this speech is now somewhat outdated. In fact, I think I could go so far as to say it is badly outdated because there have been some very profound changes in the international political situation since May 22.

We have, for example, the change of leadership in Russia. If you look at the speech made by the minister on May 22 you will find that he referred more than once to the relationship that was developing between Russia and China and expressed the opinion that this might lead to some development that might be desirable in so far as the western world was concerned. I do not want to be unfair to him. He did not suggest that the differences between these two great nations were necessarily good for the possibility of peace in the world, but it seems to me that much of what he said on the question of the admission of red China to the United Nations was predicated on developments coming out of this relationship.

Now we have a new leadership team in Russia, but I do not suppose its attitude has crystallized to the point where we can draw conclusions on whether or not the present relations between China and Russia will continue. Another point is that there has been a change of government in Britain. That may not significantly change any of these things, but there have also been important developments inside China itself, in particular the explosion of a nuclear device. We cannot completely discount that matter when thinking about the recognition of China in the councils of the world.

During the period prior to the United States election we did not press the minister too hard during question period because we realized it would be awkward for him to make positive statements at that time on what Canada intended to do to give effect to these matters. But now that election is over, and the fact remains that we have these sentiments being expressed by the two people most qualified to speak on behalf of Canada with respect to external affairs and international relations. Whether these were trial balloons or not, we have now reached the stage when we ought to have further explanation on what the government intends to do.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Would my hon. friend permit me to ask a question? He referred to the statement I made on May 22, and I believe a careful analysis of that statement will reveal it has current application. I would be very interested to know what he thinks about the suggestion made in that speech on protecting the interests of Formosa and the steps suggested towards that end.

[Mr. Olson.]

Mr. Olson: It might be well if I quoted from that speech. As recorded at page 3479 of *Hansard* for May 22, the minister said:

> Realizing the dangers inherent in Chinese isolation, Canada has, like a number of other western nations, encouraged increased contacts in the commercial and cultural fields with China; and I think this policy has been wise and has met with success.

Further on he said:

> Canada has opposed resolutions calling for the expulsion of nationalist Chinese representatives and their replacement by representatives from Peking.

He also said:

> Canadian representatives at the United Nations have made clear the Canadian desire for an equitable solution which would deal adequately with the Formosa problem and at the same time bring mainland China into the main stream of international affairs.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): But it goes on to talk about taking steps to protect that position.

Mr. Olson: I believe the minister wants me to quote this paragraph:

> Recent developments have revived interest in what could be described as a one China, one Formosa solution. To achieve such a solution would require above all the co-operation of the parties immediately concerned; but a practical and equitable solution along these lines has not so far proved acceptable either to Peking or to Taipei.

This still does not answer the question of whether the government is now prepared to take positive action, either by initiating or supporting action initiated by another member country, designed to seat red China in the United Nations. From the speech which the minister made on May 22 it is perfectly clear Canada has expressed a desire for closer contact with communist China. I am not at all arguing that point, but I am saying there must have been some follow up action anticipated by the government because of the statements made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Prime Minister during the latter part of September and in October.

A number of times I asked the minister whether any members of the United Nations had indicated they wanted the admission of red China included in the agenda for the meeting of the general assembly. So far the minister has not answered.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Yes, there is a proposed resolution by Cambodia.

Mr. Olson: I thank the minister and perhaps later he can tell us whether Canada intends to support that resolution.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I would simply like to say that the Canadian government is engaged in careful consideration of this problem in consultation with other countries. When the Canadian position on this matter has been finalized the house will be advised.

Mr. Olson: But the general assembly will be meeting on December 1 and it is now November 19.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): This question may go on for months.

Mr. Olson: The minister says it may go on for months, but I imagine it might be one of the first items dealt with by the assembly. I presume the seating arrangements would be high on the agenda. Anyway we have now received more information than we had a few days ago, and I hope the minister will keep the house informed on Canada's position.

Dealing with the financial crisis in the United Nations, article 19 of the charter provides that member nations shall lose their votes if they fall more than two years in arrears in paying their assessments. A number of nations are about to fall into this category and we only hope a direct confrontation on this question can be avoided if the results of such a confrontation were the withdrawal of some of the larger nations from the organization.

I also note that the United States has so far delayed its commitment to the United Nations voluntary assistance programs. In withholding its pledge it appears that the United States may be engaged in a bit of arm twisting with respect to the votes of Afro-Asian nations, which are the ones who benefit most under these programs.

We certainly hope the United States is not engaged in brinkmanship in this respect—trying to persuade the Afro-Asian nations to support its motion under article 19 of the United Nations charter when this question comes before the world organization. The reason I call this "brinkmanship" is because the Secretary of State for External Affairs has expressed some optimism in the last few days that the United States will finally make its usual pledge with respect to the 40 per cent of the total of these assistance programs. If the United States is holding back, engaging in arm twisting to get the Afro-Asian nations to support it in the action it intends to take under article 19, I must say that we in this party do not approve an attitude of that kind. We feel the United Nations is far too important as a forum for negotiating the important problems which arise around the world from time to time to be placed in jeopardy because of this kind of pressure.

I recognize this does not provide an answer to the question as to what must be done to encourage those nations which are delinquent in meeting their assessments to come forward and pay them. I realize this is an extremely difficult problem. But we would not like to see the whole organization placed in jeopardy because some nations have not paid their assessments and because, in an attempt to see that they live up to their obligations under the charter, the United States is threatening to withhold its voluntary contributions to the technical assistance program.

I wish in conclusion to draw attention to one other matter, the progress of the peace keeping operation in Cyprus. It appears that the Cyprus situation has settled down and become relatively quiet in the past two weeks. I believe Canadians can take pride in the fact that this peace keeping operation has enjoyed its present degree of success in keeping a dangerous situation from spreading and becoming far more serious. I think the minister should be congratulated on the initiative and on the decisive action he took earlier this year in getting this peace keeping force on to the island in time. I am confident it was largely as a result of the initiative taken by the Secretary of State for External Affairs that this force was in position in time to avert a situation which might have developed to a point at which it would have been difficult for all concerned to turn back.

To sum up, I should be obliged if the minister would give us an outline of what is happening at the United Nations with regard to the serious position which has arisen because of the failure on the part of some countries to pay regular assessments, together with the indication by the United States that it may withhold its voluntary pledge to the assistance program. Perhaps too the hon. gentleman could tell us what positive action the government intends to take with respect to red China.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Chairman, my remarks, this afternoon, will be very brief. Today, on the orders of the day I put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr.

Martin) with a view to finding out why the Minister without Portfolio, the hon. member for St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville (Mr. Dupuis) has been away since—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): May I answer the question immediately? He has gone to represent the Canadian government in Ceylon.

Mr. Rondeau: We know he has gone to Ceylon; as a matter of fact, we knew this before he left. On the other hand, we would like to know—we have noted that he has been away from the house for over a month —if this mission has lasted for a month for, as representative of a department, a one month trip would imply that the mission is very important.

I feel that the Secretary of State for External Affairs should give us additional information concerning the mission to Ceylon of the Minister without Portfolio. We were given a lot of explanations a few weeks ago with regard to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) who is now in Africa. At that time, we were told that the mission of the Minister without Portfolio was the same. We also learned that the Minister without Portfolio was to spend a few days, if not a few weeks, in Africa. Now, we would like to know the nature of the mission which the Secretary of State for External Affairs has entrusted to the hon. member for St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville.

We are right in asking questions, for we know the Department of External Affairs is paying the Minister without Portfolio's travelling expenses. We do not know whether it also pays those of his wife—because we know that she is accompanying him—and we would like to have more details on the trip of this minister who has been conspicuous by his absence for over a month. If he has a mission to accomplish in Ceylon, I think that the Secretary of State for External Affairs should provide us with more details. We would like to know what is the exact nature of his mission, when he is expected back and what success he has had with the authorities of Ceylon or of the other countries—

Mr. Chrétien: Certainly more than you have here.

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Chairman, I would point out to you that if the hon. member for St. Maurice-Laflèche (Mr. Chrétien) has anything to say, he could at least be brave enough to stand on his two feet and to express his opinion in the house.

Mr. Chrétien: Very well.

In answer to the hon. member, I should say that when I speak, I say sensible things and, unlike the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau), do not make any insinuations.

[*Text*]

Mr. Gelber: Canada must pursue a ceaseless search for peace. As a member of the United Nations and a partner of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and a member of the commonwealth our commitments and wide associations give us a unique opportunity to exercise a force for well-being.

Through the commonwealth we are in company with nations old in the arts of statecraft, and with newly emerging nations in Asia, Africa and the Caribbean. This provides special scope and affords us an intimate relationship with peoples seeking to establish their roots in freedom. It also affords us a particular tie with one of the powers which has given leadership in the emergence of western civilization. The strength of Britain is our interest. The progress of the developing countries is our concern, and we are pleased to participate through the Colombo plan and through other agencies in their development.

In the United Nations we seek the widest rule of law, and respect for international authority. Canada's role has been out of proportion to our numbers and to our power, but through the wise counsel which we can offer a place among the leaders has not been denied us. The problems of the United Nations stem in part from its deep commitment to situations where it might have been more effective by playing a lesser role. By plunging into the Congo much of the substance of the United Nations has been committed to a situation where UN leadership was not certain of the road along which it was travelling. It is a paradox that United Nations forces which were sent to the Congo upon the urgent request of the government of Leopoldville to stem the tide of Tshombe rule in Katanga have now been withdrawn, while Tshombe himself has been invited back by these very same rulers to take control of the government of Leopoldville. One of the problems of the League of Nations was that it was seized with problems much beyond its capabilities. Instead of allowing it to grow and develop, all the legacy of the Versailles treaty was placed on the doorstep of the league. Now we note that the United Nations finds that the deep commitment in the Congo exhausted much of its resources, in order to save the Congo from Tshombe

and secession. We now see that the former secessionists are in control of the central government of the Congo and the mercenaries who were the core of Tshombe's army are fighting to establish the authority of Leopoldville. A wiser and less precipitous course in the Congo might have saved the United Nations from its present impasse.

In the Middle East the wise counsel of our present Prime Minister, who as secretary of state for external affairs urged the United Nations to use the impasse of 1956 between Israel and Egypt as an opportunity for establishing a peaceable relationship between these two countries, was not accepted and upon the insistence of the then United States secretary of state, Mr. Dulles, and with the blessing of the then secretary general of the United Nations, Mr. Dag Hammarskjold, there was a return to the status quo ante. Had the wise counsel of our present Prime Minister been followed, the war situation could have been turned into a basis for an enduring peace. Canada will certainly continue to use its best influence to bring about a resolution of the unhappy state of affairs in the Middle East between Israel and her neighbours.

We now find a situation in the United Nations where it is facing bankruptcy and where one of the major powers refuses to participate in the peace keeping undertakings which have been ordered under the uniting for peace resolutions of the general assembly. To lose Russia would be a serious blow and our best efforts must be used to help resolve this very critical situation. The United Nations itself has been radically transformed with the addition of many members from the developing countries. It is becoming a wider forum, and we all hope that it will be a responsible one. The future of world peace is so intimately associated with international co-operation, which the United Nations symbolizes, that we cannot allow it to go by default.

NATO is also faced with a crisis. Formed to underpin the security of western Europe in the face of burgeoning Russian power, NATO in its early years gave confidence to nations of western Europe to defend themselves in association with North Atlantic countries. Canada has given commitments much beyond any in peacetime and the United States and Britain have also given automatic guarantees which are historic and unique. This is a situation on which to build, and the present re-examination of the NATO relationship must be used, not to dismantle the machinery which has made such an important contribution to world peace, but to direct NATO activities in new directions which can meet more fully the situation where western Europe with new confidence and a welcome prosperity can play a fuller role in the fulfilment of NATO's objectives.

The statements of the new government in the United Kingdom are welcome since they recognize that the problem of nuclear initiative within NATO cannot be spread among a triumvirate of powers. The dispersal of control of nuclear weapons would set up new dangers. Canada is content to allow this initiative to remain in the hands of the greatest strategic power in the west. The demand for independent nuclear deterrents in the hands of British and French forces means that each would have a trigger on American nuclear power. Canada, which is committed to go to war in defence of its partners should they be attacked, can only look with trepidation upon the development of these independent initiatives. The statement of the British prime minister that his country is prepared to waive this position will certainly be welcome in Canada. The proposal to expand the number of countries with nuclear weapons by organizing multilateral nuclear forces is also viewed with some trepidation here. The further dispersal of nuclear weapons is a matter of great concern.

We must continue our unremitting efforts for disarmament. I am not one of those who feel that an agreement for disarmament would bring about a cataclysmic readjustment of our economic affairs. There is much for us to do, and the predictions which were made in 1945, 1946 and 1947 about the critical economic result of the end of the war certainly were not borne out. Even if we had to pay a large economic price it would certainly be worth the security and well-being resulting from a program of agreed disarmament. We will probably only go forward slowly, but we must be patient, we must be persistent, and we must be wise.

The United Nations itself cannot continue to deny membership to mainland China. Seven hundred million people must have a voice through their government, even though it may not be a democratic government, in the councils of the United Nations. We must bend our best efforts to gain the adherence of mainland China to international agreements, particularly in areas of disarmament. We must also offer economic association to mainland China so that it can become integrated in the world community. Certainly the claims of China

irredenta on an offshore island are not sufficient for denying a place in the councils of the United Nations to 700 million people.

Canada is also taking a greater interest in the problems of Latin America, which it might well do. We must be prepared to pay a very considerable price for our participation in the affairs of Latin America, and until we fully take stock of the demands that shall be made upon us we should develop our relations on a day to day basis. I support wholeheartedly the granting of long term credits to countries in Latin America. It seems to me that economic and cultural associations are going to be most fruitful and we will probably think very hard before we enter into political arrangements involving the area of Latin America.

The expanded programs of technical and other assistance to developing countries which have been announced by the government are certainly most welcome. The disparities between the developed and less developed world are startling and critical. Despite the efforts which have been made, the gap is not narrowing; it is growing—and because of the state of our economy we can afford to participate more fully in these programs. Personally, I support all the multilateral programs of the United Nations and am pleased to see that we have increased our contribution to UNICEF by $200,000. However, the most fruitful and most likely area where we will participate to a larger extent in aid to developing countries is through bilateral arrangements. The economic development of Canada is a factor which must be related to our contribution in this particular field and it is through bilateral programs that we can ensure that the rate of growth in Canada is enhanced by our participation in the economic growth of the developing countries.

I would also like to say a word about our foreign service. The good name of Canada abroad owes a great deal to men of character, skill and modesty who have laboured for many years in understanding the problems of countries to which they have been posted in representing Canada. It seems to me that the position of this important service should be enhanced and we should take a closer look at the very serious personal problems involved for men and women who take these postings abroad. This service is an important aspect of Canadian policy and it has many unique problems which are not the same as problems facing people in other areas of government. A man who is performing in Canada is certainly not faced with the hardships and the vicissitudes which are often the daily count for those who are representing Canada abroad. We tend to think of the Canadian diplomatic service in terms of the type of career which was open in the 19th century and in the early years of the 20th century. Polite routines are not the essence of the work of Canadian diplomats abroad. They have to familiarize themselves with modes of life often far disant from those of western society. They are the listening posts of Canadian intelligence abroad. For this sensibility and these trials we must make more adequate provision. It is Canada's basic interest to live in a world of peace and a world friendly to our aspirations. In this we must invest our best endeavours.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, knowing how considerate he is, I am sure the Secretary of State for External Affairs will waste no time in answering the few questions I wish to put to him.

We have learned that the assignment of a certain mission to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) was not authorized by an order in council. There are certain things I should like to know with regard to that assignment. For instance, I would—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Ricard: I am not through yet.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I merely wish to know whether the hon. member would care to wait until the end of the general discussion before asking his questions.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, I should like to please the minister but I must advise him, with regret, that I cannot postpone my questions, as I shall have to leave.

I know, for instance, the assignment of the mission on which the hon. member for Red Deer was sent is based on good will, co-operation, understanding, and a desire to promote common interests.

I think this is probably the result of the minister's joviality. Up to this point, I feel he deserves some congratulations and a certain measure of admiration from the house.

There are questions which the Secretary of State for External Affairs still has not answered.

He told us when the matter was raised in the house that the appointment of the hon. member for Red Deer was based on the 15 years of experience he had on the dark continent.

On the other hand, we also know, as was recalled by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) a few moments ago, that the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) has also been selected by the government to accomplish a mission in Africa.

I would like to know from the minister what specific mission has been assigned to the hon. member for Red Deer and what specific mission has been assigned to the Minister without Portfolio.

Within the diplomatic corps are there no efficient officials who could have fulfilled the duties which were assigned to the hon. member for Red Deer?

Was a meeting held between our two temporary diplomats, if I may call them that, the hon. member for Red Deer and the Minister without Portfolio? Did they consult each other? Did they meet in order to synchronize their efforts so the delicate and difficult problems and duties assigned to each would be fulfilled according to the instructions of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and also in the best interests of all concerned?

I was on the platform in 1960, at Papineauville, when Hon. Lionel Chevrier told us about the detrimental effects of nuclear weapons. You should have heard him then telling us about the dreadful effects of the dropping of a nuclear bomb on our population. And that was to blame the government of the day for having accepted, he said, nuclear weapons.

As no action has been taken since to get rid of nuclear weapons, on the contrary—yet those who sit on the other side of the house campaigned against nuclear weapons, but at one time they rose in this chamber and said they were in favour of them—I ask the minister what progress has been made in the negotiations to free Canada from its nuclear commitments to NATO and NORAD?

Those are the questions that come to my mind.

However, if I am here when other matters are discussed, I will again prevail upon the kindness of the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

[*Text*]

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, in following the minister and the hon. members for Oxford, Greenwood, Medicine Hat and St. Hyacinthe-Bagot, there are a few things several hon. members have asked about during the debate on which we need some clarification.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Would it be possible to deal with them on the details? I would be very glad to deal with them then.

Mr. Woolliams: Well, I would just like to asks a few questions and I will be interested in the minister's replies. I sometimes think that the language he uses is veiled in allegory, because it is very difficult to find out at times where the minister stands on some important matters—for example, the diplomatic recognition of China, whether Canada should be a member of the O.A.S. and our stand on negotiating out of nuclear weapons today.

I have great respect for the minister, and I think many other hon. members have the same feelings as I toward him. We all enjoy putting questions to him and we also enjoy the answers. Sometimes they are very difficult to understand and we do not always understand what he means.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Sometimes he does not, himself.

Mr. Woolliams: That is right. Perhaps the minister is a little like Robert Browning, who wrote a poem and when he was asked about it several months later he said that when he wrote it he understood it, but that when he looked at it later, only God understood it.

The question I would pose immediately to the minister is the one I posed the other day. I was glad to hear the hon. member for Medicine Hat say something about this, and I was also particularly interested in the excellent address of the hon. member for Greenwood concerning whether we should recognize China. As reported at page 10154 of *Hansard* I asked this question, and I will also read the answer.

Before I read it, however, let me say this. When the minister sat on this side of the house he had some very clearcut answers to this problem. He was then in opposition looking to greener pastures, to the time when he would become minister. He felt at that time that Canada, in plain, simple language, should diplomatically recognize China. He also said without any reservation or equivocation whatever that we should become a member of the O.A.S. I am sure he was in full accord with the leader of his party at the time, now Prime Minister, that if Canada accepted nuclear weapons it would negotiate out of them when the Liberals took office.

It was with that thought in mind, and particularly in view of the new developments in China, that I posed this question, hoping that the estimates of the department would come before the house.

I should like to say at the outset that I am happy the house has agreed to limit the time of discussion on estimates. I hope we can come to this kind of an agreement often. Someone charged me the other day with having made a backroom deal with a certain minister in the Liberal party. If I had any deal at all with the minister, it was not a backroom deal but a frontroom deal. In any event we did get the job done. By limiting the time for debate on estimates we know where we are and we can thrash out our problems within that period of time.

An hon. Member: It was a Pickersgill-Woolliams amendment.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I heard someone say that it was a Pickersgill-Woolliams amendment. Whatever it was, it was a good thing, because we completed our consideration of redistribution.

On November 17 I directed a question on orders of the day to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. That question in part, as it appears in *Hansard* at page 10154, is as follows:

> In view of the coming apparent change of attitude of the United States toward China, particularly with reference to recognition of China, does the minister not think now is the time for Canada to take a lead by diplomatically recognizing China and thus put his words into action?

The minister answered as follows:

> Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the validity of the premise—

The hon. member for Oxford, who has had a considerable amount of experience in external affairs, said that it seemed to be common knowledge to anyone who reads the Sunday New York *Times*, and other newspapers, that there is going to be a change in the attitude of the United States in its policy toward China. The minister obtains his information from the officials of his department, which I think is one of the best departments of our government and always does an excellent job for the country, whether the Conservatives or Liberals are in power, because we all agree about fundamental problems, and seem to disagree only when there is a crisis. This is also because we must have continuity in our international policies.

The minister stated in answer to my question:

> Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the validity of the premise involved in my hon. friend's question—

I really do not think that was what the minister meant. He then said:

> [Mr. Woolliams.]
>
> —therefore I could not usefully answer the remaining part of the question.

Most members I suppose would let it go at that, but I am not one to let these things die, and I asked this supplementary question:

> Is the government prepared to recognize China?

I put my question in plain ordinary terms, and the minister stated:

> As I said last week, Mr. Speaker, I dealt with this matter rather fully on May 22, 1964.

I then asked another supplementary question which involved the point which I believe was developed by the hon. member for Greenwood and the hon. member for Medicine Hat, this afternoon. For once the opposition seems to be in agreement. This is the question I then asked:

> A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since May, 1964, have the circumstances changed?

I would not think that the minister wanted to leave the impression in this house that the circumstances had not changed since May 22, 1964, the date of his great speech. My question then was:

> In view of the fact that China now has some knowledge and information about nuclear weapons, has the attitude of the minister or the government changed or remained static since May, 1964?

We knew that China had experimented with some sort of an atomic bomb, although we do not know just what kind. The government of Canada may know, but that may be a secret of the cabinet.

I asked the minister:

> Has the attitude of the minister or the government changed or remained static since May, 1964?

He then answered in this way:

> Mr. Speaker, these additional factors, to which my hon. friend directs our attention, naturally are playing a part in studies that are current.

He did not answer my question. He did not say whether the government of Canada was going to recognize China, or whether the government of Canada was working in conjunction with the government of the United States, our friends and allies with which we work on the American continent, toward negotiating discussions on this problem.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I am sure my hon. friend will recognize that this is an important matter. I have already informed the hon. member for Medicine Hat that this matter is now being discussed with a number of countries.

Mr. Woolliams: That is one reason why this problem should be aired this afternoon. We

have now smoked out the minister. The minister did not give us that kind of a clearcut answer on November 17, and that is not long ago.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I did not do so because the next day we had very important consultations, which are now continuing, with certain countries.

Mr. Woolliams: I must have been looking in a crystal ball in order to realize that the minister was going to hold a very important conference the day after November 17, but in any event on that day he had not changed his attitude as he expressed it on May 22, 1964.

With the greatest respect for the minister, who is one of the most senior and respected members of this house, I say that while we enjoy the comedy of his answers at times, I do wish in the future that he would give more clearcut answers to our questions. I think many members of this chamber and members of the press gallery are beginning to realize that the minister's answers are wrapped in such allegory that we do not know what he means. He speaks in a different language, and it is very difficult for us, with some limitation, to understand his answers.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Would the hon. member permit me to remind him of the observation of a great British foreign minister who said that, when answering difficult questions on foreign policy, it is desirable to make sure that the opposition is well informed to the point where there will be no danger as a result.

Mr. Woolliams: I appreciate that interjection because we now know exactly what is the policy of the minister when he is answering questions in the House of Commons. It does give us some comfort to know that he follows a deliberately planned move in answering our questions.

In relation to the point developed by the hon. member for Greenwood this afternoon, and also developed by the hon. member for Medicine Hat, I should like to quote a portion of a recent article which appeared in the *Saturday Evening Post,* now called the *Post,* which puts the situation into proper perspective and in better language than I could use. It relates to the China policy of the United States. This article confirms the belief that Canada's policy in respect of communist China is tied to the United States China policy. I do not know whether the minister criticized us in this regard when we were in power, but this article certainly does put the situation in its proper perspective. Several weeks ago I made a statement similar to that contained in this article, although I did not make it in words as well chosen as those used here. The editor of this article states:

> It would be matter enough for concern if 700 million people were being systematically taught to hate America—that and no more. Now, however, the paranoiac leaders of communist China have an atomic bomb, crude though it may be. It may take them five years, or even 10, to develop a workable weapons system to deliver the bomb. But we can take little solace from this fact. The Chinese bomb may not have altered the world's balance of terror for the moment; nevertheless, nothing in world affairs will ever again be quite the same.

It is for that reason I asked the questions, to which I have referred, on November 17, 1964. The minister in answering left the impression that world affairs had not altered since he made his speech on May 22. Whether or not he meant to leave that impression, that is the impression that was left.

The editor of this article then continues as follows:

> The fateful clock which appears on the cover of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*—the hands showing five minutes to midnight—is now ticking inexorably closer to possible world disaster.
>
> This period of grace, whether five or 10 years, must not be wasted. The U.S. can no longer postpone the scrapping of that patchwork crazy quilt—full of internal contradictions—which is misnamed a "China policy." We must replace it with a coherent policy worked out by the coolest and ablest brains at our command. We can no longer afford to drift, for time is running out. Unless communist China can be brought within the framework of a dependable system of international guarantees—of arms control, nuclear test bans, inspection, and so on—the world may face a new kind of aggressive Hitlerism, its madness reinforced a million times by nuclear power.

In other words, we have no conversation with them, no intercourse with them at all in reference to these matters. They go on in their own way. We have divided the world into two separate parts. So I think it is time to take a new look at this situation. I trust that the minister with his skill will in his negotiations and discussions, whether with NATO or the United States, ably bring this question before these conferences, particularly before the United States, and try to get these views across.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I am glad my hon. friend has mentioned the United States. I assure him that is being done. The consultations we are now conducting are with a number of countries, including the United States.

Mr. Woolliams: Again I thank the minister, but if he had given that answer on November

17, 1964, I would have been happy and the opposition would have been happy and we would have known exactly where the minister stood. The minister has referred to conferences. He must have known where he stood. A man of his experience just did not wander into a conference. The conference must have been arranged. A date must have been set for the conference to carry on these discussions. He had to be briefed and he must have been briefed at the time he answered the question on November 17, 1964, at approximately three o'clock in the afternoon. He is not going to lead us to believe for one moment that after three o'clock on November 17 he briefed himself for a full discussion of the matter on November 18 and was able to change what he said on November 17 to what he has told us today, and that all that happened on November 18.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): You are being hard on me.

Mr. Woolliams: I do not believe for one moment that the minister wants me to accept that version and I tell the minister right now I will not accept it, and I know he never really intended me to because his manner of answering questions sometimes leaves us wondering what he really means. In fact, as he himself has said, when he reads his own answers he is not able to understand them.

Having referred to the editorial, I would say there are certain things that probably should be done. Maybe these are the things the minister discussed. Maybe these are the things that the minister should have said in his statement today were being considered in reference to China. But let me finish this quotation:

> It is possible, of course, and devoutly to be hoped, that the achievement of even a crude atomic weapon will bring to communist China—as it has already brought to the United States and the Soviet union—a sobering sense of responsibility.

I pause there. I was very interested in the view of the hon. member for Greenwood that it is rather shocking that we should have waited until they got such a weapon before considering negotiating with them. I agree with him in that regard. It seems to me that we have been a little naïve and certainly immature. That country has now moved into the upper class, the aristocratic class, so far as knowledge of nuclear weapons and the ability to use them is concerned.

> It is paradoxical but true that communist China, without atomic weapons, could take greater risks of major war than either the United States or the Soviets—knowing that both these powers were restrained by this very sense of nuclear responsibility. China now loses this curious immunity, for her sense of dwindling time will make both the United States and the Soviets more inclined to risk a showdown with China now.

What is the editor saying? I think it can be summed up in this way. We have to change our attitude with reference to Chiang Kai-shek's government. We cannot believe they are still the government of China when none of them has visited the mainland for 15 years. We cannot believe this is the government that we must deal with at the present time. If you have 700 million people living as one nation and with internal and external sovereignty, surely we must give them proper avenues of trade and diplomatic recognition. That is the second point.

Let us not fool ourselves. We have recognized China. Whether they have had a communist government or whatever government they have had, we have recognized China for a long time as a great and powerful nation, but we must recognize them as taking their place alongside the other large nations of the world so they can be brought into the avenues of trade with other nations, and so that they can be brought into these conferences which the minister dealt with this afternoon.

Miss Jewett: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Woolliams: Certainly.

Miss Jewett: I was wondering whether that was his view in the year 1960, because I remember reading a contribution he made by way of interjection in a debate of that year, I believe, which suggested he was much opposed to recognition of communist China.

Mr. Woolliams: I will answer that question when I am through my remarks. I have been reading *Hansard* lately and I find that at times when I speak I get carried down the road by people asking me questions. I get off the subject and the chairman has to bring me to order. Therefore I should like to complete my remarks as I prepared them in my office, rather than speaking off the cuff and be taken down the avenue. I say this nicely to the hon. lady because I respect her.

Miss Jewett: Why don't you answer?

Mr. Woolliams: I will at the end of my remarks, and if I do not you remind me.

Miss Jewett: Yes or no.

Mr. Nesbitt: Don't go down that garden path.

Mr. Woolliams: I want to read now from the editorial the four points the editor makes with regard to policy:

It must decide, once and for all, that Chiang Kai-shek's government cannot continue to claim to be the government of mainland China, which none of his officials has even seen for 15 years. Instead of maintaining this legal myth—rather like the Count of Paris' claim to being the King of France—we should concentrate on protecting the freedom and self-determination of Chiang's stronghold, Formosa. That land must not under any circumstances be handed over to red China.

That is point one. Point two:

It must abandon the folly of trying to keep China's 700 million people perpetually isolated from the normal avenues of trade and diplomatic interchange.

I might pause there. I think the former Conservative government can take some credit for opening up the avenues of trade with China. That policy has been carried on by the present government and it should be extended and expanded.

The more we can engage China in long range international obligations, the less likely it would be to run amok.

Point three:

It should make an imaginative effort to lift the existing disputes between China and the United States onto a higher and different level, which would acknowledge China's right to be regarded, and treated, as the great nation it has always been. While fearing its development of nuclear rockets, we must remember that China invented rockets in the first place—and paper and printing as well, for the Chinese proudly remember that they were highly cultured when the west was barbarian. We might consider such imaginative gestures, for example, as inviting China to join with the other great powers in the exploration of outer space. We must try, in every honourable way, to break through Mao's hatred, to reach the Wong Tsens and the younger leaders of the China yet to be.

Point four:

At the same time we must be prepared for a showdown if the Chinese leaders show increasing signs of preparing for war, and inciting their peoples to readiness for war—if, in short, they clearly move in the direction of neo-Hitlerism. We must not repeat the Anglo-French failure to stop Hitler when there was yet time. We must be prepared, regardless of possible Soviet intervention or United Nations condemnation, to knock out China's nuclear capability by pinpoint-bombing its reactors and arsenals before its power becomes indestructible. Terrible as this alternative is, we must not exclude it from our planning, or fail to warn the Chinese that we do soberly include it. To do otherwise would place America's own survival in jeopardy.

These are the four points and I want to summarize them. First of all, we cannot say that the government of Formosa is today the government of mainland China because, as the editor has pointed out and as other members have pointed out in this debate, it has not been on the mainland for 15 years. We cannot continue, as I said before, to ignore 700 million people either in the avenues of trade or in the diplomatic field. We must recognize China as a great nation, try to work out international economic and other problems with China and bring her into the community of nations. Above all, we must never let ourselves not be prepared—I see it is six o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Perhaps the hon. member could finish and we might pass this item.

Mr. Woolliams: No. I have a few more remarks to make. I am not going to be long.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): You could do it now.

Mr. Woolliams: No.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, just before the supper hour I had been dealing with the question of Canadian diplomatic recognition of red China. Some questions were posed by the minister and during the supper recess I had a chance to go through my file. I see now that he probably was presenting this matter to us in chronological order.

I am not saying the problem is an easy one. It is one we have to work out with our friends and allies, but I have made myself quite clear on the four points to which I think serious consideration should be given. In fact that is why I objected, and I did it with respect, to the kind of answer I got when I asked the question on orders of the day about the position of the government.

An article in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of September 7 by Emerson Chapin of the New York *Times* service, filed from Tokyo, stated:

Paul Martin, Canada's secretary for external affairs, said on Saturday that the Canadian government did not believe in insolating China and was increasing—

—this may be a new word—

—its non-diplomatic relations with Peking "on a modest and reciprocal basis."

I am sure that is not what the minister had in mind in answer to questions posed by us just before the supper hour.

An article in the Montreal *Gazette* of September 16, under the headline "Canada Holds Discussions on UN Seat for Red China," written by Arthur Blakely, stated:

> Mr. Martin said that he was not "implying" that early action would be taken—this in again refusing to give opposition leader Diefenbaker a categorical assurance that such a policy would be put to debate in the commons before being implemented.
>
> The questions were inspired—

Of course this may be where the minister gets some of his inspiration.

> —by a speech which Prime Minister Pearson made to the Atlantic treaty association (Monday) in which he said, in part, "If we expose them (the red Chinese) more to the views of the rest of the world, we might some day expect a more realistic policy from them. The present isolation of China encourages recurring crises."

If the minister really feels that, and I am sure he does, then this is the point I want to drive home, that if we cannot reach a solution, through negotiations and working the problem out with the United States, then maybe what was reported on September 25 will be the action that the government will take.

As I said before the supper hour, when the minister sat over here on the opposition side without having the responsibility of his present portfolio, which is one of the most important, the one closest to the Prime Minister, he stated, I believe categorically, that we should recognize China so that we could widen the avenues of trade with her, negotiate with her diplomatically and thus bring her into the community of nations to discuss those problems common to all the nations of the world.

An article in the Toronto *Daily Star* of September 25 said:

> Despite frequent Canadian denials, the United States firmly believes Canada will recognize red China after the U.S. elections in November.
>
> This belief is held at the highest levels of the U.S. government.

I would say that if we cannot work this out with the United States then the question remains, what is Canada's policy in this regard? I am not going to repeat the four points I made before supper hour, as I must pass on to something else, but I emphasize that I believe those points deserve serious consideration by the government. Conditions are not now the same as they were in 1961, 1962, and 1963, and the minister has changed his position at great speed. Between November 18 and November 19 he changed his known position. His reason was that he held a conference on the 19th, and therefore his answer on the 18th would not be the same as it was on the 19th or the 20th.

I now wish to deal with another subject, the organization of American states. It was my privilege to attend the civil rights conference held in Mexico City in 1959-60 and at that time met and talked to the representatives of various Latin American countries. It was about that time that the late President Kennedy, speaking in this House of Commons, pressed for Canada to become a member of O.A.S. At that time the minister sat on this side of the chamber, and he said the Conservative government of the day should see to it that Canada became a member of the O.A.S. in the interests of the security of this part of the hemisphere and so that we might all work together. However since he has assumed the responsibility of the external affairs portfolio no such action has been taken.

We are now a long way from the cry we heard during election time when he said it was a time to excite the daring and test the strong. The Liberals are very daring and strong when in opposition, but they seem to become a little more moderate when they get into positions of responsibility.

Though the criticism the minister offered at that time may have been strictly for political expediency, the fact remains that he made a statement at Banff—I have not got the press clipping with me—in which he categorically said we should be a member of the O.A.S.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I did not say that.

Mr. Woolliams: That is the general feeling.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I said that Canada's ultimate destiny was a closer association with Latin America.

Mr. Woolliams: Ultimate destiny is not a destiny of 60 days, 120 days or 180 days. This ultimate destiny might be in 1984, but by that time the O.A.S. may have taken on a broader scope, or our destiny may lie with the whole world, not just with a geographical group. Had we been members of O.A.S. we might have been prevented from opening up avenues of trade with China and Cuba, and I do not see how we can recognize China and still follow the United States and the objectives of the O.A.S. I would like the

minister to explain this, because I am quite convinced that if that had happened we could not have opened up our trade with Cuba, and I point out that there has been no change with respect to our trade with Cuba since this government took office.

Further, there has been no change with respect to our trade in grain with communist countries. It was interesting to hear the hon. member for Medicine Hat press the government this afternoon to tell the committee where it stands on this question of recognition. Here, too, there have been some changes. It has not been a case of osmosis altogether, but changes have taken place. I should like to draw attention to what was said in the course of a speech made by the leader of the Social Credit group in this house on November 23, 1962, as reported in *Hansard* at page 1951. That hon. member, who is now out of the country on a special mission for the government—I shall say nothing about this now, though I may have some comments to make with regard to it later—was asked by the present Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources to make the position of his group clear as far as trade in grain with red China and the other communist countries was concerned. Mr. Chairman, I have continually heard the leader of that party deny he was ever against selling grain to Russia. Well, it took me a lot of research, but I finally came up with this exchange which took place back in November, 1962:

> Mr. Laing: Would the hon. member make an unequivocal statement that the group he heads does not favour the sale of foodstuffs to red China and other communist countries?
>
> Mr. Thompson: The question the hon. member has asked must seemingly give some concern as far as the answer is concerned.

Of course it would, because 95 per cent of the hon. member's riding benefited from the sales of wheat to China and Russia and it would cause a great deal of concern if the leader of the Social Credit party was against these sales.

The Chairman: Unfortunately I must interrupt the hon. member to point out that his time has expired. If there were unanimous consent—

Mr. Woolliams: I have just a few more words to say.

The Chairman: Is there unanimous consent for the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Maybe the hon. gentleman intends to take only a minute or two.

Mr. Woolliams: Well, the minister certainly shows us the kind of courtesy we respect on this side of the house. I shall not get into an argument with members on the back benches behind him because their actions speak for themselves.

I should like to read the reply given by the hon. member for Red Deer.

> As long as there are hungry people on the free side of this struggle that I am talking about, who need our wheat and cannot get it, we are against the sale of wheat to communist China or any other such country.

In brief, I do not see how they can come along now and say they are in favour of recognizing China, or in favour of any of these ideas. I say this because they were opposed to opening up the avenues of trade. If we do not open up the avenues of trade with countries such as Russia and China, how can we work out these solutions which will lead to peace and security in the world?

I had a few other words to say with reference to another matter, but I intend to resume my seat now, because I appreciate the courtesy extended to me. The hon. gentleman is one of the most courteous ministers on the front bench and, as I say I appreciate courtesy when it is shown.

Mr. Prittie: About 15 years ago I spent about two years in a brief, unsuccessful career in the department. During that time I learned to sympathize with a particular group—the people in the department called F.S.O.-1s. This is the bottom person on the diplomatic totem pole—foreign service officer, grade one.

When I think back to those years and think what a struggle it was—we were paid $2,500 a year at that time—I was a veteran, married, with a child, and I was paying $95 a month rent in Ottawa, and found it difficult to get by. It was a thoroughly miserable time, from a financial point of view. So I have had a continuing interest in salaries paid to staff members of the department, and I am wondering now whether the government is offering enough to get the right sort of person for this job, and a broad enough choice, and in the second place whether or not those chosen are having too much of a financial struggle when they take up their duties and begin to learn the difficult job of serving the country in the department.

I wonder, too, whether the salaries are sufficient to attract the numbers and types of

candidate needed. Competition for university graduates these days is keen. I have obtained from the department the present pay rate. A person entering the department as a foreign service officer in the first grade, if he has his B.A. degree and just graduated from university is paid $4,860. There are various intermediate grades up to a maximum of $6,060 for a person with a Ph.D. degree. I was checking these rates against the salaries offered in the province of Ontario to members of the teaching profession. I took up the *Globe and Mail* today and noted figures such as the following: The Windsor board of education is starting teachers in grade IV at $6,100. These are not perhaps people with Ph.Ds, but the board probably requires a masters degree for this category. Lakeshore school district offers $6,200 and, again, I assume this calls for a masters degree. Those with an ordinary pass B.A. start at $4,700-$4,900 a year. I suggest there is a great deal of competition from secondary schools in the various provinces for the kind of staff the Department of External Affairs wishes to attract. I cannot imagine there would be many candidates with a Ph.D. degree applying to come into the department on the ground level.

It must also be borne in mind that there is a great expansion taking place presently in the universities and colleges in this nation. I do not have figures as to the numbers of applicants, but I suggest that this situation be looked into. Perhaps the department is aware of this. But it is not sufficient for the department alone to be concerned; the civil service commission and treasury board need to be concerned about it as well. The salaries offered to junior officers in the department do seem to be low by comparison with those offered by other institutions with which the department is competing. Perhaps the minister could say something about this subject later.

There is one policy matter I should like to discuss. I do not intend to range over the whole field of external affairs or to talk about communist China, the organization of American states and so on, as others have done. Nevertheless I have a particular interest I should like to bring forward. It has to do with a matter which will be before the forthcoming general assembly of the United Nations, and concerns the almost annual resolution on population control. I attended the United Nations meetings as a parliamentary observer in 1962 and attached myself to the second committee, following the proceedings of that committee with a great deal of interest. I was present when Sweden, Denmark and representatives of ten other countries presented a resolution on this matter. I followed it right through and should like to make some comments on the subject this evening.

The key point in the resolution presented in 1962 by those 12 countries was this—and I intend to read the appropriate paragraph from the United Nations document. This is what paragraph 6 calls upon the general assembly to do:

> Endorses the view of the population commission that the United Nations should encourage and assist the governments, especially of the less developed countries, in obtaining basic data and carrying out essential studies of the demographic aspects, as well as other aspects, of their economic and social development problems, and that the United Nations give technical assistance, as requested by governments, for national projects and programs dealing with the problems of population;

This is the resolution which was carried in the second committee, with Canada abstaining. It did not carry in the plenary session of the general assembly because some countries used a procedural motion to have it declared an important subject which would require a two thirds majority, and it did not obtain that majority. The assembly did pass a watered down resolution, the effect of which was to continue the studies for a further two years, after which another report would be made. So presumably the subject matter will be under consideration at this session of the general assembly.

I shall not take up much time trying to prove there is a population problem in the world; the evidence is overwhelming. One has only to look at the demographic year books of the United Nations, the reports of the food and agriculture organization and the reports of Mr. Eugene Black when he was president of the world bank. The case is very well and clearly documented there. I would just point out one or two facts to illustrate the particular problem. It is generally estimated that the world population will double by the year 2000. The latest reports of the F.A.O. show that food production for the last year in which they were reporting did not increase as much as world population. This of course is on a global scale. In particular places there were marked increases in food production, but in those areas which suffer most there was not an increase. Since world war II the production of food in Latin America has gone up 70 per cent, but the production of people has gone up 76 per cent. The point is that there is no real economic growth per person in many of these countries.

I do not need to emphasize this too much because apparently the minister is well aware of the problem. I must confess that I had not realized this until I read two of his recent speeches. I wish to quote briefly from both of them. The first is a speech he made in Banff on August 24, 1964, to the second annual Banff conference on world development. The reproduction of the minister's speech is entitled "Latin America: Challenge and Response", and he had this to say:

> In rough terms the population of Latin America is now over 200 million, rather more than that of the United States and Canada together. However, the demographic projections of United Nations experts indicate a very different situation by the end of the century. Latin America may then contain up to 600 million people, while North America will have not much more than 300 million. This fantastic population increase—the highest rate of any region in the world—cannot fail to add to the relative international importance of Latin. America. There is reason to believe, however, that it will at the same time increase its serious economic and social problems. Very great economic growth will undoubtedly result but, when considered in relation to population, the material benefits may well fall short of popular expectations.

Again, in a speech the minister delivered in Cleveland on September 26 last, entitled "The Challenge of Underdevelopment", he had this to say in a section headed "Population Outruns Development":

> Of course, the problem presented by the underdeveloped world is not a simple one and it is not capable of any single or simple solution. A few facts and figures will, I think, help to illustrate its scope. In the decade from 1950 to 1960, the countries of the underdeveloped world were able to increase their production of goods and services from $110 billion to just under $170 billion. This means that, at the beginning of the decade as at the end of it, these countries accounted for only three tenths of all the goods and services produced in the free world as a whole. Over the same period the total population of these countries increased from 1,000 million to 1,300 million people. That is a rate almost twice as high as that experienced in the advanced countries of the free world. When the growth of production is discounted by the growth of population, we find that the less developed countries were able to increase their average per capita income over the decade by no more than $25, from $105 in 1950 to $130 in 1960. In other words per capita income in these countries rose by a mere $2.50 a year.

So the problem is apparently understood by the minister and his advisers in the Department of External Affairs. In his speech in Cleveland the minister outlined seven points by which Canada could give aid to Latin America and other developing countries. They are all perfectly good points, but he failed altogether to mention that they might be given some help on this question of population control, which is certainly an important point. No more than the minister do I want to oversimplify the problem of population and resources and the relationship between the two, and how you make any real advance in the standard of living in these countries. Population control is only one of the approaches that must be taken. The production of food in these countries by all means is very, very important and there are agencies working at this. Better trading relationships, better distribution of goods are other parts of the problem as well. But I think you have to attack the problem on all fronts and I am suggesting that one particular aspect of this is being ignored.

Not all countries are ignoring it. One of the most significant things which emerged from the debate at the United Nations in 1962 was the fact that at that time the United States government changed its position. Prior to that time they had been taking the same position as Canada; that is, they abstained from votes on these matters. However, in 1962 they changed and I would suggest that they did so with the obvious approval of the late President Kennedy. The importance that the United States government attached to this was underscored by the fact that their statement to the committee was read by Mr. Richard N. Gardner, deputy assistant secretary of state for international organization affairs. This is from a statement delivered by Mr. Gardner at the United Nations on December 10, 1962. I want to read one paragraph of his statement because I think it is the correct approach and is the one the Canadian government should follow:

> While the United States will not suggest to any other government what its attitudes or policies should be as they relate to population or the adoption of specific measures in its implementation, the United States believes that obstacles should not be placed in the way of other governments which, in the light of their own economic needs and cultural and religious values, seek solutions to their population problems. While we will not advocate any specific policy regarding population growth to another country, we can help other countries, upon request, to find potential sources of information and assistance on ways and means of dealing with population problems.

The government of the United Kingdom have also announced that they are willing to take the same position. The Earl of Aberdeen, who was then minister of state for foreign affairs, made such an announcement last spring in the House of Lords. However, the United States government has gone quite a bit further than that. A year ago there was an amendment to their foreign aid act, called the Fulbright amendment, which

authorized the United States government to enter into negotiations with any country that wanted advice on population matters. Last April I attended a conference in San Juan, Puerto Rico, dealing with the population problems of the western hemisphere. This conference was sponsored by a private organization, the international planned parenthood federation, and I was a delegate from the Canadian society. However, I found out later that part of the costs of this conference were paid by the state department, and at that conference a representative of the state department, from the agency for international aid, appeared and further elaborated on the change which had taken place in United States policy. The person who did that was Mr. William D. Rodgers, deputy United States co-ordinator, alliance for progress agency for international development, department of state. He had this to say:

> As you know, the United Nations passed without a dissenting vote a population resolution proposed by the African and Asian nations in December, 1963. A few months later the U.S. congress adopted the Fulbright amendment to the foreign assistance act. This amendment enable A.I.D. to fulfil requests from Latin American nations for assistance with respect to demographic aspects of development. This we are ready to do. Our efforts will be concentrated in the fields of information, training and research. We intend to co-operate closely with all responsible segments of society, church, private and public organizations; and will constantly reflect the fact that such matters are in the last analysis the choice and initiative of each individual family.

I should mention in passing, Mr. Chairman, that although I attended as a delegate of a private organization in Canada, at this conference there were representatives from every country in North and South America. Some of them represented private organizations but many of the countries sent official government delegations. Among the countries which sent official government delegations were these ones from Latin America: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru and Venezuela. I mention that particularly because they are countries with predominantly Roman Catholic populations and it is an indication that they have been concerned about this problem that they were willing to send official government delegates to this conference. The United States delegate at the conference announced that his government is assigning an officer in each United States mission in Latin America to act as a liaison with the local authorities on population matters.

[Mr. Prittie.]

I do not quite understand why the Canadian delegation under this government at the United Nations, and also the delegations of previous governments, have taken the stand which they have taken. If this stand is based upon fear of offending the sensibilities of Roman Catholics in Canada or is based upon the fear of some reaction at the polls if they do take action, then if that is the case I suggest that our stand was based upon myths which should no longer exist.

I am convinced from what I have read, from my discussions with people and from the type of response on this subject which members of parliament have received concerning a bill which I introduced, that this massive opposition by Roman Catholics in Canada to any discussion of population planning does not exist. In fact, as we know there has been a great deal of discussion on this matter recently by the church and by some of the leading prelates of the church. Therefore, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, to the minister and his colleagues that this particular policy be re-examined with a view to the Canadian delegation at the United Nations this year taking a different stand from that which it has taken in the past.

Mr. Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie): Mr. Chairman, I should like to take a very few minutes of the committee's time to bring the attention of the minister to one area of our external relations where I think Canada could shine forth but is not doing so. I submit that Canada should immediately launch a peace corps type operation. The United States has a successful program in effect. This year there will be over 10,000 people in the field as a result of the United States peace corps program. Britain, France and Germany are all considering launching similar type programs and within a year or two each will have two or three thousand men and women in the field.

I submit that Canadian representatives would have a twofold advantage over any representatives from these older colonial countries. We can supply technicians to teach and to work in two of the world's major languages. In addition we are in the enviable position of not having enemies abroad either old or new, so we cannot be tarred by any stretch of the imagination as being colonialists.

Our French language students have a particularly important role to play in Africa where I think the French and the Belgians are suspect as colonialists. We have embassy

level relations with only two of the new French speaking nations in Africa, so I would submit that this type of student or youth aid program would allow Canada to play a very efficient and effective role in French speaking Africa.

Combined with a peace corps type operation, Mr. Chairman, must be the setting up of adequate training facilities here in Canada. I hope that this government will immediately consider the encouragement of university training facilities which would serve a threefold purpose: to train personnel who could be used domestically for some of our ARDA programs in depressed areas; to provide personnel who could be used for these self-help programs we have instituted for Indian reserves; and to provide personnel who could also be sent abroad.

I would strongly urge the minister to ask his department to give immediate consideration to such a peace corps type program for Canada. This would mean perhaps substantial government support for the very successful private program initiated by the Canadian university service overseas organization, which this year has over 200 students, young people and older people abroad serving in the name of Canada. This organization is a privately sponsored organization which receives its contributions from the public, but has been helped this year by government aid in transporting abroad in R.C.A.F. transports certain of their personnel. It has also benefited from the advice of the external affairs department. Whether the government would support such a well proven, successful private program or would decide that the establishment of a parallel, fully government sponsored aid program is better is a matter for departmental decision; but I am convinced that something should be done immediately either to aid substantially the university program or to set up a parallel government program.

The inauguration by the Canadian government of a massive peace corps type operation would mean more value dollar for dollar than any other form of aid. But, much more important, I submit it would be the right kind of therapy for a youth in this country, which, in its introversion and preoccupation with Canada's internal problems, is losing sight of the role Canada should be playing in the world. By looking beyond our frontiers, by making use of the evident advantages of possessing two of the world's greatest languages and cultures and by making available to the world the experience of compromise which is ours, almost uniquely in a century still plagued by ancient antagonisms, I submit our youth can silence the doubters and cement our own unity more effectively in this way than by any other method.

Mr. Cantelon: Mr. Chairman, I should like to spend a few moments discussing Canada's foreign aid policy. Most of these comments seem to offer widespread criticism. It is easy to find many illustrations of this criticism. I refer only to one, an article in the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* on August 21 of last year, which discussed the whole question of Canada's foreign aid policy and seemed to conclude that we gave too little. And that is my own conclusion.

It has been suggested that a favourable level of giving for a country as prosperous as Canada would be about 1 per cent of our gross national product. I am not sure whether this has been arrived at by a "guess and by golly" procedure or by careful analysis. It does seem, however, that this would not be an exorbitant amount particularly since some countries, especially the United States and Britain, already measure up to this percentage. Canada is well below it.

Perhaps the first question we should ask ourselves is, why do we give to foreign aid at all? Very superficially we might answer, because it is expected of us. Or perhaps because it really does not hurt us very much, if at all. But I think these would be superficial answers and to be expected only of the cynical. In my view, we give mainly because we really do care about mankind generally, and about our brothers in the have-not nations. We would like to do our part to raise their standards of living and to see that they have the material things of life which we enjoy.

I am sure we all know that a great deal of material aid will be required. We know that it is a task which cannot be done in a minute but one that takes many years. We also know that we are doing quite a bit along that line; but as I said earlier, I do not think we are doing enough. I am quite sure the people of this country are prepared to give, and spend the time to give assistance to these people, to help solve their problems.

There are many ways in which we may help, and the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond referred to the speech the minister made in which he set out some ways. However, there are some ways I should like to mention. First of all I believe that we have many commodities, some of which might

even be in surplus supply in our own country, which would help other countries. For example our flour mills have been working at high speed for the last year to meet Russian orders for flour. It does not appear that this will be the case for this crop year. The Barbados for many years have taken around 20 million pounds of flour from Canada annually, so I am quite sure that the West Indies generally could use gifts of this commodity to help their people.

It would also be possible for us to provide countries with technical assistance. Some of this we already do. We could give additional aid in the supply of teachers, as mentioned by the last speaker, particularly along the line of C.U.S.O. I think this kind of aid should be expanded a great deal. There is no better way of successfully aiding people or a nation than to help them to help themselves. This is something our technical assistants do very well.

In this connection I should like to refer to the very valuable work which is being done by Canadian university service overseas. I am happy to see that the representations made by the member for Royal in his resolution of June 10, 1963, and to which I had the honour of speaking, has been so generously supported by the minister for external affairs. It is possible too that in some very limited instances more direct financial aid might be given. I am inclined to think, however, that this aid would require very careful supervision.

In this connection I have a letter from a friend of mine, who was until recently in one of the aid countries, in which he emphasizes that point. While I dislike to waste the time of the committee there are a few points in this letter I think should be emphasized. He says:

> We will never get used to the terrible squalor of the lives of 50 per cent of the Jamaicans, in contrast to the extravagance of the middle class, millionaires, civil servants and the government.

Then he goes on to state:

> The *Gleaner* newspaper, today, Sunday, April 6, 1964, speaks of £22,000 ($66,000) to be spent on interior decorating. A lady from Canada married to a Jamaican, is flying around the world to pick up objets d'art for the P.M.'s house.
>
> Remember, Jamaica is an emerging country of 1,700,000 people and yet, while schools are poverty stricken, the P.M. gets a new $330,000 palace.

Then he goes on to state:

> When P.M. Bustamante spends $9,000 on his 80th birthday party, it simply means that $9,000 of Canadian and American money has gone. Cobbla youth camp received £75,000 ($225,000) of equipment from Canada's external aid office. This of course frees Jamaican money that government officials can use for travel, expensive government buildings, government limousines and expensive houses, etc. for Jamaican high commissioners around the globe. Why does a country of 1,700,000 people have to have an embassy in all countries, when many nations such as Sweden can't afford it.

The final quotation I should like to refer to reads as follows:

> Did you know that all civil servants get a full year's holiday every ten, with full pay, and transportation first class to Britain or its equivalent. This is a heritage from colonial days.

I am sure our civil servants would like the same sort of treatment. Finally we might give credit so that many of these countries would have a development fund to which, at a low rate of interest, say 4 or 4½ per cent, they might turn for assistance when they might wish to finance industrial development.

Having made these general remarks I would like more specifically to discuss our aid to the West Indies. I do so because this is an area in the world which is peculiarly fitted to receive aid from Canada. There are many things which bind us together. While I have never had the good fortune to visit the West Indies it is rapidly becoming one of the major winter vacation grounds for many people in eastern and central Canada. These visits have acquainted many Canadians with the life of the West Indians. So far as I can judge, the relations between these visitors and the people of the West Indies have been cordial. There is also the fact that our economies are complementary. Many things which we cannot do in Canada, because we live in the north temperate zone, can be done in the West Indies, because these islands are in the tropics. Then too it is easy to communicate with them because they have a common language and all speak one of our national languages. It would be fair too to say that they have the same heritage of respect for common law that we have.

Canada has been increasing her exports to the Caribbean area both in volume and in value, but this trade, however, has tended in recent years to become more one-sided, because we sell to them much more than we buy. For example, in 1950 the Barbados sold over 50 million West Indian dollars worth of produce to Canada. In 1962 Canada bought only $4.8 million worth from that area. So trading is mainly in one direction. Even the rum exporting business has seriously declined, a rather strange decline since our imports from Britain of this product have grown enormously. The Caribbean is somewhat bitter about this, and with reason. The point then that I want to make is that with complemen-

tary economies, such as we find existing between ourselves and the West Indies, trade should not be a one way street.

The Caribbean is one of those fortunate, or unfortunate regions, depending where you sit, which has a surplus population. Like all such areas, they recognize the need to industralize if they are to raise the standards of living of their people. But as is also common, there is a shortage of capital. Hence we see the need for a development fund. As is common with many other areas, and in spite of surplus population, there is a shortage of manual labour in agriculture. This is understandable, as many people do not like to do the hard physical labour involved in basic agriculture. The Barbados are a case in point. There they have 8 to 10 per cent unemployed but find it difficult to get the sugar cane reaped. Other islands such as Saint Kitts, Antigua and the United States Virgin Islands have the same difficulty.

The West Indies are partners in the commonwealth, but do we remember or know this? Mr. Errol Barrow, the premier of Barbados, as reported in the *International Journal* for the spring of 1964, made some very scathing comments about the relations between the Canadian government and his government. I was going to quote some of his comments, but in the interests of facilitating this debate, I will refrain from doing so. He did however criticize bitterly, and I intend to show that this criticism was somewhat unjustified. To do so I should like to quote from the House of Commons external affairs report of 1963, which deals at some length with what the Conservative government did to assist the West Indies. It also gives some conclusive answers to the rather bitter partisan questions and statements which were made in this house in July. That report states in part:

> In 1958 the Canadian government announced that it wished to assist the West Indies federation in its economic development efforts and that accordingly it was prepared to grant, subject to parliamentary approval, a total of $10 million over a five year period commencing in the fiscal year 1958-59. This program continued even after the dissolution of the federation but obviously some changes had to be made in it. With the separate independence of Jamaica and Trinidad in 1962, Canadian diplomatic missions were established on these islands and assistance was carried on through bilateral negotiations. In 1961 Canada joined with the United States and Britain in carrying out an economic survey of the smaller territories and as a result of this survey Canada accepted certain projects to be carried out in these islands under its West Indies program.
>
> The original undertaking of a $10 million five year program expired on March 31, 1963. In advance of this date the government agreed that Canadian aid to the West Indies area should continue into 1963-64 and should be maintained at the same average level as in recent years. This meant a sum of $2 million for 1963-64. At the same time, the government also agreed that British Honduras and British Guiana, which had formerly been receiving about $100,000 worth of annual assistance under a separate program for other commonwealth countries, should be brought into the general Caribbean scheme. Accordingly the cabinet decision of November, 1962, was that Canadian aid to commonwealth countries and territories of the Caribbean area should be maintained in 1963-64 at a level of $2.1 million.

Capital assistance was extended for some eight special items ranging from $5,866,000 for two ships down to $400,000 for drilling and developing of fresh water wells and so on. I continue the quotation:

> In addition to the above described project assistance, Canada has provided substantial amounts of technical assistance. Sixty West Indian students received training in Canada and 43 Canadian advisers or teachers served in the West Indies to the end of March 31, 1963.

From this it can be seen that starting in 1958 under a Conservative government the West Indies were given substantial assistance in very many ways. I should also like to emphasize again that it is my opinion that immigration policy should be extended in this area, as I pointed out in a speech I made in the house on September 25 of this year.

Mr. Smallwood: Mr. Chairman, I do not like to take too much of the minister's time. I have known him ever since I entered parliament. I have watched him operate as a politician when he was in the opposition and I appreciated his ability when one of our ministers at that time was a little vague in his answers. I recall the tantrums he would work himself into in those days in trying to get an answer. Those were the days when he was looking forward to leading the great Liberal party.

But now the shoe is on the other foot. My good friend is on the other side of the house and I am over here. Now I am trying to get some information from him. He is still looking forward to leading that great party, although he has difficulty with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Minister of National Defence and possibly the hon. member for Lotbinière.

The minister was a little vague when I asked him a question regarding the trip to Africa of the member of the Liberal government without portfolio from Red Deer, and wanted to know why they sent Bongo Bob to the Congo. I wanted to find out from the minister how the expenses of the member for Red Deer were going to be paid and whether

he had been appointed by order in council. At that time there were 14 ministers in the house.

Mr. Byrne: What about P.F.A.A.?

Mr. Smallwood: There we have that great mind from Kootenay East again, that great voice of the mountains. If I could only buy that man for what he is worth and sell him for what he thinks he is worth I would quit politics tomorrow.

An hon. Member: For what he thinks he is worth.

Mr. Smallwood: Thinks he is worth, yes. When I was interrupted I had been referring to whether there had been an order in council sending the hon. member for Red Deer to Africa.

An hon. Member: Did you get your hay cheque?

Mr. Smallwood: You had better go up to mount Moses and make your speech, because you have never made any contribution in this house and I do not think you ever will. We realized there should have been an order in council. There were 14 ministers in the house at the time but none of them knew anything about the matter. I asked why the hon. member had been sent to Africa. I suggested that possibly it was a political plum for supporting the Liberal party and was assured it was not.

After half an hour of conference and discussion the minister finally admitted that they had sent him to Africa, but he was still vague about why they had sent him. Then he slept on the matter all night, came back next day and said that they had sent him to Africa to rescue some missionaries.

An hon. Member: A mercy flight.

Mr. Smallwood: It is a funny thing that they should hit upon this means of doing so. When I look across at the backbenches of the Liberal party I see some very intelligent men there—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: What is wrong with your eyesight?

Mr. Smallwood: —excluding the hon. member for Kootenay East. As I look up in the gallery I see some very intelligent men from the external affairs department sitting there. Why did the government have to dig down into the Social Credit party to find someone to send to Africa?

An hon. Member: A long way down.

[Mr. Smallwood.]

An hon. Member: The bottom of the barrel.

Mr. Smallwood: Here is an extract from the Ottawa *Citizen* of November 12 last in which the hon. member for Red Deer is quoted as follows:

> I want to find out how Canada's aid program is being administered and find out what other schemes might be financed efficiently by my government.

I more or less expected that he might run as a Liberal in the next election but I did not know that he already had joined that party. They sent him to Africa, they tell us, to save these missionaries. Here is an article in the Ottawa *Citizen* of November 6 last:

> The mother of a Saint John missionary said today she had misgivings about Social Credit leader Robert Thompson's efforts in Africa to gain the release of 26 Canadians held by Congolese rebels. Rev. and Mrs. David Grant left Saint John July 5 for their jungle mission post and are among about 800 hostages. Mrs. D. A. Grant said she is afraid diplomatic pressure by the Canadian government might antagonize the rebels and bring tragic consequences.

That is just about what has happened. The hon. member for Red Deer is in Halifax tonight and in a radio report he said he could not help these people, that he could not get within 30 miles of them. He was sent to Africa by the government. It is quite interesting when you look at what has happened. At first nobody in the government knew that the hon. member had been sent to Africa. It was a big surprise when I asked the question in the house. Fourteen ministers did not know and my dear friend, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, looked shocked and a little bewildered. This just happened overnight. So he rushed out and saw Mr. Spaak, the Belgian foreign minister. The minister had sent a Department of Transport plane to New York to bring Mr. Spaak to Ottawa. Then he said that Mr. Thompson was sent urgently to Africa to save some missionaries.

Time magazine has an article headed "The Junket that Wasn't," which reads:

> It certainly looked like a junket. Thompson's travels, scheduled three months ago but postponed because there was no summer parliamentary recess, included no government assignments that career foreign service officers on the spot could not handle better: he planned to quiz African leaders on such questions as seating red China in the UN; he wanted to assess Canadian aid to African development programs. And so forth. His odyssey was so "important"—Martin to the contrary—that Thompson was not even briefed before departure by Ottawa's external aid office.

Mr. Rhéaume: They did not know why he was sent until next day.

Mr. Smallwood: They still don't know why he was sent. Further on the article says:

> Thompson, in common with every other western emissary, came away with little more from Kenyatta than a promise to issue a bland appeal to the rebels "to do nothing that would be inhuman towards civilians in their custody".

But the first part of the article is the most interesting bit and gives the real reason why the hon. member for Red Deer went to Africa:

> Inside his starkly modern palace overlooking Addis Ababa, the Lion of Judah greeted the member for Red Deer like one of the family. Then Haile Selassie escorted guest of honour Robert Thompson to a glittering state banquet attended by just about everybody who is anybody in Addis. That, as it happens, includes just about the whole original graduating class ('46) of the secondary school—Ethiopia's first—that the present day leader of the Social Credit party helped to establish during his 15 years as the emperor's top education adviser.

Now we are getting down to the facts of why he went to Africa. It was to attend a reunion. When we get reports like this we can only ask who is right?

The Toronto *Daily Star* of November 14 carried the following story:

> Robert Thompson, leader of the Canadian Social Credit party, said last night that he has information three Belgians have been executed by Congolese rebels in Stanleyville and three more are under sentence of death.
>
> But in Brussels, a Belgian official said Thompson's statement "contradicts" information received there.

I ask that the minister be good enough to get up and admit this is a worked up scheme, and admit this junket was planned three months ago. It was definitely a political plum in return for the hon. member's support. Will the minister say when the hon. member was briefed by his department? Will he tell us how much he is going to be paid and how he is going to be paid? Will he tell us why the hon. member was chosen and why all the great names in the back benches of the Liberal party were ignored?

If the minister will tell me why the officers in the external affairs department, who could have carried out this mission successfully, were ignored, then I shall not delay passage of his estimates any further. I believe this is a junket to be paid by the Canadian taxpayers. It is a trip that was planned some three months ago.

Mr. Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke): Mr. Chairman, I am prompted to enter this debate, not so much by what was contained in the minister's statement but by what I feel was a rather obvious omission, an omission to which emphasis was given by some of the things contained in the statement.

I had hoped that at this stage, particularly in view of the fact that earlier this year the minister visited Japan and after his visit made a comment on Pacific affairs, he would in his preliminary statement have given a clearly defined, comprehensive, well articulated statement on Canadian policy for the Pacific. I feel it is not just this minister who has omitted such a statement on occasions like this. Successive Canadian governments throughout history have never really bothered themselves to devote their full attention to Canada's Pacific role or to the question of whether in fact Canada has a Pacific role at all.

So much of our policy is built on an old tradition. Our orientation is toward Europe and toward the United States. Our perspectives tend to be the old perspectives and we do not have a fresh, new, Canadian perspective on the world as it is occupied by Canada. I have often wished that when we enter these debates on external affairs there could be a map of the world on the desk of every member, or else a very large map of the world hanging in a prominent place in the chamber, but not on the familiar Mercator's projection with which we have grown up and with which we are all familiar—that visual image of the world tends to shape so many of our ideas about the world. Rather it should have a projected centre, not on the prime meridian but on the 105th meridian west, that would show North and South America at the central point of focus, with the shores of Africa and Europe to the east and the shores of Asia, Australia and all the island countries in the South Pacific to our west, so that we would stop thinking in that European term of Asia as the Far East, but rather of Europe as our eastern area of interest and Asia as our western area of interest. For that is the Canadian perspective, or what ought to be the Canadian perspective.

We are a nation that looks out on two shores, to the east over the Atlantic and to west over the Pacific, but so much of our external affairs policy is influenced by the old perspective, the European perspective, rather than what ought to be the Canadian perspective, looking outward from both the east and west of the North American continent, and also looking south, which we must do as part of the necessity of our existence. And perhaps we do it to too great an extent.

In his statement today the minister emphasized our commitment to the trans-Atlan-

tic community and the importance of it. That I do not deny. It is an enormously important part of our whole policy for our existence that we live in harmony and trade on as equitable terms as possible with all in the Atlantic community, but we have not yet articulated for ourselves any kind of over-all concept of Pacific policy.

However, we are being dragged into it. We are coming into it through the avenues of trade. It is almost as though the old traditional rule were applying in this situation, that the diplomat were being preceded by the merchant, because in the post-war years and since, as we have developed our trade with Japan, and more recently in wheat with China, we have begun to think in more positive terms about a Canadian role in the Pacific. This has come about as a consequence, first of trade. The nuclear explosion by China, to which reference has been made, has undoubtedly accelerated our interest; but trade actually gave it its first impetus. The first real turning of our attention to the west followed our interest in the sale of Canadian goods.

But this is not enough. It is only part of what should be done if Canada is to enunciate a clear, definite and well developed policy for this country in the Pacific. We have to be aware that two thirds of the world's people live in the Pacific region of the world. Whatever affects them politically or economically is increasingly going to affect us. What they do has a bearing on what happens to us. Even if we were to try to do so we could not live in isolation; we could not escape involvement in the Pacific. It would be most unfortunate if our involvement took the form of policy developed on a hit or miss, day to day basis to meet circumstances as they arose. The development of a continuing policy for this region is not simply the responsibility of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Many of his colleagues in the cabinet have an interest in the evolution of such a policy. But the minister and his department can give the leadership required, provide guide lines, provide the basic plan upon which Canadian policy can be developed.

If we are to have a well integrated policy for the Pacific it will have to take into account trade and commerce in addition to the usual diplomatic relationships. It will have to take account of defence policy and the policies of our allies and friends in the commonwealth who are already deeply committed in this region. It will require the integration of foreign aid and technical assistance programs. We have a substantial interest in the north Pacific fisheries. Our immigration programs are bound to be affected. We shall need to develop an interchange of people through tourist travel. We shall require an accelerated rate of development of our west coast ports as well as of our interior lines of communication with those ports. It will involve the development of a national highways policy, all brought into some relation with the development of a Pacific policy.

There is one question which has been discussed along the west coast for many years but which has received still greater attention in the past few months. People are asking whether we should not now be actively negotiating for a corridor through the Alaska Panhandle to provide access to tidewater for the great, developing northwest regions of British Columbia and the Yukon. Furthermore, as there is a continued development of the resources in the north of the prairie provinces, and since much of this production will be turned into the Asian and Pacific markets we shall need to be more and more concerned about communications on the west coast—the most rapid and economic means of getting these products to the Pacific region. All this calls for an integrated and articulate policy of development which will be understood and supported by the Canadian people. I hope that the minister, in the course of this debate or in the course of a future debate on foreign affairs will tell us what thinking has been done on this subject within the Department of External Affairs or in any of the other departments of government.

I noticed that at the time of the meeting in Japan the hon. gentleman did refer to a Canada-U.S.-Japan triangle. It was a step further than we had gone in the past but I am asking the hon. gentleman to go further still. After all, a triangle is not the most satisfactory basis for a relationship—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The Pacific triangle.

Mr. Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke): Well, I think it is a step forward though I believe it still falls short of what we really need as a Pacific nation. Although the coastline of British Columbia measured in a straight line from the 49th parallel to the Alaska Panhandle is only about 500 miles, the length of the coast line itself, with all its many indentations, amounts to something like 15,000 miles. These fiords reach deep into the re-

source region of the interior, giving access to all the possibilities for development in British Columbia. But we must not limit ourselves to these possibilities alone. There are other provinces in western Canada, each one of which is benefiting to a notable extent from trade with Japan at the present time.

No Canadian who travels over our main line railways or over the trans-Canada highway these days can fail to be impressed by the large number of trains moving to the west coast carrying coal, great loads of sulphur from the petrochemical industry of Alberta, copper from the interior of British Columbia, newsprint, lumber and other products of the western region of Canada which are pouring into the Orient, particularly into Japan. This is apart altogether from the movement of wheat and other grain.

The noise in this chamber at the present time suggests to me that eastern members may find this to be a boring subject of no consequence to them. I would point out to them that there is another movement west, and no one who drives along our highways can fail to be aware of it. I refer to immense trainloads of farm equipment moving from the industrial regions of eastern Canada to the western provinces—trainloads of equipment which would not be needed and which could not be paid for were it not for this earlier movement to the Orient of grain and the other products to which I have referred.

This is one aspect of our relations with the Pacific—the trade aspect, perhaps a selfish one. But on this basis, following the path of the merchants, we could develop a diplomatic program reaching out beyond the Pacific region itself to southeast Asia and to India. There is tremendous interest in this region but I am afraid there is now only a tentative sense of Canadian identification with it.

There is one other subject to which I should like to refer, and it is a related one, that of foreign aid. The minister will recall the success of the program undertaken by the Canadian government in 1959-60 in connection with the international refugee year by means of which 300 families of tubercular refugees were brought from Europe, treated for their disability, found work and rehabilitated with the result that they are now integrated into the Canadian life and economy. They found useful employment, and not only did we provide them with new opportunities but they provided us with new skills, talents and people with tremendous enthusiasm because of the kindness and humanity Canada had shown them.

Of course we have no such program now. There is not, perhaps, the same requirement for such a program. The hard-core tubercular cases no longer occupy European camps; certainly not to the extent that they once did. But could we not perhaps draw on our experience of that particular program, benefit from the success of it and give the lead in a fresh approach to the same kind of program? Could we not, using the experience of that program, try another experiment? In our foreign aid and technical aid programs we go out to the underdeveloped countries throughout the world and endeavour to assist them. We make them gifts of food and provide assistance in training, the building of physical plant, and so on. We endeavour to lift their economy so they can provide for their own people. But we know that in regard to many of the overpopulated countries of the world, whatever the rest of the world can do involves a long and slow process; and some of these countries will never be able from their own resources to provide for their own people because there are simply too many people for them to sustain, even with the most advanced development of their economy.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, can we not, in an experimental way in the beginning, draw on our experience in the tubercular refugee program and reach out in the world and accept into this country, say 100 families annually from overpopulated countries, families which know illness, poverty and hunger—all the disabilities that poverty stricken economies have imposed upon them; families for whom in their present circumstances there is no hope and can no longer be any hope. I suggest that we bring these families to Canada. Let us treat those that are ill, educate, train and rehabilitate them and establish them here as Canadians. I realize that we have still to provide for many among our own people; but despite that we are still one of the great and rich nations of the world. However, much we may still have to advance in our own economy, we are so far advanced as compared with the rest of mankind that we cannot stand selfishly by and assume that we have all these benefits by divine right, or that we can retain them without accepting a greater degree of responsibility for the unfortunate people of the world than we now accept.

I think we should persuade the Canadian people that we can today, at least in the beginning on an experimental basis, take and completely provide for at least 100 families annually. While it is not much, while it is only a token, it would at least provide some

hope for those 100 families, some reason to live, some prospect for a decent future for themselves and the young people among them. I believe that is not too much for Canada to do. If it worked well I would hope we could expand the program and I would hope that the Canadian people as a whole would support the government in such an endeavour. I believe this program would be worth trying. I do not say that we should go too far too fast, but I do think that on an experimental basis and on the basis of the success of the tubercular refugee program we should now try this further step along that line.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Chairman, most of what I had to say to the committee has already been dealt with by hon. members, particularly in relation to the situation of this country vis-à-vis the countries of South America, Central America and Mexico. However, I think I can add a few words which can constitute a postscript to what has been said. It is not without signficance that in today's *Globe and Mail* there was an interesting news item dealing with the intentions of the government with regard to the inter-American development bank. Also not without significance, I think, is the fact that in tonight's Ottawa *Citizen* there is a news item dealing with a report made by a colleague of the minister, Senator Connolly, who has just returned from South America and has had some very pertinent observations to make in connection with what he discovered there—observations that I am sure will not be lost to the minister.

Most important, however, I want to put before the committee the text of a news item which appears in the *Christian Science Monitor* of Wednesday, November 18. This news item is headed "Lima Parley to Map Continental Body". I would ask permission, Mr. Chairman, just to read a few extracts from this article:

> Legislators from at least 15 Latin-American countries will meet here from December 6 to 11 to discuss establishment of a continental assembly on the lines of the European parliament in Brussels...
>
> High on the agenda will be study of the economic and political integration of Latin America and the establishment of a Latin American parliament, similar to the European parliament.
>
> This first meeting of the legislators will attempt to fix the seat, powers, and constitution of the parliament as approved by referendum of the attending countries...
>
> Among the terms of reference of the meeting are:
>
> The recognition of democratic representation and social justice as norms of true continental cooperation;
>
> A desire to strengthen world peace and progress without hostility or prejudice toward any country or group of countries;
>
> The strengthening of hemispheric unity by means of efficient co-operation leading to the emergence of the Latin-American countries as an integrated and independent froce in the solution of world problems.

It is interesting to note that this meeting will be attended by representatives of the organization of American states, which has been mentioned during the course of this debate, the inter-American development bank, the Latin American economic commission, the inter-American economic and social council, the Latin America free trade association, the inter-American regional labour organization, the Central America economic union, the Latin America university union, and the American inter-parliamentarian regional group.

Up until recently I think we have been proceeding with regard to this problem as if time did not matter, believing, with Mr. Micawber, that something was going to turn up. But I think this article indicates that this is no longer the case. Time is of the essence; and I do not think time is on our side, and we will have to act. I realize that successive governments have found it difficult to deal with this matter. Discussions have centered recently around joining the O.A.S. I know there are problems inherent in that and I am not going into them; the minister recognizes them, as do his officials. The alliance for progress is another means of doing something which is going to be of help and benefit to the countries of South America. This is a program initiated by the United States. But having in mind the countries of the southern part of this hemisphere have now gathered together, are apparently determined to do what they can to help themselves, and have come up with programs and suggestions of the kind which I read out, indicates that we cannot delay much longer a decision as to the course we must pursue. It is a case of enlightened self interest. The economic trade, imports and exports of the South American continent, are in the order of $18 billion to $19 billion, of which our share, if we deduct the actual imports into this country of Venezuelan oil, is not a very substantial amount.

Over and above that is the extent to which we as a country, by some means not yet clear to us or made clear by the government, can do our share to help these countries to help themselves. I do not know whether the minister or the officials of the department will be represented at this gathering, acting as

observers. I do not know whether we will participate in any of the organizations. It might be that we will become involved in the American inter-parliamentarian regional group. I know we are not members of the O.A.S., although the article in the *Globe and Mail* today indicated that we might be coming close to some sort of associate membership.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): We belong to about five related organizations.

Mr. Baldwin: Perhaps the minister can indicate later on whether there will be some representation directly or indirectly at this particular conference. Possibly he will consider sending greetings and best wishes from this parliament, which I think would be useful. It is for us to do more than simply attempt through private means to expand our trade; it is up to us as a government and as a people to indicate our interest, care and concern.

It is no good being critical unless one also makes suggestions, so I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that while it is for the government and the minister to come to a decision and make these representations, these representations when implemented will involve parliament and the people of Canada. This is a problem about which not enough is yet known in the country. I suggest to the minister that he give consideration during the next session to having this matter referred, by means of a specific term of reference, to the very able and active external affairs committee; that a debate might be initiated, the impact of which would be heard and felt throughout the country so that people would then be better prepared, through knowledge and understanding, to participate in the decisions which will have to be made, and will give their support. Because without the support of the people it is obvious that not too much can be done. I throw that out as a suggestion for the minister to consider in regard to the problem, which has been pretty well ventilated.

There is one other issue with which I should like to deal, Mr. Chairman. It touches the whole future of the Department of External Affairs and its course of conduct in connection with transacting the business of that department. I think my hon. friend from Battle River-Camrose referred to the good old days when the minister was in politics on this side of the house. Since then for a good part of the time he has been riding very high on cloud nine, looking down on the struggles, the thoughts, and the toil and sweat of us ordinary politicians over here. But despite that he must be aware of the fact there is a very considerable debate raging in this nation on matters involving federal-provincial areas of responsibility and powers, and I am sure he must be quite interested in this problem.

This, then, brings me to a question which I posed to him which was based on a speech—I tried to introduce this question in the house the other day but without much success—which was made at Victoria to the Kiwanis club by Mr. Lucien Saulnier, the chairman of the executive committee of the city of Montreal, who I understand is a very responsible individual. This speech was not made in the province of Quebec but in the province of British Columbia. With much of what was said I am in thorough agreement; it was a good and an excellent speech. But toward the close of his speech Mr. Saulnier indicated what in his opinion, in this very delicate and sensitive area of federal-provincial responsibilities, should be matters which might well go to the provincial government. Included in these items was—and I am using his own words here—power to participate in drawing up external trade policies.

I suggest that there is no doubt that the minister has consulted, and will in future consult, as will other responsible ministers, the provinces when negotiating with other countries in matters specifically affecting one or more of the provinces. We had a fair example of that during the negotiations on the Columbia river treaty; I am sure he had many hours of negotiations with Mr. Bennett and his officials. However, this was not really a constitutional responsibility.

What alarms me, and what I wish to question the minister on, is this. As minister who, under the Department of External Affairs Act, is given statutory responsibility to conduct the transactions which this country must enter into with other countries, a responsibility which is augmented by constitutional practice, under circumstances where the constitution of the country provides that he must when entering into trade or other external negotiations consult with provincial governments, does he feel that he can adequately deal with the external affairs of this country? We have heard talk from time to time in connection with the nuclear arms policy, of various alliances where there are one or two or three or four fingers on the trigger. What about a situation where, in negotiating for a treaty or in writing a treaty, we find there are 11 hands on the pen which signs the treaty? I think, having put this matter succinctly to the minister, that I should like to hear his view

at some time before this debate is concluded as to whether he feels that a constitutional amendment of this kind is one which would permit him to undertake and to carry out his responsibilities as one charged with conducting the external affairs of this country.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I am encouraged to take part in this debate for a few minutes because of the remarks the minister made about me this afternoon. I want also to correct an impression which may be getting abroad, contributed to by some of my colleagues who are looking at the minister as if he had adopted an avuncular attitude now to the House of Commons and to life in general. I have known him of old and I do not see this kindly, paternal attitude of the minister. I think he must be very careful or very soon he will be called "Uncle Paul" and "the old gentleman". I would prefer to see a firmer hand on our foreign affairs than is now being shown by the minister of external affairs.

I am worried about the impression he is going to create among his distinguished colleagues in other foreign countries when he uses in this house such undiplomatic language as he used this afternoon when I put before him a serious question on the policy of this country. He talked about this being a shoddy and a parochial question. He imputed a motive to me by saying I was pursuing the question as a political hobby and indicated that I was inefficient and amateurish in the performance of my duty. That is undiplomatic language in any country. I thought I would admonish the minister tonight so that he will be a little more careful in the future.

Let me just say a few words about the situation in the Congo, and the Canadians who are there. There has been a bit of buffoonery with regard to the unexpected and generally unauthorized visit of the hon. member for Red Deer to the Congo as a government representative. Now that he has returned perhaps the minister will take the matter firmly in hand to see whether it can be straightened out. The people of concern are the Canadians there, and if they were relatives of any one of us we would be deeply disturbed about their fate.

What I should like to know, quite seriously, is what the minister is doing about appointing an official and competent representative of Canada to solve this situation. I think two things are essential. The first is an attempt, as has been made, to get in touch with the rebels who are endangering the lives of our Canadians there. The second thing is for someone of competence and knowledge to make contact with the government of the Congo, and be on hand if possible when the relieving force now approaching Stanleyville is successful. The minister has not told us about that. Has he any information as to whether Stanleyville is under attack at the present time, whether these hostages have ben released or, if they need assistance, what assistance will be given by the Canadian government?

This is a serious matter, but all we have witnessed is the fiasco of sending, without public notice until we discovered it, the hon. member for Red Deer to conduct negotiations. What is going on now with regard to the Canadians who are endangered in the Congo? I should like to see a serious approach to these matters adopted by the minister.

The other thing I want to refer to is related to the question I posed to the minister this afternoon, and it irritated him a bit. He showed that irascible side of his nature of which I have been aware for 14 years. His mask fell off and the real member appeared, rather than the glorified minister who moves with the slow steady steps of a mandarin of the old school.

I should like to know about the commitment that this government has made to negotiate out of the nuclear weapons field. There is a tinge of hypocrisy to these bland statements which are made to other countries of the world, such as: Do not accept nuclear arms because it is a bad thing to do; do not do as we do, do as we say. Canada has nuclear weapons, but of course we do not produce them; therefore we are not a member of the nuclear club. This seems to me to be very close to hypocrisy.

I should like to refer again to the famous speech made by the minister on May 22. I have read it again, for the third time, but I hope I will not have to refer to it again. The minister places reliance on his speech of May 22, and when questions are asked of him he invariably suggests that we can find all the answers in that speech. The repetitious answer that one finds in that speech is: We are watching the situation closely. I have watched the situation very closely and I have again read this speech. I find that the minister has not answered the very important questions about Canada's position in relation to other nations of the world.

On May 22 the minister talked about the importance of disarmament and how someone should make a start in that direction, even if

it is only a unilateral start. At the same time he has not taken any action with regard to Canada's arms and the promise that was made to the Canadian people by the Liberal party in 1963.

What about Canada's prestige abroad? That is something which disturbed the minister several years ago. It is disturbing me very seriously at this time, because what confidence are our allies going to have in us, and what confidence will the United States have in us. The minister and his supporters, particularly the Minister of National Defence, told the Canadian people that immediately they were put in office they would have nuclear missiles for the weapons systems in Canada. Almost two years have elapsed and there are no nuclear weapons for the Voodoo aircraft. The greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the Canadian people was this defence issue, when we were all told stories about how we were to be protected. We have the Bomarcs armed and ready to fire, and the Voodoos will come in and strike down the attacking aircraft so that Montreal and Toronto, which were unprotected cities, will be protected. Nothing has been done during those two years in this regard.

What about the confidence of the United States in this government which promised it would immediately arm these Voodoo aircraft with nuclear missiles? What about our NATO allies in Europe?

This government has told us that it has made a commitment to provide nuclear weapons for our air division in Europe. The only answer I have been able to obtain from the Minister of National Defence, when I asked him about these nuclear missiles for our air division, is that our air division is operative. What does that mean? It means they can fly, and we have known that for a long time. One quarter of that air division is armed with photographic equipment, and the Minister of National Defence has told me that they are weapons.

What about Canada's prestige with our NATO allies, in view of the fact we are not living up to our promises? That famous speech the minister made on May 22 is going to be recorded as a historic document, as important as the British North America Act. The minister criticized NATO at that time and said we should tell each other what we are doing, and then he used these words:

> I am afraid that that is now the situation. If we fail to do so, mistrust sets in and we lose sight of the fundamental reasons which keep us together and we become obsessed by our differences.

This government must live up to its promises with regard to NATO. Therefore, using the minister's own words, if we do not live up to our promises, mistrust will set in.

I have asked the minister on several occasions about those promises to negotiate us out of our nuclear arms situation. The leader of the New Democratic party has asked him similar questions. His answers to both of us were: "Refer to my earlier answer". And his earlier answer was, "I will take your question as notice". He has had that question now as notice for about three months. I point out some of these things to some of my colleagues in this house who have not seen the real man behind this mask. They think he is a kindly gentleman. I am putting them on their guard for the future.

The third matter with which I wish to deal is also a serious matter. Why did the minister not tell us today about the situation in Malaysia? I was able to drag out of him over a considerable period of time, the fact that a military team from Canada was going to Malaysia to investigate the situation. Why did the minister not give us a report of that investigation tonight? Is that team there or has it returned?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The team has been in Malaysia. When it has returned and made its report my hon. friend will be the first to get it.

Mr. Churchill: The minister says I will be the first to get it. I want hon. members to mark those words.

An hon. Member: After the newspapers.

Mr. Churchill: Yes, after the hon. member for Red Deer has been consulted I might be the first one to get it.

I ask the minister whether this is one of the serious trouble spots of the world, and if it is, why are we not told about it? We know what has happened during this century with these troubles starting up here and there in obscure places in the world, and then flaring up into great conflicts. What is the situation in Malaysia? What troops are operating there? Who is giving aid to Malaysia? What aid, if any, are we going to give? What is the strength of Indonesia?

Mr. Nesbitt: We know who is giving aid there.

Mr. Churchill: We know who is giving aid there. How great a threat is Indonesia to the peace of the world? We are dependant upon reports in the newspapers. The government

frequently tells me not to rely upon these reports but I think they are a lot better than the information we get from the government. We read in the newspapers about Australia either intending to impose or perhaps already having imposed conscription. Why? Is it because of the threat of Indonesia? The imposition of conscription in a normal period of peace is a very serious matter for any country and Canada is fully aware of the implications of such an action.

What is the situation in Malaysia in respect of Indonesia, and what part are other members of the commonwealth playing with regard to that troubled area? Is this what is bothering Australia? If it is, we should know, and if Australia is in danger surely we should be the first to say, "Count on us to assist", because we have fought with them in other wars.

I draw to the attention of the minister some of the really serious matters which I hope he will deal with frankly and not with those peripatetic platitudes to which he subjects us. They arouse a bit of humour, but foreign affairs are a very serious matter. The whole country can be affected by actions which take place elsewhere in the world and we should be kept informed, because when trouble arises we have to call on the Canadian people to make a response, even call on the Canadian militia, which is now being disregarded by the Minister of National Defence, to make a response.

That is all I want to say at this stage with regard to these important matters. I hope the minister, if and when he answers us, will treat the subject with the seriousness it deserves and make clear to the Canadian people what Canada's policy is with regard to the matters I have touched upon.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I think it is understood that we might perhaps take a few moments extra to deal with some of the matters raised. I thank my hon. friend who I think was perhaps justifiably vigorous in his denunciation of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and I accept it in the very kindly spirit which I know motivated his remarks. He mentioned the situation in Malaysia. It is a serious problem. Malaysia is a commonwealth country. Canada was recently visited by the Tunku, the prime minister of that country. We discussed with him desirable methods of assisting his country in meeting the continuous guerrilla attacks that have been made against Malaysia by Indonesia.

It is not the intention of the government of Canada to send troops for purposes of combat to any part of Asia, except pursuant to obligations under the charter of the United Nations. This policy has been enunciated by the Prime Minister and by me. It was examined in the external affairs committee when all of these estimates were considered. There has been a military mission in Malaysia examining with the government of that country and its military authorities, in conjunction with the forces of Australia, Britain, New Zealand and other countries, what kind of assistance we might be called upon to provide. This is a matter of great concern to us and also of particular concern, of course, to Australia as it is to New Zealand, because of the geographical relationship of those countries to the federation.

It will be recalled that one of the reasons why Australia could not participate in the United Nations peace force in Cyprus was its preoccupations in Asia. My hon. friend may be assured that this matter is being followed through the closest consultation not only with the commonwealth but with other countries as well.

I followed with interest the statement made by the hon. member for Okanagan-Revelstoke and I agree with him that the interests of Canada in the Pacific are growing, and that our interests in that area cannot be allowed to go unregarded. We are a Pacific as well as an Atlantic power. Our interests with the Orient are increasing. We have with Japan the third largest volume of trade that we have with any country in the world. We exchange goods with that country to an amount approaching $500 million. There are many communities of interest between the foreign policies of Japan and Canada. At the third ministerial meeting last September my colleagues and I took advantage of the opportunity to review important economic, trade and foreign policy matters.

Our interests with the Orient, of course, are not confined to Japan but involve commonwealth and other countries in Asia. I fully agree with the hon. member that this is an area to which Canada inescapably in its own interests must pay increasing attention. I thought the hon. gentleman made a thoughtful speech.

There were other problems referred to. My hon. friend referred to our relations with Latin America. The hon. member for Peace River quite properly noted that an area of the world that will have a population at the end of this century of 600 million people is an area that we cannot ignore, particularly when we think of the community of cultural,

religious and other interests that we share with Latin America. It seems inevitable that in this interdependent world we should show increasing interest in that part of the world.

Great emphasis is placed by some on the institutional aspect of inter-American relationships. As I indicated to the hon. member, we now belong to a number of subsidiary bodies of the organization of American states. Each of us has his own view as to the importance of institutionalization in this context. What is important is that we should realize that this is our hemisphere, that there are great interests, great currents involved in the welfare of the free world in the developments that are taking place in that growing and populous area.

We have already given some evidence of our appreciation of the situation in our external aid program. This year, for instance, out of $50 million of soft loans $10 million is being provided through negotiations that are now being carried on with the inter-American development bank for the first time. This symbolizes our interest.

Some hon. members referred today to the financial situation in the United Nations. I did endeavour in the brief statement I made to outline our concept of the problem. We recognize this as a problem that has to be resolved in the interests of the United Nations itself. The solution of course does not rest with Canada but it does rest with those defaulting countries who are being called upon to bear their share of a financial responsibility that should be collectively accepted as well as imposed.

Mr. Howard: I do not want to interrupt the minister, except that I notice the clock and I think we should make some determination of what we are going to do.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Perhaps I might ask the chairman not to see the clock, if hon. members so wish, in order that I might finish these responses and give other hon. members whatever opportunity they wish to speak. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I promised the hon. member for Greenwood that I would answer several questions, one with regard to the defence review. The NATO ministers at the Ottawa ministerial meeting in May 1963 directed that there should be further studies of the interrelated questions of strategy, force requirements and the resources necessary to meet those requirements. Since then there has been slow progress on this defence review, in part because of the differences of view to which I referred this afternoon. However, the review is continuing and we expect we will be informed of what progress is made at the forthcoming meeting.

With regard to civil-military relations, I have emphasized many times that it is essential in the complicated world of 1964 that in this respect Canadian foreign and defence policy should work hand in hand. Indeed co-operation between the Department of External Affairs and the Department of National Defence is close on this subject, as on others.

Within NATO the military and civilian branches have remained quite separate and arrangements for liaison have not worked out as expeditiously and beneficially as desired. For this reason we have been urging NATO members, in examining methods of improving the organization of the alliance, to consider ways of co-ordinating and making more effective the arrangements between the military and civilian arms of the alliance.

We had a full discussion today on the relationship of mainland China to the United Nations, and in the brief interventions I made in answer to some questions, I stated what the position of Canada is at this moment. I can very well understand why, when I referred several times to the statement I made in the house on May 22, I might have given the impression of not wishing to discuss the matters involved in this important issue. But I do suggest to hon. members that in view of the importance of this matter, in view of its significance to this country and to all the nations in the free world, the situation that prevails between one communist camp and another is a question that cannot be treated lightly. It must be viewed by me in the light of my responsibilities as Secretary of State for External Affairs and the advice I receive from those who serve this country in the Department of External Affairs and in our missions abroad, in the light of our relations with other countries, our relations with our closest neighbour, our relations with commonwealth countries, and in the light of our assessment of the situation in Asia.

All these are factors which any government anxious to carry out its responsibilities must observe. In the statement I made on May 22 I called the attention of the house to the views of Canada on this situation. I pointed out that Canada's policy with regard to relations with China had to take account of the integrity of Formosa. This was the

policy of the former administration and it continues to be the policy of the present government of Canada. The secretary of state in the United States, commenting on this matter the other day asked what about the people of Formosa? Are we to leave these people to the wolves? There are some 12 million people on that island. The history of recent times certainly warrants consideration by a country such as Canada as to their welfare and their legitimate position. In the statement I made on May 22 I suggested that the time was probably close at hand when we should give consideration in the United Nations to the steps which could be taken to protect the integrity of that country. This is no academic question; it is a question of importance. We have been canvassing the reaction to what was involved in the statement of policy which I made in the house on May 22.

I fully appreciate the debate which has taken place today on this question. It is important that there should be a realization of how this house feels about a matter which involves the most populous country in the world, mainland China a country whose position now, in the light of the situation which confronts all nations, cannot be ignored. The question of the admission of that country to the United Nations and of the recognition of the regime of that country are matters of the most fundamental importance and, as I indicated today, we have been giving this subject the fullest and the most responsible consideration that we know how to give. We have been discussing the matter with a number of countries. The interest of those countries, their assessment of the consequences, the resulting situation in Asia itself, the consequences within the United Nations—all these questions are inevitably involved in the consideration which I have been giving to this matter, and which I shall continue to give to it.

I am not in a position tonight to go any further than I have gone, and I would not be expected to do so by anyone with a full appreciation of the importance of this matter. I do fully share the view uttered tonight by the secretary general of the United Nations, if not in the same precise context, which prompted him to say that we had to take into account the desirability of furthering the universality of the United Nations. I think I can stand in this house along with any other member and say I have given evidence, by my contribution in the United Nations, of my support for this principle of universality,

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

since it was through an effort of Canada in 1955 that a number of new nations were brought into the organization. We are examining this problem in the light of what we believe to be the interest of the United Nations, and the interest of world peace. We are taking into account all the relevant considerations particularly in Asia, bearing in mind all that is involved, as well, in our relationships with other countries. No foreign policy could be based on any other assessment. A foreign policy which ignores national interests in their broadest context is not a well based foreign policy. We will have to take a position at the United Nations. We will take a position after the fullest consideration of all that is involved. It will be an unequivocal position, a responsible position, and the result of a thorough examination of all that we believe to be involved.

Mr. Smallwood: Mr. Chairman, I have just one short remark to make to the minister. I want to thank him from the bottom of my heart for the answer he gave me in his usual manner, because he skirted right around the question and never really answered it. I wonder whether, now that the government had admitted sending the prodigal son home to Haile Selassie at Addis Ababa, where the fatted calf was killed in his honour, the minister would consider sending one of his experienced officials of the Department of External Affairs to the Congo to try and help these hostages in their serious situation.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, when my hon. friend speaks about returning home, I want to say to him—and I am sure he will agree—that what I have been saying is a matter that affects home as do perhaps few other problems. With regard to the question as to the decision of the government to send the hon. member for Red Deer on this mission, I can only reiterate what I said earlier. We are faced, as other governments are faced, with a serious situation in Stanleyville, where about 800 people are held as hostages. It would not be possible for anyone to say with any measure of certainty what is going to happen there.

Among that number are some 37 or 38 Canadians, some of them missionaries. We have tried to resort to every means within our power to obtain, along with other countries, the release of these hostages. In addition to the hon. member for Red Deer, one of our own officials, Mr. Gauvin, who likewise has had contact with some of the personalities involved in Stanleyville, is there

now and was there with the hon. member for Red Deer, associated with him in an attempt to bring whatever influence they could to bear, through acquaintances in Africa on those authorities in the Congo and in the organization of African states for the release of these hostages. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre asked a proper question: What is the situation now? The central government forces have made some progress in the Congo in the last few days. They have been gradually surrounding the rebels in the Hante province in the Congo of which Stanleyville is the capital. In some instances the central government forces have come as close as 80 miles to the city. This has been paralleled by a disintegration of authority in the rebel areas. These events suggest that the dangers for the captive civilian population affected are now reaching a very critical point.

In mid October the government of Canada —and we have no representative in Kenya, nor in Stanleyville—appealed on behalf of our people in the Congo to the governments represented on the conciliation commission and the organization of African unity, and notably to its chairman, Mr. Kenyatta, the president of Kenya. This appeal was based on the four conventions signed in Geneva in 1949 with regard to the treatment of civilian populations. I regret that this appeal and the appeal of other governments has not proven to be effective.

As I first informed the house on November 5, the hon. member for Red Deer knows Africa and has spent a lot of time there. In spite of the criticism which has been made of him he has, to paraphrase the statement made by United States authorities, rendered valuable service in circumstances which are causing concern to the government of the United States as well as to Canada. He was asked to make an appeal, with a number of friendly governments and certain African leaders he knows. More specifically, because of the fact that he had acted in a governmental capacity in Ethiopia for over 18 years, serving the emperor; and because the emperor was the first president of the organization for African unity, we asked the hon. member for Red Deer, with whatever authority and support he could receive from the emperor, to deliver a message to Mr. Kenyatta as chairman of the O.A.U. conciliation commission, expressing the concern of the Canadian government for its nationals who are in the Stanleyville area and of whom we have not had any direct information since midsummer.

Mr. Kenyatta assured the hon. member for Red Deer that in response to the appeal of Canada and other countries he had taken what immediate action he could to request all authorities in the Congo to respect the human rights of civilians and also to facilitate the work of the international committee of the Red Cross. He indicated that the Stanleyville authorities had assured him that the foreign civilians in Stanleyville were not in danger. I hope that continues to be the situation, although the news that we have now is anything but encouraging.

Like Mr. Kenyatta the Emperor of Ethiopia, largely through the efforts of the hon. member for Red Deer, made known his grave concern over the safety of the Canadians and other foreigners in the affected area. The hon. member for Red Deer was in constant touch, in the course of the four or five days during which he travelled back and forth between Addis Ababa and Nairobi, with certain diplomats and officials in both capitals. He consulted with the Ethiopian minister of foreign affairs, with the Kenyan minister of state Mr. Murumbi and also was in touch with the director of the organization most concerned in this matter, Mr. Diallo Telli, the secretary general of the organization of African unity.

Mr. Churchill: Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): May I just finish this statement.

Mr. Churchill: We are very interested in the statement but we are getting a little weary of the big build-up of the hon. member for Red Deer. Keep to the facts of the situation.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That is what I am doing. The point I am making is I want to indicate in fairness to the hon. gentleman that he did undertake to do something which the government of Canada thought was worth doing. He did it well, and I am sure that on analysis of all that is involved here it will be recognized that it was wise to have him go to Africa for this and other purposes. He has discharged his function as well as anyone could in these very difficult circumstances.

Mr. Woolliams: Why did you not tell us that when we first asked the question?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I did.

Mr. Woolliams: No, you did not.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): But whether I did or not, as long as I am Secretary of State for External Affairs and faced with such responsibilities, and knowing there was somebody in this house with a long experience in Africa—

Mr. Smallwood: A bunch of boloney.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friend may say that, but let me tell him that there are 38 Canadians who will be grateful for what he has done and who will say he has helped them.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the situation. When the hon. member comes back here he will likely be able to tell us more of what he has done. But I do want to say from all the messages I have had from our own people, from Mr. Gauvin, and particularly from the American government, no one has worked harder as an individual in this matter than the hon. member for Red Deer. I am extremely grateful to him for what he has done.

Mr. Smallwood: I have one short remark to make, Mr. Chairman. No one on this side of the house has condemned the hon. member for Red Deer for his efforts. It is the underhanded way the government went about sending him to Africa that is contemptible. The hon. member is now back in Canada and has reported that these refugees are indeed in danger, and that he was not able to get within 30 miles of them. For heavens sake, will the minister not consider sending one of our officials over there to try to make contact with these people? I repeat, no one condemned the hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Gauvin of our department is there.

Mr. Smallwood: Both individuals failed in their efforts, according to the hon. member for Red Deer.

An hon. Member: Oh, for goodness sake.

Mr. Smallwood: You just go and lay an egg. We would like to send you somewhere, but I will not say where.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the minister one short and simple question. Is it not customary to make appeals of a compassionate nature, and investigations such as were undertaken by the hon. member for Red Deer, through our regular diplomatic channels which have been in existence ever since his department was formed? Are there not establishments permanently set up for that purpose?

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Mr. Martin (Essex East): We have no resident mission in Nairobi, the capital where the president of the organization is, nor have we a mission in Stanleyville.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Is it not usual to work through the closest nation with which we have diplomatic relations?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That is right, and we have done that. As a result of consultation we have also used the services of the hon. member for Red Deer.

Item agreed to.

5. Representation abroad—operational—including authority, notwithstanding the Civil Service Act, for the appointment and fixing of salaries of high commissioners, ambassadors, ministers plenipotentiary, consuls, secretaries and staff by the governor in council, $14,679,000.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to the minister concerning item No. 5.

In February last, all those who benefited from the education the Jesuit fathers dispense were sorry to learn that the latter were ordered out of the country by the government of Haiti and that some of their properties, including the "maison Manrèse" and the radio station which they used for their broadcasts had been confiscated.

I would like to direct the following question to the minister. Were negotiations carried on through our ambassador in that country with a view to allowing the Jesuit fathers to recover their property? Furthermore, could the government seize this opportunity to promote the negotiations of an industrialist called Vachon, who is interested in establishing a business in Haiti, and through those negotiations bring about a compensation for the Jesuit fathers?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, we are not satisfied with the situation regarding the Jesuit fathers' property in Haiti and we hope that a satisfactory solution can be found. The religious authorities themselves, the church in Haiti and the religious orders involved must, however, find the elements of such a solution before we can find means of implementing it and, in particular, raising the matter with the Haitian government.

I can assure the hon. member that we are following this matter very closely.

[*Text*]

Item agreed to.

35. Economic, technical, educational and other assistance as detailed in the estimates, $75,600,000.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, I should just like to comment briefly about item 35 which involves, among other things, contributions under the Colombo plan and contributions to other nations. The total amount of the item has been increased from approximately $50 million to $75 million this year.

I merely want to contrast this assistance for economic development and technical and educational assistance to other countries with the paltry amount that we consider worth while to contribute toward the same sort of advancement and assistance for our native Indian people. An announcement was made earlier this year to the effect that $3½ million would be expended over the next three year period for community development and advancement on Indian reserves, or a little more than $1 million per year. It has long been the position of the C.C.F. and the New Democratic party to favour external aid programs such as the Colombo plan, thinking that we are doing a wonderful thing in assisting other nations to advance economically; but I am beginning to have some objection to proceeding in this manner with regard to other countries when we treat our own native Indians in such niggardly fashion.

I merely want to express my opposition to the vote now before us, and to suggest that until such time as we can develop a Colombo plan for our Indians that means something we should not be sending these large amounts of money to other nations. Let us look to home first.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre:

That vote No. 35 under the Department of External Affairs be reduced by the amount of $350,000 being the value of wheat flour to be given to Indonesia under the Colombo plan.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that no wheat flour has been sent to Indonesia yet. The matter is being reviewed, as I told the house some time ago.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, in view of the remarks I just made, which incidentally were made not knowing that the hon. member for Oxford was going to move an amendment of this sort, and having regard to the opposition I expressed to this sort of activity when we are treating our own people in such terrible fashion, I can do nothing else but vote for the amendment to reduce this vote.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that I can quite understand the reason advanced by the hon. member for Skeena in indicating his intention to vote in favour of the amendment to reduce this item. For myself I feel that despite any feelings we may have about the government of Indonesia we should be very careful about cutting off aid which goes to the people of that country. Therefore I personally propose to vote against the amendment for that reason.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Chairman, my two colleagues here and myself intend to oppose the motion of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt).

I am of the opinion that Canada must help those countries which are less fortunate than we are.

Personally, I should like to take this opportunity to point out to the Secretary of State for External Affairs that, in my opinion, one of the best ways to help underdeveloped countries through the Colombo plan is still to help the missionaries of various religious denominations, so as to enable them to assist those unfortunate people as much as possible.

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Chairman—

[*Text*]

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in the observations made by the hon. member for Greenwood and by the hon. member who has just spoken. I am sure the hon. member for Oxford cannot really have reflected seriously on the implications of what he is suggesting.

I have been asked whether the government intends to terminate shipments of flour to Indonesia under our Colombo plan program. I have said we have not yet shipped flour this year, although we provided assistance to Indonesian students, some 40 of them, a number of whom are now in this country, I would like to place this question in the proper perspective.

Over more than a decade decisions by Canadian governments with respect to the magnitude and type of our assistance to the Colombo program, of which Indonesia is a member, have been largely free of strategic and political considerations. The view now being taken by some hon. members that our aid has a political motivation will, I think, be received with great concern in certain areas.

The fact that over the years our development of assistance has been largely free of fluctuations dictated by short term political consideration accounts to a very large extent

for the fact that Canadian assistance in the developing countries has been especially welcomed and, I believe, effectively used.

It would be interesting to note what other countries are doing. Indonesia is still receiving substantial assistance from the United States, Japan, Australia, France, Germany, New Zealand and the specialized agencies of the United Nations. It should therefore appear evident that it is a collective judgment that this aid under present circumstances should not be terminated.

We were among the first to participate in the Colombo plan. Our proposed total assistance to Indonesia is in the amount of little more than $400,000, of which roughly $350,000 represents wheat flour, in connection with which there has not yet been made a decision to make a shipment of that commodity. Our external aid program this year has been increased from $117 million in 1963-64 to $195 million. It is a program that is designed to bridge the gap between the developed and underdeveloped nations of the world.

I cannot believe that it is the intention of any member, in the face of this background, to put forward such a resolution, particularly when one bears in mind the fact that the hon. gentleman who proposes it was a parliamentary secretary to the secretary of state for external affairs, and served with distinction at the United Nations. I find it very difficult to believe that my hon. friend will not accede now to the suggestion I make to him, as the foreign minister of Canada, that he should withdraw this motion.

Mr. Barnett: I understand from what the hon. member for Oxford said that he is motivated by his interest and desire to be of help to the people of Malaysia in their present difficult situation vis-à-vis Indonesia. As one who had the opportunity of enjoying fully the warm hospitality of the people of Malaysia as a delegate to the parliamentary association conference held there a year ago, I certainly share his sympathy and desire to be of assistance to the people of Malaysia, but I feel that action or support of the kind he proposes, far from supplying any assistance to our commonwealth friends in Malaysia could well have a completely reverse effect. For this reason I wish to register my feeling that this is an unwise motion which I certainly would not wish to support.

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Churchill: On a point of order; we agreed to sit beyond ten o'clock. We thought it would be for about half an hour. We are not going to sit here and listen to a filibuster by government members. They are always crying out for a vote. Why did they not vote ten minutes ago? What are they afraid of?

Mr. McIlraith: I think I should explain that the hon. member for Skeena raised a question in relation to Indian affairs, and the minister was about to explain that his items were coming. That was the reason he rose.

Mr. Churchill: What relation does that have to the motion before the house?

Mr. Barnett: As the member who resumed his seat immediately before the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre rose, I wish to make it clear that I was not indulging in a filibuster of any kind.

Mr. Churchill: Nobody accused you of doing so. It is the government side.

Mr. Barnett: If responsibility for sitting for a short time after ten o'clock rests anywhere it rests upon those who introduced this motion and, having introduced it, they should not deny anyone who wishes to do so the opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. Churchill: Yes, but not all night. They can do it tomorrow, if they like.

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Motion (Mr. Nesbitt) negatived: Yeas, 33; nays, 48.

The Chairman: I declare the motion lost. Shall the vote carry?

Mr. Churchill: No, Mr. Chairman, I have a few more words to say on this. I think we should now call it ten o'clock.

Resolutions adopted in committee of sup ply this day reported and concurred in.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted to announce the order of business for tomorrow. We propose to finish the remaining items of this department first, and then, depending on the time, calling the estimates of the Indian affairs branch of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, followed by those of the Department of National Defence. If by any chance all those items should be finished, we would deal with the estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce.

It being forty four minutes after ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

[The following items were passed this day in committee of supply:]

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

A—Department—

1. Administration, operation and maintenance including payment of remuneration, subject to the approval of the governor in council and notwithstanding the Civil Service Act, in connection with the assignment by the Canadian government of Canadians to the staffs of the international organizations detailed in the estimates (part recoverable from those organizations) and authority to make recoverable advances in amounts not exceeding in the aggregate the amounts of the shares of those organizations of such expenses, and authority, notwithstanding the Civil Service Act, for the appointment and fixing of salaries of commissioners (international commissions for supervision and control in Indochina), secretaries and staff by the governor in council; official hospitality: relief and repatriation of distressed Canadian citizens abroad and their dependents and reimbursement of the United Kingdom for relief expenditures incurred by its diplomatic and consular posts on Canadian account (part recoverable); Canadian representation at international conferences; expenses of the third commonwealth education conference; a cultural relations and academic exchange program with the French community, and grants as detailed in the estimates, $10,826,300.

1a. Administration, operation and maintenance including grants as detailed in the estimates, $381,600.

5. Representation abroad—operational—including authority, notwithstanding the Civil Service Act, for the appointment and fixing of salaries of high commissioners, ambassadors, ministers plenipotentiary, consuls, secretaries and staff by the governor in council, $14,679,000.

10. Representation abroad—construction, acquisition or improvement of buildings, works, land, equipment and furnishings, and to the extent that blocked funds are available for these expenditures, to provide for payment from these foreign currencies owned by Canada and provided only for governmental or other limited purposes, $1,801,000.

10a. Representation abroad—construction, acquisition or improvement of buildings, works, land, equipment and furnishings, $113,000.

15. Contributions to international multilateral economic and special aid programs as detailed in the estimates, including authority to pay such amounts as are specified in U.S. dollars notwithstanding that the total of such payments may exceed the equivalent in Canadian dollars, estimated as of December 1963, which is, $9,582,000.

15a. Contributions to international multilateral economic and special aid programs as detailed in the estimates, $1,060,000.

15b. Contributions to international multilateral economic and special aid programs as detailed in the estimates, $120,000.

20. Other payments to international organizations and programs, as detailed in the estimates, including authority to pay the amounts specified in the currencies of the countries indicated, notwithstanding that the total of such payments may exceed the equivalent in Canadian dollars, estimated as of December, 1963, which is, $965,500.

20a. Other payments to international organizations and programs as detailed in the estimates, $7,000.

25. Assessments for membership in the international (including commonwealth) organizations that are detailed in the estimates, including authority to pay such assessments in the amounts and in the currencies in which they are levied, notwithstanding that the total of such payments may exceed the equivalent in Canadian dollars, estimated as of December, 1963, which is, $9,433,000.

External aid office—

30. Salaries and expenses, $796,600.

30a. Salaries and expenses, $29,100.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, November 20, 1964

The house met at 11 a.m.

THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NAMING OF MOUNTAIN IN MEMORY

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it was a year ago this week end that shots were fired in Dallas that brought shock and disbelief throughout the world. President Kennedy had been slain. Hon. members will not soon forget, I believe, the emotion we all felt when the news was announced in this house, a feeling which was shared by millions everywhere. The funeral in Washington a day or so later was a moving and dramatic demonstration of that feeling.

I attended President Franklin D. Roosevelt's funeral in 1945 and there was a great outpouring of grief then, but it was for a leader who had done his work, who had finished the course. Last November it was sorrow for the loss of one who had just begun; it was the ache of unfulfilment. His life, so short, is already a legend. His death, in the words of James Reston, has become "a symbol of the tragedy and caprice of life. He never reached his meridian. We saw him only as a rising sun".

Members of this house and the people of this country will, I know, approve of a decision of the government to commemorate this sad anniversary and honour John Fitzgerald Kennedy's memory by naming a high Canadian peak in the Saint Elias range in the Yukon, near the Alaska border, Mount Kennedy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: I believe it is appropriate that Canada's memorial to him should be a mountain. A mountain is solid and enduring, and so will be his place in history. Mount Kennedy is a graceful, towering, unencumbered peak. President Kennedy was clean cut, a man of clarity and direct vision. A mountain is a symbol of aspiration and upward reach. John Kennedy greatly aspired and his reach, as the poet tells us it should, exceeded his grasp. Today Canada honours, and we remember, the young president, the uncommon man, in the designation of Mount Kennedy.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I speak today, as I did one year ago, extemporaneously and without knowledge in advance except that a few moments ago the Prime Minister advised me that he intended to make a reference to the tragic passing of President Kennedy. I think the course taken by the government in naming a mountain in his honour will epitomize the words which I used one year ago, words that were used at the time of the death of President Lincoln; "Now he belongs to the ages". Mountains, too, belong to the ages.

The intervening 12 months have cleared away many of the fears that touched the hearts of men at the time of President Kennedy's assassination. We now know that it was not an international plot but the action of a demented individual. We also know that the controversies which would have arisen had the commission not been set up have been allayed by the findings of the commission headed by the chief justice of the supreme court.

One year ago the world was struck with horror and fear. God works in his own way. The president who has succeeded him has carried on the work that was commenced by President Kennedy and has done it in a way that has done honour to him and given to all free mankind the sure hope that the United States will follow the course of freedom.

This is a most unusual occasion, giving parliament the opportunity to pay its tribute to one whose life was short but whose contribution was great.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt whatever that all the people of Canada will approve of the action of the Prime Minister in naming a mountain peak after the late President John F. Kennedy. In the three short years during which he held that high office he won for himself a place in the esteem and affection of the Canadian people. It is amazing that a man who held office for so brief a period of time should have left the imprint of his personality so indelibly stamped upon his day and generation. Not only the people of the

United States but the peoples of the world were shocked at the sad news of his cruel assassination. I am sure all the Canadian people will warmly welcome the decision of the government to have this permanent memorial to the memory of a great president, one who was a friend of freedom the world over.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, it is significant that Canada should commemorate the late President of the United States, J. F. Kennedy, by naming a mountain peak after him. I agree that this is something with which I am sure all the Canadian people will be wholeheartedly in sympathy. There is no doubt that this man made a greater impact on the world in a fewer number of years than any other person, at least in our generation. As we observe the first anniversary of his death, which in itself is rather significant as far as the Canadian parliament is concerned, I know that around the world people in similar ways are remembering the sad occasion, which I am sure all of us clearly recall just one year ago in this same chamber.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that we in this party give our support to the action the government has taken in remembering that our great neighbour to the south lost one of its great leaders, who was certainly a man we find very close to our own affections.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, as was recalled by those who spoke before me one year ago on this date as we were sitting in this house, the whole population of Canada and of the world heard the incredible news that the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, had been assassinated.

Since that date his memory lives in all our minds.

The memory of the late President Kennedy, his policies, his prestige, the works he achieved, although he did not remain long at the summit of American politics, still were alive when the last American election was held.

Monuments and commemorative works are being erected almost everywhere in the world in remembrance of this American president in whom the democratic world had placed all its hopes.

In Europe, now, when discussions are getting under way to remove obstacles which prevent free trade between nations, everyone knows that this is another of President Kennedy's undertakings and that the expression "Kennedy round" has been kept to describe the negotiations.

May his reputation and the things he did to establish a truly economic and political democracy, not only throughout the world, but especially in his own country through his fight to promote the emancipation of Negroes, remain forever alive and incite his successors to follow in his footsteps on the road to peace and true democracy.

[*Text*]

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources arising out of the statement made by the Prime Minister this morning. I would first say how proud and honoured we are in the Yukon that the mountain selected to honour the memory of President Kennedy is situated in our territory. May I ask the minister the location of the particular mountain; I believe he might be aware of it.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am assured that this is a particularly spectacular peak, a very sharp spire indeed, located some five miles south and slightly west of Mount Logan, Canada's highest mountain. It is part of the St. Elias range, which I think in over-all composite height ranks as the greatest single mountain range anywhere in the world. There have been discussions in the Yukon in reference to the establishment of a national park in that area. While there are differences of opinion at this time and some people think it is premature, it would be my thought that when it is established it will be in the St. Elias range region.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CONGO—REQUEST THAT INDIA INTERCEDE ON BEHALF OF HOSTAGES

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister and ask him whether it is a fact that Canada has joined with the United States, the United Kingdom and Belgium in requesting the government of India to do what it can to secure the safety of foreigners held by rebels in the Belgian Congo; and what reaction, if any, has been received by the government in reference to this action. Does the fact that Canada

joined indicate that the fears which are in the hearts of all Canadians regarding the safety of prisoners held by the rebels are justified by the danger in which they find themselves?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, Canada has joined in the appeal to which my right hon. friend has made reference. I believe this is the second appeal of this kind that has been made, and I understand its terms will be made public today or tomorrow. We are most hopeful, Mr. Speaker, as my right hon. friend has expressed, that this appeal will be successful in saving these hostages from assassination.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, has the government received any hopeful indication in this regard? I realize the limitations in speaking at this time, with these people facing the horrible and frightful danger in which they find themselves. Will the Prime Minister also say when the first appeal was made to have India assist?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, on the first question I know of no grounds which would justify any modification of the very serious assessment of the situation given by my hon. friend the Secretary of State for External Affairs. As far as the second question is concerned, I think the first appeal was made between two and three weeks ago.

Mr. Diefenbaker: When the right hon. gentleman says that an appeal was made three weeks ago, was that made through India, and was India asked at that time to have its legation or embassy in that country do what it could in this connection? Also, what reports have been received in consequence of that first appeal?

Mr. Pearson: The first appeal was not made in conjunction with other governments, some of whom had already made separate appeals. The first appeal was from the Canadian government alone to whatever sources we could reach which would have, as we thought, some influence in saving these hostages. Up to this time there have been no concrete results from that appeal, but it is to be hoped that the appeals that have been made by Canada and other countries separately, the steps that have been taken by Canadian representatives and now this joint appeal will be effective in saving these hostages.

Inquiries of the Ministry

HEALTH AND WELFARE

FAILURE OF DRUG MANUFACTURERS TO MEET GOVERNMENT STANDARDS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the alarming revelation that only 63 out of 140 drug producers in this country were able to meet the government's minimum manufacturing standards, does the government intend to take any steps to increase the staff of the drug and food administration in order to correct this apparently deplorable situation?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have had some discussion with my colleague the Minister of National Health and Welfare, and she may wish to answer this question.

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, this matter has been given wide publicity in the last few days, and I should like to say to the chamber that the differences between the regulations which apply to all drugs manufactured in the country and the regulations which are used by the Department of Industry are very minor. It is in relation to minor differences in lay-out of plants, storage of materials and things of that kind that most of the manufacturers have been disqualified in the sense that term was used in the committee. I am informed that in so far as safety and quality are concerned there is no difference between the drug manufacturers on one list or the other.

I am grateful for the suggestion of my hon. friend to the Prime Minister that it may be that the drug directorate will need additional inspectors. As must be apparent, the drug directorate has not now and is unlikely ever to have sufficient staff to inspect every drug manufacturer every day. Nevertheless, if my hon. friend will check he will note that in the estimates each year there is a modest increase in the number of inspectors applied for to treasury board and which this house sees fit to approve in the estimates. I have no doubt this number will increase, and that from year to year we will need more inspectors to keep up with this increasingly complex industry.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask the minister if she is satisfied after having looked into the matter that the public are getting the highest possible quality of drugs for which they are paying? May I also ask her at the same time

if there is any substance in the suggestion of Dr. Showalter, to the effect that so far as purchases of drugs by the government are concerned, drugs of lower quality are supplied to the government than are sold to the general public?

Miss LaMarsh: My hon. friend will be aware at once that my reaction, and I am sure his as well, to the newspaper alarum was that the public must be protected, and that drugs of good quality must be available to them as well as available for purchase by the government. I am satisfied, after discussing this with Dr. Morrell, the chief of the drug directorate, that the public are getting quality drugs for their money. I have asked Dr. Morrell to go at once to the committee. I am informed that the drug committee will be sitting next week, will be able to receive Dr. Morrell, and that he will be able to go into the whole matter with them.

The present regulations which the directorate uses are those which were adopted just before the election last year. They had been circulated for about two years among the profession and the drug manufacturers, as well as other interested parties. They were very carefully drawn up as minimal standards for drug manufacture. The regulations, which I would suggest my hon. friend look at, and which are put out by the national research council, are extremely detailed. They cover such things as whether or not household pets may be allowed on the premises at any time: what kind of garments are to be worn over or instead of ordinary clothing during the manufacturing process; the supply of toilet tissue, and that sort of detailed directions which I am informed by my director have no direct bearing on the quality of the drugs manufactured.

TRADE

WHEAT—SUBSIDY ON EXPORTS BY UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In view of the deliberate dumping of wheat by the United States in contravention of their solemn international obligations under GATT, under the committee of the exporting nations and under private and public commitments to the quarterly meetings, what action has the minister taken in this regard?

[Mr. Douglas.]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has made a very general statement. I wish he could be a little more particular before I answer. Is he referring to a reduction the United States has made in the price of Durum wheat?

Mr. Hamilton: I am referring to an announcement which was made yesterday that the United States were subsidizing the sale of Durum wheat by 38 cents a bushel, which is in contravention of its international obligations.

Mr. Sharp: Now that the hon. gentleman has clarified this point I want to tell him and hon. members that we are very concerned about this development, and we have made our concern known. The wheat board recognizes, of course, that there is a heavy surplus of Durum wheat in the world. When the United States administration increased its subsidy, as the hon. gentleman has said, thereby reducing its selling price by from 16 to 20 cents a bushel, the Canadian wheat board had to follow suit. This is a disturbing development because it represents the use of United States treasury funds. The reduction in price does not come out of the farmer there as it does in Canada. It causes us great concern, therefore, and we have made these views known through the wheat board.

I shall certainly make our concern known directly to the administration of the United States. It is in our interest, as it is in the interest of the United States, that there should be as much stability as possible in the prices of our main agriculture staples. This point of view is known in the United States, and it will continue to be urged upon them.

Mr. Hamilton: May I ask a supplementary question, which will be very clear and obvious. The minister said "I shall make our views known to the United States." Do I understand from this that the United States government, either through the quarterly meetings or by information provided to the minister or the Canadian wheat board, did not inform the minister of this impending action?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I would not have expected that I would know of this personally in advance, but the wheat board was aware of the action taken by the United States, and it caused them grave disturbance.

Mr. Hamilton: My question was very clear. I asked the minister a simple question, namely

did the United States government, in any form or through any agency, inform the Minister of Trade and Commerce about this change, in view of the fact that their action is in contravention, as I said in my earlier question, of their solemn international obligations?

Mr. Sharp: I hesitate to get into a debate with the hon. member about the nature of the obligations which have been undertaken.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Sharp: The hon. member has been making statements, Mr. Speaker. His statements are to the effect that the United States has broken some solemn international obligations. I would hesitate to give a view on that without looking into the nature of those obligations myself. This is a grave charge the hon. member has made against the United States administration, and I should like to be sure whether it is justified.

An hon. Member: What about answering the question?

Mr. Sharp: That is what I am endeavouring to do, if the hon. member would listen. I assure the house that it is the desire that there should be the greatest possible stability in agricultural prices. I share the hon. member's dislike of government funds being used to subsidize the export of agricultural products.

Mr. Churchill: You are making a speech.

Mr. Sharp: I am of the opinion that the price reduction made in the case of Durum wheat is excessive. But this is a commercial decision made by the United States in what it considers to be its own interests, and we must compete with them. We have made to the United States administration and shall continue to make known our desire for the greatest possible stability.

Mr. Churchill: Answer the question.

Mr. Hamilton: I think it is very clear now that the answer to my question is no.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Hamilton: My next question is a related one. Has the government of France had any contact at all with the government of Canada with regard to their decision, and the decision of the European common market countries announced yesterday that they will subsidize wheat sales to China not only in contravention of the GATT arrangement but in direct contravention of the international wheat agreement?

Mr. Sharp: The answer is yes.

Mr. Hamilton: Can the minister inform the house at what time—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I realize the importance of this question, but it does seem to me the minister has attempted to answer as far as he can be expected to answer without notice. Surely we do not want to enter upon a debate at this time.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): May I ask the minister whether these recent happenings with regard to the United States reduction in the price of Durum wheat will have any effect on the discussions concerning the international wheat agreement which began last Wednesday, and whether the minister anticipates there is likely to be an extension of the agreement, which expires next July?

Mr. Sharp: I am sure all these developments in the wheat situation will have an effect on the discussions which are proceeding at the international wheat council. However, all members of the council have recommended to their governments an extension of the international wheat agreement in its present form. The only difference of view is on whether the extension should be for one year or for two years.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

COMPLETION OF REDISTRIBUTION BEFORE ELECTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister prompted by statements made by some of his colleagues in the government. In view of the provisions of section 51 of the British North America Act which make mandatory a redistribution after each census, and in view of the public necessity to have the next parliament represent at least the Canada of 1961 rather than the Canada of 1951, can the right hon. gentleman assure the Canadian public that barring defeat in the house on a matter of confidence there will be no general election until this vital matter of redistribution has been completed?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not know whether the hon. member is really serious in asking this question, but it is not up to the Chair to wonder.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I am sure that in view of the statements of various ministers the Prime

Minister would be most glad to answer that question.

Mr. Scott: I give notice that I intend to raise this question during the adjournment period.

COMPENSATION FOR STAFF WITH REGARD TO LATE SITTINGS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I could direct a question to the President of the Privy Council in his capacity as house leader. My question is based upon the fact that last evening the house sat beyond the normal time of adjournment, and the fact that because of the decision of the house in respect of estimates we might do something similar in the future, in the coming week. Therefore I wonder whether the President of the Privy Council would look into the effect this would have upon the staff of the House of Commons, and see that because of the overtime no undue work load falls upon their shoulders and that they are adequately compensated therefor.

Hon. J. G. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to do that.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

INQUIRY AS TO NUMBER OF DEATHS BY SUICIDE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): I have a question for the Minister of Justice. It arises out of a question placed on the order paper by the hon. member for Villeneuve, and the answer thereto. The question was No. 1,975, relating to deaths of serving members of the R.C.M.P. between October 1, 1954 and September 30, 1964. In his answer the hon. gentleman said that of 123 deceased serving members, 61 had died of natural causes, 41 by accidental death and 2 by misadventure; 5 were murdered and 14 had committed suicide.

When I first read the answer I wondered whether that last figure was a misprint. If it is not, perhaps the minister would explain why there is such a high rate of suicide in the R.C.M.P.

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): This matter will be completely explained when my estimates are considered on Monday.

Mr. Woolliams: Because of the noise made by certain members of the Liberal party I was unable to hear the answer. I wonder if we could have a little order. This is a serious matter. I respect the R.C.M.P., even if members opposite do not.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: The answer was that the estimates of the minister concerned will be up for consideration on Monday, at which time he will deal with the matter fully.

Mr. Nielsen: A supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: What possible supplementary question could there be with regard to this? If the hon. member wishes to ask an original question, let him go ahead.

DISCIPLINARY MEASURES RESPECTING APPLICATION OF FUNDS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Would Your Honour hear my question? Will the minister inform the house whether he has yet made a decision in connection with the two Montreal police officers about whose case I have spoken?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): I thank the hon. member for co-operating in the preparation of the agenda for the presentation of my estimates on Monday.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REVIEW OF FORMULA TO DETERMINE DESIGNATED AREAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry. In view of the harm being done to Galt and other communities in Waterloo South because an adjoining city has been named as a designated area, is the minister considering making a change as requested by the city of Galt and other municipalities?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I believe that in the circumstances this question should be allowed.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Let me on behalf of all my hon. friends here welcome the new member. It is with some satisfaction that I note his first question is directed to me. Had he received the benefit of the earlier counsels of the house he would have learned what I will now repeat, namely that a review is in progress as to the current eligibility under the criteria in connection with designated areas, and it is our hope that this review will be completed and the results announced within a short time.

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): A supplementary question. Did not the members of the New Democratic party support the government in bringing about the present situation with regard to designated areas?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

CROWN ASSETS

LONGUEUIL, QUE.—DISPOSAL OF JACQUES CARTIER RESERVE PROPERTY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. Because a large sum of money is involved there is some urgency attached to it. Has the government undertaken to sell to the city of Longueuil the Jacques Cartier barracks reserve property for $870,000, or has an undertaking been given to sell the property to a private individual without tenders being called?

Mr. Speaker: Surely this is a very good example of a question for the order paper.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. Is it the policy of his department and the government to sell property worth more than $800,000 without tender? Is it the policy of the government to dispose of property in that way?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has raised the matter of the sale of certain property to the town of Longueuil, and I am sure he would not expect me to carry all the details in my head. I will be very glad to take notice of this question and make a reply early next week, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. Woolliams: I appreciate the minister's courtesy, but my question was this. Is it the policy of the department to dispose of government property and sell it without tenders, particularly when it is worth over $800,000? Is this the policy? That is the question.

Mr. Laing: Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure the hon. member would agree that in the sale of a property of this nature which is no longer required by the federal government, some appreciation should be given to the fact that it was the city of Longueuil that wished negotiations; and inasmuch as they have a plan for the property that is not unrelated to the Expo '67 development, we were of the opinion that it would be in the public interest to negotiate a sale with them rather than to sell it to a private developer. I will be very happy to make a full statement on the matter. Completely adequate protection was ensured by us in respect of valuations, and it is our opinion that we received a very satisfactory price for the property.

Mr. Woolliams: A supplementary question. I would have gone along with the minister if that had been the situation; but was this property sold to Mr. Jean Paul Auclair, and not to the town or village?

Mr. Speaker: Order. It seems to me that earlier this morning I suggested that this question should be put on the order paper, for the particular reasons that now appear quite evident.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following communication:

20 November 1964

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Hon. Robert Taschereau, P.C., Chief Justice of Canada, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber today, the 20th November, at 5.45 p.m., for the purpose of giving royal assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,

Your obedient servant,
A. G. Cherrier
Assistant Secretary to the Governor General

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY—SOLITARY CONFINEMENT OF PRISONER

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): Some time ago I asked the Prime Minister a question concerning a French Canadian prisoner at St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary who had been sentenced to a long term for his part in the riots of two years ago, and who was not allowed to communicate with certain people. The Prime Minister promised to transfer my question to his colleague the Minister of Justice who now has an answer ready for me, I understand, and I should like to hear it.

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Gaston Nicholas was serving a sentence of six years for manslaughter at the time of

the riot in 1962. He was identified as the ringleader of the riot and sentenced by a criminal court of the province of Quebec to 14 years' imprisonment for destroying government property. Nicholas appealed his sentence, but his appeal was rejected in February, 1964.

Nicholas was in segregation, not in solitary confinement, awaiting trial since 1962. He refused to go out of segregation, and sent a letter to the authorities to the effect that he be kept in segregation. This was obviously for his own protection. The warden did stop the delivery of certain letters written by Nicholas, but only because they were dealing with matters prohibited at the institution. Nicholas wrote to the commissioner last July for a transfer to another institution. He is now at Kingston penitentiary.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. In view of the fact that Gaston Nicholas received the maximum sentence under the Criminal Code for the destruction of government property, namely 14 years, compared with the sentences imposed on other participants in that riot who engaged in much more strenuous activity than Mr. Nicholas, does the government have his sentence under review with a view to either pardoning him or providing him with parole?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, it would of course be wrong for me to comment upon the particular assessment made by the court at the time sentence was pronounced. As far as the matter of parole and review is concerned, this of course is not under the authority of the minister or the Department of Justice. Under the Parole Act it is under the exclusive—and the word "exclusive" is in the act —jurisdiction of the national parole board. However, I will be pleased to inquire and report to the house, if my hon. friend thinks this would be appropriate.

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. I am no authority on the matter of penitentiaries, but one thing does bother me as a Canadian. These prisoners are not allowed to send some letters, under certain rules of the penitentiary. I hope the minister will consider sending me personally some sort of list of the rules and regulations as to the type of letters that prisoners are not allowed to send. I think it is in the interests of the protection of human liberty in these penitentiaries that some of us know what these regulations are; because the thing that disturbs me is that a prisoner cannot write to the head of the penitentiary or to members of his family in certain circumstances. I would like to know what these regulations are.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, that would be a good subject for discussion on Monday. I shall inquire in the meantime, and will be pleased to report then.

DENISE THERRIEN—REQUEST BY QUEBEC FOR FEDERAL POLICE ASSISTANCE

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lucien Plourde (Quebec West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. Could he tell the house if he has received from the attorney general of the province of Quebec, a request for assistance from the federal police in conducting an inquiry into the kidnapping of Denise Therrien?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): The answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

PARTICIPATION IN TELEVISION PROGRAM "TELEPOLL"

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question which I will direct to the Prime Minister because its substance covers more than one department. Will the Prime Minister ascertain from the Canadian National Railways, which are supported annually by millions of dollars supplied by taxation, their justification for joining with C.P.R. telecommunications in sponsoring the production of the "Telepoll" program on C.T.V., which is emphasizing partisan, political broadcasts slanted in favour of the Liberal party.

COMBINES

WINNIPEG—SIGNING OF CONTRACTS BY YOUNG HOCKEY PLAYERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice, notice of which I gave him several days ago. I would like to ask the minister whether his attention has been drawn to cases in Winnipeg whereby ten year old children desiring to play hockey are forced to sign contracts which tie up their entire hockey careers for life. If so, is the

minister considering taking action to break up this type of monopoly and combine affecting the lives of young people?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for giving me notice of this question. On their face, the facts he describes appear to involve a situation not covered by the Combines Investigation Act. I shall, however, refer the matter to the director of investigation and research in order that he may consider whether the act has any application in this situation.

AGRICULTURE

INQUIRY AS TO GOVERNMENT POLICY ON DEPRESSED PRICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. H. Jorgenson (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture, but in his absence I wonder whether I could direct it to the Prime Minister. In view of the cancelling of the import quotas on turkeys and the resultant drop in prices; in view of the refusal of this government to do anything about falling cattle prices, and now that there has been a reduction in the price of wheat, are we to assume that the depressing of agricultural prices is a deliberate policy on the part of this government?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should make no such assumption, because it is not based on fact.

GRAIN

WHEAT—INQUIRY AS TO GUARANTEED PRICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of the revelations which have been made today by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, when can we expect the long delayed and well promised legislation in regard to a guaranteed price for wheat?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, that is a question of broad policy which could not very well be answered on the orders of the day.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

35. Economic, technical, educational and other assistance as detailed in the estimates, $75,600,000.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, last evening we had some discussion on this item; an amendment was moved and a vote taken. In view of some of the remarks made by the minister on that occasion I should like to make some further representations to the minister in this regard.

The minister indicated to us last evening that an item of $350,000-odd was contained in vote 35 to provide aid to Indonesia in the form of wheat flour, which had not yet been shipped to Indonesia and was in fact a matter still under consideration by the government. I am very glad indeed to hear that but I do think that some further clarification of this matter should be forthcoming at this time, just to prevent any misunderstandings.

First of all, I think it would be quite safe to say that no member of this house bears any malice or has anything against any of the Indonesian people. Those people have had a long struggle for their independence and are doing the best they can to develop their country. No one has anything against the Indonesian people; I think that is quite clear. As I have pointed out in this house on various occasions, there is no objection from this party regarding scholarships for Indonesian students in Canada. What is objected to is the gift of wheat flour which would be turned over to the government of President Sukarno, for what purposes we do not know. It may be the intention of the external aid office to see that the Indonesian people get it, but we certainly have no assurance that it is the people of Indonesia and not the army who are going to get this wheat flour.

A number of persons may well ask—I have been asked this question myself—how does the shipment of wheat flour to Indonesia help President Sukarno in his unprovoked aggressions against Malaysia. I think the answer is quite simple. Arms cost money, in the first place. In the second place, arms to fight wars are not produced to any extent in Indonesia. Third, to buy arms abroad you have to have foreign exchange, and most of these countries in southeast Asia are rather limited in that regard. Since Indonesia undoubtedly has a limited amount of foreign exchange available, it must conserve its use very carefully.

It is undoubtedly necessary that a certain amount of wheat flour be used in Indonesia by the Indonesian government, and if it is not given to the government they will have to buy it. If they have to buy it that reduces

the amount of foreign exchange they can spend abroad on arms to carry on their war against Malaysia. The more wheat flour or wheat or anything else in the nature of food we give to President Sukarno, the more foreign exchange is released to purchase arms for him to carry on his aggression against Malaysia. As I have already indicated, we have not had the slightest indication that the wheat flour ever gets to the Indonesian people, who may well need it. We suspect it probably goes to the Indonesian army, which is engaged in aggression.

As I have mentioned on other occasions, if there is a food shortage in Indonesia that is the fault of the government of the country. There is no country in the world which has more arable and fertile land per head of population than Indonesia. It is merely because the economy has been mismanaged that there is a food shortage, coupled with their aggressive actions against their neighbours, first of all against Netherlands New Guinea, now against Malaysia, and possibly in the future against the Phillipines or Australia. At least the Australians think there is some sort of danger to them, and are having conscription.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): And they are giving assistance to Indonesia.

Mr. Nesbitt: The minister says they are giving assistance to Indonesia. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Well, I am telling you.

Mr. Nesbitt: The minister says he is telling me. That is fine. He may have information about this, so perhaps he could tell us what form this aid is taking, how much it is and if they are still giving it.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Yes, they still are.

Mr. Nesbitt: The minister says they still are. I cannot explain the actions of the Australian government, but to my mind the matter is very simple. If you release foreign exchange to the Indonesian government so they can purchase arms from abroad, it is most certainly helping their aggression against Malaysia.

I would again appeal to the minister to do one of two or three things. First of all, the minister should try to get assurances from Dr. Sukarno that he will desist in his aggression against Malaysia, and in that case by all means let this wheat flour go there. If that kind of assurance cannot be obtained, then I would suggest to the minister that this gift of wheat flour might well be transferred to the people of Malaysia, who are the subject of Dr. Sukarno's aggressions. Failing that, if the minister is dead set on giving some sort of aid to Indonesia and to Dr. Sukarno, let us say that we will not give him materials, whether they be food or anything else, which will enable him to save on foreign exchange to buy arms, but that we will expand our student training program and train more Indonesian students.

That is a long range project, and when Dr. Sukarno has passed to the great beyond and his policies with him, we hope, then the students who received training in this country or elsewhere will really be able to do some work toward developing their country in a peaceful way. If the minister would transfer these funds to the training of Indonesian students I do not think we would have any objections. I would be glad to see it, because it creates good will for the future. But to turn over holus-bolus a large shipment of wheat flour which could probably be used by the Indonesian army, and would also enable the Indonesian government to save on foreign exchange with which it could buy more arms to carry out its aggressions, is something which I think is intolerable. I fail to understand how anybody in this house could support such a move against one of our friendly brother nations in the commonwealth.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Chairman, I must say that I was greatly impressed by the high moralistic tone of the hon. member for Oxford in advancing his thesis, which appeared to be that we should use the wealth of this country to enforce on other nations a certain course of action, or force them to refrain from certain courses of action and adopt policies which suit our way of life more than theirs.

The hon. member for Oxford is not carrying his position to its logical conclusion. If, as he says, this is a logical course for the Canadian government to follow, and that it must withhold foodstuffs from countries with whose governments we disagree or of whose actions we disapprove, where is he going to draw the line? Why does he not suggest a more positive line? Why does the member for Oxford not advocate that we take more definitive steps to place embargoes and blockade everything that Indonesia is doing? Why do we not carry out this policy throughout the world, if that is to be the policy of the Canadian government?

For instance, I think there are many members of this house who deplore some of the activities of the governments of Spain and Portugal. Would the hon. member suggest that we sever all diplomatic and trade relations with those governments because we do not like what they are doing? Come to think of it, Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me that the government which the hon. member supported was the first one to negotiate the sale of wheat to communist China, which of course has been guilty also of aggression against India. The hon. member for Oxford took great pride in that step by his government, and I certainly do not remember him raising objections against these actions of the government he supported, which I thought were very commendable. I am now depressed by the supporters of that government, and particularly with their foreign affairs spokesman, who apparently disagrees with that view. I feel that is a very serious attitude for any member of the Canadian parliament to take.

Mr. Moreau: Including the member for Skeena?

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Yes, including the hon. member for Skeena, if you wish. I did not hear him last night, but possibly he has his own views and he spoke for himself. I am now speaking for myself.

I think this is a very serious attitude to take. We who live in an affluent society should be very careful just how moralistic we are going to be. We must be very careful as to whether we consider, because we are wealthy, we have a right to impose regulations on the rest of the world. There are what I call deplorable examples of aggression in the world, but I am firmly of the belief, and I may be naïve, that even to risk withholding from starving or hungry human beings food which would relieve their misery cannot but ultimately have a bad end. If we wish to be moralistic let us be moralistic on that point, that we have a responsibility to our fellow human beings.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I should like to make some comments about the general purpose of this vote for the provision of technical assistance and aid to various parts of the world. I took the opportunity this year in Copenhagen of pointing out that the capacity of countries such as Canada to help underdeveloped areas is to some extent conditioned by the capacities of those countries to receive aid. In the first place they have to be literate populations because an illiterate population cannot operate a modern economy or a modern society. More than that, they must have developed in their midst all those skills which go to making a modern economy. We must do something more than just send goods to those countries.

At this point I should like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we should not pride ourselves too much on helping the Indonesian or other peoples when we sell them wheat. We should remember that we are also helping the prairie wheat farmers, which I think is perhaps one of the considerations the Canadian government has in mind and which it should have in mind. I do not quarrel with that at all, but let us not adopt too virtuous a position. We must provide these developing areas with the means and ability to help themselves during their organization. That is much more difficult and costly than simply providing material things. I hope that we shall not observe the hon. member for Oxford rising in his place objecting to the provision of teachers for Indonesia.

Mr. Nesbitt: I suggested we should train some.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): You were merely suggesting that we train a few. I am suggesting that we should be providing Indonesia and all these developing countries with as large a number of teachers and technically trained individuals as we can muster. This to my mind is equally as important as, if not more important than, sending actual material, concrete goods to relieve conditions in these countries. I hope the Canadian government will continue to increase, as I heard this morning on the radio they are proposing to do, the contributions we are making under these various plans, and will bear in mind that we have an opportunity here of which I think a great many Canadians are anxious to avail themselves.

During the last week or two I had an opportunity to address three or four groups of university students, and I found that at each campus I visited there was intense interest in the possibility of this sort of imaginative service to humanity, or in this adventure, if you will call it that. This is certainly something to stimulate the minds of young Canadians, and I hope the Canadian government will not be deterred from advancing along this line at a much more rapid rate than it has done in the past. I realize that probably Canada's greatest contribution to these de-

veloping countries can be made by helping them to develop the thousand and one skills they require if they are to move into the modern world and into affluent society.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, in all fairness I think one has to make some sort of reply to the remarks that my very good friend, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, has made. I very often agree with his views, but I am afraid I cannot in this particular case. He suggested that my representations to the minister were of a high moralistic character. I assure the hon. member that they were not intended to be such, but were intended to be of a realistic nature rather than somewhere out on cloud nine.

The main objection as I see it to this policy, without repeating what I have already said, is that on the one hand we are supporting Malaysia, so the government informs us, with arms, military advice and other aid to help in its efforts against this completely unprovoked aggression on the part of Indonesia, while on the other hand we are indirectly providing Dr. Sukarno with foreign exchange with which he can buy arms to carry on the war with Malaysia. If anything could be considered as having come from Alice in Wonderland, surely that could.

One other observation I neglected to make in my earlier remarks I should like to make now, and I am delighted that the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands reminded me of it. He pointed out that the previous administration initiated the sale of wheat to the People's Republic of China, and that that was the same as making gifts to the government of Dr. Sukarno.

I am astonished by the hon. member, who is the financial critic of his party, when he makes a statement like that. Surely he knows better, because one of the advantages of selling wheat or other foodstuffs to countries such as the People's Republic of China and insisting on payment as we do is that it uses up their pool of foreign exchange and indirectly prevents them from buying abroad more arms, machinery and other materials with which wars can be waged. This is certainly one of the prime reasons for selling wheat to countries with aggressive intentions. It uses up their foreign exchange, which they cannot then use to purchase war materials and the like abroad. I am astonished that the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands would not have observed that. However, perhaps on the spur of the moment he overlooked it.

[Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

I was very interested in the suggestion made by the previous speaker concerning teachers and students. Only a few moments ago and on many other occasions I have said I have no objection to this at all. I think it would be a good thing if Indonesian students were trained here or if we were to send teachers to Indonesia. This is not contributing directly or indirectly to the Indonesian government's war effort. This would help the long range development program of that country, which certainly needs such help; and if the minister would divert this money to some such program nobody would have any objection.

What is objected to is that this gift of food could be made use of indirectly to purchase war materials to carry on aggression against Malaysia, which is a member of the commonwealth and which we support militarily and economically. That is where the objection lies. Again I mention the fact that if this food should go to Indonesia we have no assurance and no way of knowing that it will ever reach the people it is supposed to reach. In all probability it will be used by the Indonesian army on some of their aggressive tours either now or in the future.

Since the minister told us last night that he has not yet sent this wheat flour to Indonesia, I should hope he would give serious consideration either to sending it to Malaysia, or to diverting the funds to training students or, as the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands suggested, to sending teachers to Indonesia to help train the people there. But for heaven's sake let us not continue on the one hand to help Dr. Sukarno, albeit indirectly, wage war against Malaysia and on the other hand help Malaysia to protect itself against the aggression by Dr. Sukarno which we are indirectly supporting.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, as the committee knows, I have listened with interest both last night and again today to the argument being advanced by the hon. member for Oxford. Like my colleague, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, I find myself rather confused with regard to the logic of the argument put forward by the hon. member for Oxford. If, as the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands suggested, the hon. member for Oxford had advocated a complete embargo on any kind of relationship, economic or otherwise, with Indonesia, I could understand the logic of his position even though I would not agree with it. But I fail to understand the logic of his argument that on the one hand we should not consider

sending food to feed hungry Indonesians and on the other hand that the minister should carry out an expanded program of assisting Indonesians to gain an education.

Unless the hon. member for Oxford is assuming that all Indonesian students who would come to Canada would engage in abstract studies in the field of philosophy, the classics or something of that kind, I fail completely to follow his logic in suggesting that the training of students would not be assisting Sukarno in his war efforts. To follow through the logic of the member's argument, it does seem to me that if Indonesians come to Canada and acquire training in the fields of engineering, technology or any one of a dozen other fields one could mention, one can logically argue that directly or indirectly this could be a much more valuable contribution to Sukarno's war efforts than the providing of a little wheat to feed hungry Indonesians.

I felt constrained to make these few remarks in addition to those I made last night to emphasize again that I think the member for Oxford in this particular instance, despite his very laudable wish that we should indicate our desire to assist the people of Malaysia in bettering their situation and their way of life, and should take such steps as we can to protect them against incursions from without their country, is taking a completely illogical position in respect of what is proposed under the external aid vote in the estimates of the Department of External Affairs.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, the minister co-operated with us last night in arranging to have his estimates brought forward again today, by his obstruction which he carefully managed at a late hour, so I think it would be discourteous of us to dismiss him from the house after only a few minutes. Obviously he wanted to carry on with the discussion of his estimates.

I think this is a good idea, because he failed to clear up the situation with regard to Indonesia. Last night, in one of his unusually frank moments, he used these words as found on page 10296 of *Hansard*: "the continuous guerrilla attacks that have been made against Malaysia by Indonesia". So he has publicly acknowledged that press reports are correct and that continuous guerrilla attacks are being made by Indonesia against Malaysia. Then he went on to tell us about other commonwealth countries, Australia, Britain and New Zealand, assisting Malaysia. He told us that Australia could not participate in the Cyprus peace keeping force because of its preoccupation with the danger in southeast Asia.

Now that we have the facts in front of us, how can we justify giving aid to Indonesia when Indonesia is causing trouble for one of the countries within the commonwealth? I know it is easy to argue that this wheat flour is meant for people who require food. Canada has taken the position over the years that we are prepared to assist needy people around the world, and we do give quite a bit of assistance in the form of food. But it strikes me as very odd indeed that in a situation like this, which may become very critical this year or in the next few months, the minister would come before us and ask us to use our own tax money, for that is what it amounts to, to assist Indonesia in this way.

As the hon. member for Oxford has pointed out, how do we know whether the wheat flour will reach starving people in Indonesia or will be diverted for some other purpose? I cannot go as far as the members of the N.D.P. who have spoken about the inconsistency of not advancing an argument for a complete embargo on trade with Indonesia. Perhaps this would come about if the situation became more dangerous than it is at present. But what a strange situation this is. Here we have the Secretary of State for External Affairs admitting openly that Indonesia is engaged in warfare against Malaysia and asking us to support a military mission from Canada to Malaysia, which may end up in military aid being given to that commonwealth country, while at the same time he comes before the house and says "Let us vote $350,000 for Indonesia." It does not make sense to me. What is the purpose of it? Let the minister tell us how this all came about. Under what circumstances did Indonesia ask for this, and what arguments were put forward? Are conditions in that country such that this type of aid is desperately needed?

Some representations must have been made by Indonesia. When were they made? What discussions were undertaken? Why did we settle on a contribution of wheat flour? For what purpose is it to be used? If the minister is abreast of the developments within his own department he should be able to answer some of these questions. It just does not make sense that on the one hand we should say there is a danger spot in southeast Asia, in a sister commonwealth country which is suffering from unprovoked attacks by Indonesia, and on the other hand say that Canada must give assistance to Indonesia.

I do not know what purpose is behind this. If we want to win Indonesia to our way of life and get the Indonesians divorced from advocating aggression, then perhaps this is the reason the minister has undertaken to give this aid. But perhaps there would be other and better means of achieving that objective. The question with regard to aid to Indonesia has not been raised on this occasion just out of the blue. The hon. member for Oxford has repeatedly drawn the situation in Indonesia to the attention of the minister and has questioned this type of aid. Unfortunately the minister, following the practice which I feel sure he is going to correct now after our discussions with him last night, brushed aside those questions and treated them very lightly. We are looking for a change of attitude now.

Let us be very definite about this. What is our stand going to be under this Colombo plan? We do not resist any suggestion of giving help where help is desperately needed. Why do we help the enemy of a member of the commonwealth? Perhaps in the future we are going to be called upon to give not only military equipment; we might be asked to provide service people to assist this member of the commonwealth and they would be in grave danger. Somewhere the line has to be drawn. I think the minister could be quite helpful this morning if he would give us the picture with regard to this troubled area in the world.

The population of Indonesia, if the reports I read are correct, is very large, about 40 million. The population of Malaysia is small. You have a giant of a country threatening a small country. We are told that Indonesia is building up great armaments and has a maritime force now which it did not have before. This may well threaten New Zealand and Australia. We had a story in one of the newspapers the other day that Indonesia might be approaching the stage where it could develop nuclear weapons.

Now, when we have a troubled area like this, why we just coast along and say that we must assist Indonesia? Suppose we do not assist Indonesia; suppose we look at the question a little more closely. Are there ways and means by which we could persuade other people in the world to put pressure on Indonesia to desist from her activities against Malaysia? Let the minister go a bit further now and tell us what action he proposes at the United Nations with regard to Indonesia. What discussions were held at meetings with the commonwealth foreign affairs ministers with regard to Indonesia? He has not disclosed any of these facts in the house. It is not in the speech of May 22, 1964, that famous document to which we were referred last night. Let him bring us up to date with regard to Indonesia and justify, if he can, this vote for which he is asking at the moment.

The Chairman: Shall the vote carry?

Mr. Churchill: No. Are we going to have a reply from the minister to some of these questions? We have quite a bit of leisure today. The minister arranged this last night. If he wants to sit here this afternoon from 2.30 until six o'clock, we are agreeable. We might even sit later as we did last night for 45 minutes while he obstructed the process of passing his estimates. Let him now, having himself elected to have his estimates discussed today when they could have passed last night, answer some of these questions and clear up the situation.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend is in rare form this morning. I appreciate this friendly attitude; it really helps the dispatch of public business. My hon. friend has forgotten what was said last night with regard to the wheat flour in question. I would refer him to what was said as recorded on page 10302 of *Hansard*:

> We were among the first to participate in the Colombo plan. Our proposed total assistance to Indonesia is in the amount of little more than $400,000, of which roughly $350,000 represents wheat flour, in connection with which there has not yet been made a decision to make a shipment of that commodity.

That is the situation. As I said before, no shipments have been made from the 1964-65 commitment. The decisions with respect to the program for the next year have not been taken. Our judgment will, of course, be influenced by developments in the coming months. We discussed this matter with the Tunku when he was here. There has been no decision taken with regard to the shipment of wheat flour at the moment.

In any event my hon. friend, who of course will know how these matters are dealt with by way of counterpart funds and the like, knows that if a shipment were made the local currency equivalent to the Canadian cost of the flour could be used only for jointly agreed economic development projects that are arrived at by arrangement between the two countries.

Mr. Diefenbaker: How is that controlled?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That is controlled, just as it was in my hon. friend's time, by external aid officers through our embassy in Indonesia. As I said, we have discussed this matter with the Tunku, with our Australian, British and United States friends. The policy of the government has been influenced by those consultations.

Mr. Nesbitt: We have had some enlightenment in this regard from the minister. Since the government, as the minister has just said, has not made any final decision as to the shipment of this wheat flour, what then is the purpose of putting this item in the present estimates? Why not remove it and at a later date, if the government decides it wants to send this assistance to Indonesia, a supplementary estimate could be introduced. The minister has suggested there is some considerable doubt in the government—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I did not say that.

Mr. Nesbitt: —some doubt—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I did not say that.

Mr. Nesbitt: The minister says there is no doubt, then.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I said there was no decision on the shipment of that commodity in the year 1964-65.

Mr. Nesbitt: I cannot help but wonder why, if that is the case, this item is included in the estimates at this time. Would it not be better to cover it by a supplementary estimate on some future date? This has all the earmarks of a blank cheque—not only with regard to this assistance to Indonesia—since everything under the Colombo plan is lumped into one large sum. Perhaps the minister could tell us whether any of the other Colombo assistance programs have not yet been completely decided on by the government. What are we voting all these sums for, if the government has not yet made up its mind? Are there any other items in this plan with regard to which the government has not reached a decision?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Of course there are. The hon. member knows that a program of these dimensions is bound to be one which depends, among other things, on bilateral arrangements.

Mr. Churchill: While the minister is thinking over the very sensible suggestion made by my hon. friend from Oxford, namely that this item should be dropped from the present program and then, after consideration, reinstated by means of a supplementary estimate should it seem—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That could not be done, because the committee last night decided to the contrary.

Mr. Churchill: I am suggesting it might be done next session as a supplementary estimate. The minister, with his long experience in government, will appreciate how that is done.

But I am wondering whether he would enlighten us now on the following point. He told us, as reported at page 10302, that Indonesia was still receiving substantial assistance from the United States, Japan, Australia, France, Germany, New Zealand and the specialized agencies of the United Nations. May we have detailed information with regard to the type of aid which is being given by those countries? I am sure the minister was speaking with authority when he made that statement last night. It was impressive, and it almost persuaded us to permit his estimates to go through.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I cannot give the hon. gentleman all those details now, but I can say that the United States, which is greatly concerned, as are Canada and Britain, about the situation in Asia generally, is giving many millions of dollars in the form of commodities and technical equipment to Indonesia. So are Japan, Australia, France, Germany and New Zealand.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask this question. Are Australia and New Zealand at present giving substantial aid to Indonesia while at the same time making appropriations to protect themselves against that country?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I cannot say what is the nature of the assistance supplied by Australia and New Zealand, but they are giving assistance.

An hon. Member: Five dollars worth?

Mr. Churchill: May I ask for the evidence? We like to accept the minister's statements, but could we have the evidence sometimes? Let him tell us exactly what aid is being given by Australia and New Zealand.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I have made a statement.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What was that?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I have said that Australia and New Zealand are giving assistance to Indonesia, along with the United States, Japan, West Germany and Canada.

Mr. Churchill: Could the minister direct me to a source which I might consult to find out what aid, specifically, Australia and New Zealand are giving?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I would refer the hon. gentleman to the Australian and New Zealand high commissioners here in Ottawa.

Mr. Nesbitt: The minister has told us that one of the reasons his government is giving consideration to supplying this assistance to Indonesia is that a number of other countries, particularly Australia and New Zealand, France, Japan, and so on are also providing aid to that country. If this consideration is relevant in arriving at a decision, as I am sure it would be, then surely the minister has at his disposal information as to the amount of aid which is being given by all those countries—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No, I do not.

Mr. Nesbitt: —as well as the nature of that aid. Is it technical training, military assistance, food? What is it exactly? I cannot understand anyone making a decision on an important matter such as this without knowing the type of aid and the amount which is coming from each place. I cannot understand the minister, of all people, doing such a thing. Can he give us no indication of the amounts of aid, expressed in dollars, which each of the countries mentioned is giving to Indonesia in the coming year?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I can tell the hon. member, for instance, that New Zealand is giving a total of $98,000, mainly for technical assistance to Indonesia. Australia is giving $648,000, and this is in the capital field. For instance, Australia is providing Indonesia with road building equipment in the amount of $189,000. It is also providing intercommunication equipment for civil aircraft in the amount of $648,000.

Mr. Nesbitt: That is most interesting. The minister has just told us that New Zealand is giving $98,000 for the training of students. That is the kind of suggestion which I and others have been making here, that our assistance to Indonesia should be of a long range nature concerned with training students or preparing teachers for Indonesia. That is what New Zealand is doing.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Would the hon. member object if Canada gave equipment for civil air services? Would he object if we supplied help in making roads? Would he consider this more strategic than giving food?

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

Mr. Nesbitt: The minister will have better information at his disposal than I have in this regard, but it would seem to me there is probably little distinction in Indonesia between what is civil aviation and what is military aviation. Unless I had some information to the contrary I would certainly think this would very likely be the type of aid which would prove most helpful to the aggressive activities of the Indonesian government. Road building equipment would be more open to question, but on reflection it would seem to me that since parts of Malaysia adjoin Indonesia in jungle areas where road building equipment would be very helpful in building invasion routes, such equipment would come into the same category. I certainly would not agree with the minister on that. I would agree, rather, with what the New Zealand government has been doing. I wonder how up to date the hon. gentleman's figures of Australian aid are—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Figures for 1964-65.

Mr. Nesbitt: I was wondering when the minister received this information.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): September 9.

Mr. Nesbitt: That was before the government of Australia decided on a course of conscription because of the obvious threat to Australia from Indonesia. I suggest to the minister that some of this aid may well be under review at the present time by the Australian government. This is something which neither the minister nor I can really know at this point.

I would again request the minister to give careful consideration to this program and to examine the necessity for helping Dr. Sukarno conserve his foreign exchange for the purpose of buying war materials. Instead, I suggest that a long range program of assistance be adopted and that a student training program be undertaken with these funds. Certainly, as I have said before, we have nothing against the people of Indonesia. I shall be glad to see them develop themselves and get out of their present difficulties.

Item agreed to.

International joint commission—

40. Salaries and expenses of the commission and Canada's share of the expenses of studies, surveys and investigations of the commission, $151,500.

Mr. Barnett: On this vote, which has to do with the international joint commission, I should like to ask the minister whether he

would indicate briefly what activities, if any, or what responsibilities, if any, the international joint commission currently undertakes with respect to the development of the Columbia river basin. The minister will recall that over quite a period of years the international joint commission had a major responsibility and carried out a major activity in connection with the proposed development of this river. I would like to have the position of the international joint commission, in relationship to the Columbia river basin, clarified while we are on this item.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, as my hon. friend knows, when the proposal for the joint development of the Columbia was first put forward 20 years ago, in accordance with the procedures laid down for study by the international joint commission the governments of both countries decided, first of all, whether or not a reference should be undertaken by the international joint commission. It was after a decision had been taken that there should be such a reference that the international joint commission made a very detailed engineering examination of the whole project.

As a result of that study, which involved over eight years of serious consideration, a formulation of principles was reached and concurred in by the two components of the commission. These principles in turn were accepted by the government of Canada and the government of the United States as the essentials of any proposed treaty between the United States and Canada. The interest of the I.J.C. now, following the ratification of the treaty, arises only in the event of a dispute which cannot be resolved by the two governments. In the event that a dispute does arise in the interpretation of the treaty, then under article 16, I think it is, of the treaty an adjudication is made by the international joint commission.

Mr. Barnett: That means that in effect the international joint commission has no current responsibility for anything that takes place in this connection?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That is right; no administrative responsibility.

Mr. Barnett: And it would require a reference by the governments of Canada and the United States?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No. If there is a dispute between the two parties and they cannot agree, then the matter is automatically referred by both governments for adjudication to the I.J.C.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister what progress the commission is making in studies on a pooling of the natural resources of Canada and the United States.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I am not aware of any study being made by the joint commission of the pooling of the resources of the two countries. I am wondering whether my hon. friend is thinking about the assignment that has been given to the chairman of the international joint commission, along with Mr. Livingston Merchant, in connection with another matter altogether.

Mr. Fisher: I am thinking about the statement the minister made a little over a year ago, in which he indicated his excitement and enthusiasm for a policy started, I believe, by Mr. Udall that was going to set up sort of the big thing. I believe the minister also indicated in the house and publicly that in this field of resource management the international joint commission would be a good agency to make surveys and studies.

I know the minister likes his speeches put on the record. He likes people to refer to them. He has made a habit of it recently; "My speech of April 19", "My speech of May 26". This was a speech made sometime in October of 1963. Knowing the minister's initiative and dynamic qualities I would assume that since he tossed this suggestion out to the public, something would have resulted, so I think my question is quite natural. Could he just set out what he has done, after making this statement?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I was right in the first instance, Mr. Chairman. We were referring not to the commission as such but to the fact that the chairman of the Canadian section of the commission and Mr. Livingston Merchant, former United States ambassador to Canada, had been selected by both governments to give consideration to the formulation of principles with regard to that matter.

Mr. Fisher: The minister indicated at the time that he did not know whether joint studies would be definitely initiated. He certainly did not make it clear that they would be; he indicated there would have to be some consultation between representatives of both governments. That was a year ago. The pace of things in this particular field is moving with some speed. It is not only a question of power; it is a question of water, natural

gas and other energy sources. We have some difficulties at the present time in connection with forest products and this kind of material. It all fits into the big picture.

I just want to express my disappointment that the minister, a year after, in a sense, putting this whole idea on the top level, has not got any more to suggest or offer than this. It indicates to me that maybe he is too much involved in the problems of Laos, Cambodia, the Congo and things like that.

An hon. Member: And Indonesia.

Mr. Fisher: Yes, and Indonesia; certainly Indonesia. He is not being nearly enough concerned about what seems to me the most important of all the bread and butter issues of external affairs; that is our relationships, diplomatic and economic, with the country that shares this continent with us. I am not going further with this point; I just wanted to remind the minister that if he and I both survive into the next parliament I propose to raise this same question with him, if he should survive his particular position. I hope by then he will have something a little more positive to say about what the government has done in this regard.

An hon. Member: Whether he survives is very "iffy".

Mr. Fisher: Someone has suggested that is a very "iffy" question. Yes, I imagine it is; although it is only fair to say—this has nothing to do with external affairs—that in so far as the sun porch has its influence on lower Michigan, it is very hard for us to conceive of the minister disappearing from the Windsor scene. I think this is not such a bad point to bring up right now, because I may say to the minister that in all the time he has been involved in these great affairs of the world, dealing with great statesmen like Dean Rusk and Mr. Couve de Murville and all these other people, those of us who follow his intimate and domestic political career know he has never lost a chance to make a phone call to Windsor and get in touch with his many constituents. We know he has one of the largest mails going out of here to Windsor.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, could we discuss the item under consideration?

Mr. Fisher: I am discussing the item. We come down to the fact that the minister—it is a point I had not thought of until it was raised by a person over here—has time for all these things far distant from Canada and for all these domestic affairs in Windsor, and I think he might follow up a little more constructively than he appears to have done the great suggestion he put on the record last year. I must find the date of that speech.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I will get the date for you.

Mr. Fisher: We will try to make it as important a term of reference as his speech of May 22.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could tell us whether he has any report to make on the progress of the studies of water pollution as provided in the items under vote 40.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): What was the last part of the question?

Mr. Nasserden: Whether there is any report on the progress of the studies with regard to boundary waters pollution.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): There has been a reference made to the commission with regard to pollution in the great lakes. On October 7 the governments of the two countries requested the commission to conduct an investigation of pollution in lake Erie, lake Ontario and the international section of the St. Lawrence river, and to make recommendations to the two governments in this problem. This is, of course, a long study.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, I would have thought the minister would have spoken at some length on this question of pollution which has been raised by the hon. member for Rosthern. This is a problem of great importance. I have always found the minister able to use a great many words when the occasion demands. To conceal thought he uses words. Indeed, as I listened to him from time to time I am reminded of someone in the United States Senate who described the tongue of a certain senator as being like a race horse; the less load it carries the faster it goes. I could not have thought of a better description of the minister, and when I noted that that expression had been used in the United States Senate I thought it should be appropriated here in the House of Commons.

Surely the minister is in a position to say more than he has said in those few words. This problem is one of the most serious facing our country. It also affects Windsor, to which fleeting reference was made a moment ago by the hon. member for Port Arthur. I should like to have a report from the minister in this connection. Certainly the expenditure

involved is very small. We are able to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars in Indonesia, but when it comes to problems close to home apparently a different viewpoint is held by the government. The total expenditure here as Canada's share of the expenses of the study amounts to $13,000. There is no matter more important, no subject deserving greater consideration.

We all know that by 1980 or 1985 Canada's water supply may be seriously endangered. Indeed, water at that time may have a greater value for our country than the oil resources which are located here. An expenditure of $13,000 is very small for a problem which is of such importance, not only to the great lakes but also to contiguous international streams. Here we are, having been blessed with more water than any other country on earth in proportion to our area, and year by year our water levels are falling, year by year the degree of pollution increases.

So far as waterways within our country are concerned, pollution is a matter for consideration and for co-operation between the federal government and the provinces. However, our international waterways require full and careful examination in relation to the problem of pollution. If we can bring the minister back home for a moment and he can leave that stratospheric atmosphere of international diplomacy and get down to the ground, perhaps he can tell us the situation in this regard and what is being done.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in the exclusive domestic interests of the right hon. gentleman, who was a distinguished prime minister and who will, of course, appreciate how unimportant are international problems. But I do agree with him that domestic problems are very important, and it is because we regard pollution in the great lakes and in the Windsor area, which he said means so much to me as it does also to my dear friend the hon. member for Essex South and the hon. member for Essex West—

Mr. Diefenbaker: And to all hon. members.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): —that this government has decided to do something about it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Tell us what is going to be done.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): We have asked the I.J.C. to make these studies. My hon. friend will remember that the Ontario government had been pressing the former administration for some time to undertake a study of the pollution of the great lakes. While a study is not an achievement, a study has at least begun. When the report of that study is ready it will, of course, be given to the house and I hope it will be possible for action to be taken to remove pollution in the great lakes through the joint endeavours of the province of Ontario and the federal government.

My hon. friend from Rosthern asked me about other reports. I forgot to mention that he was likely thinking of the Rainy river project; that report will be available some time in the course of this year. The study at St. Croix is still under way, as is the study of the pollution of a connecting channel between lake Erie and lake St. Clair.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I thank the hon. gentleman for his reference to pollution. As a matter of fact it was the government of which I had the honour to be the head which first provided assistance to end pollution in municipalities, action which was long overdue and which, of course, the hon. gentleman will remember was a matter to which the former government had paid little or no attention. However, this report is rather short and uncertain. What has been the nature of the investigation made so far in this connection by the joint commission? Have they come up with any interim suggestions?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No, there have been no interim suggestions.

Mr. Diefenbaker: When did the joint commission start to sit in this regard?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): October 7.

Mr. Diefenbaker: And there have been no interim recommendations or suggestions?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No, I am sorry.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am sure the hon. gentleman would have asked for them.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): If I had been in the opposition I would.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is quite amazing how the minister is always speaking about these wonderful relations between countries, which relations I must say are today in a worse state in regard to Canada's international position and image abroad than they have been for many years. However, this matter is close at home, and naturally I would want to inquire from the minister what are the nature of the investigations being made, how many Canadians are engaged in the scientific or technical aspects of this matter, and—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Thirty eight.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I am told that the personnel engaged in these studies is around 38.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am not going to be brushed aside by facetious observations which indicate that the minister does not know anything about this matter. I hope during the recess between now and 2.30 he will come up with something more than he has brought forward so far.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 2.30 p.m.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the minister would tell us what terms of reference were given to those who are studying boundary waters pollution.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): To which particular reference is my hon. friend directing my attention? Has he the Rainy river one in mind?

Mr. Nasserden: No, I am thinking of the great lakes reference.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I will be very pleased to deal with that one, and perhaps this will give me the opportunity of discussing a matter that is of great concern to border communities, and particularly to areas such as the city of Windsor.

As I said earlier today in answer to a question asked by my hon. friend, the international joint commission is conducting investigations on water pollution under three commission references from the two governments.

On October 7 the commission was requested to study the problem of pollution of lake Erie which borders the southern portion of the county of Essex, the county in which I live. This is the area where the constituencies of Essex South, Essex West and Essex East happen to be. At the same time the commission was asked to investigate pollution of the waters of the Red river at the international boundary, and to make a similar report to the governments with recommendations for any measures which they might regard as appropriate.

Under the third reference, the commission is now preparing a report to the governments concerning pollution of the Rainy river and lake of the Woods. In addition to these three current investigations, the commission since 1951, as my hon. friend, the minister of national health and welfare knows—and he has had a lot to do with these things—has maintained surveillance of water quality conditions in the connecting channels of the great lakes. I refer to the channels such as the Detroit river, which joins lake Erie and lake St. Clair and which borders the city of Windsor.

The commission has also been authorized by the two governments to maintain supervision over boundary water pollution in the St. Croix river basin in Maine and New Brunswick. If any hon. member would like the particulars of these I will be very happy to deal with them.

Mr. Nasserden: Let us have them.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): With regard to the situation covering the Detroit river area, lake Erie and lake St. Clair, it may be recalled that following complaints I made in this house some time I think in 1948 or 1949, steps were taken by both Detroit and the city of Windsor for a submission to the joint commission concerning air pollution in the Detroit-Windsor area, which might be attributed to vessels plying the Detroit river. A recommendation to broaden the reference term to the advisory board, allowing it to make recommendations respecting other major sources of pollution in the area was, however, rejected by the United States. In 1954 a technical advisory board on air pollution was established which conducted atmospheric studies in the area, and reported that the air was being polluted and that the many vessels plying the river were a contributing factor to the situation.

The minister of national health and welfare will recall—

Mr. Monteith: Thank you.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): —that he himself made a report to this house in respect of the interim report of this advisory board.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is twice.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): A smoke abatement program was inaugurated with the voluntary co-operation of vessel owners, operators and their associations.

I did not catch the interjection of my right hon. friend.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The interjection was simply this. That is twice the minister has referred to the hon. member for Perth as

the minister of national health and welfare, and I appreciate it very much.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I should like to remind my right hon. friend that the hon. member for Perth was the minister of national health and welfare during the time that my right hon. friend was the head of the government.

Mr. Diefenbaker: But not today.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The technical advisory board also continued studies of possible remedial measures to present to the international joint commission in April, 1957. Certain recommendations which it proposed to incorporate in its final report were presented. Criticisms of its draft proposals were made, and amendments to it were drafted over a period of time. The final report of the technical advisory board was submitted to the international joint commission, as my friend the hon. member for Perth will recall, at this October meeting in 1959. The international joint commission presented its recommendations to the government later, on May 31, 1960.

One of the recommendations provided for the establishment by the joint commission of a board which would continue surveillance on a voluntary basis of air pollution from vessels plying the Detroit river. This has been accepted by both governments, and has received the support of the government of Ontario.

The other recommendations of the international joint commission report, which are now under study, call for the following. First, the adoption of standards for smoke emission, described by the technical advisory board, and incorporated in the commission's final report. The standards are to go into effect as soon as the governments have worked out the legal and administrative details necessary to enforce them. Second, during the interim period the new standards are not to apply to handfired coal-burning vessels. Third, that all costs incurred in converting vessels in order to meet the new standards are to be borne by the owners of the vessels. This marks an example of the progress being made in trying to meet the very serious problem in the area covered by the Detroit river.

As a further follow-up on the recommendations of 1961, the Department of Transport, it will be recalled by the former minister of transport, the hon. member for Three Rivers, who sits with the right hon. gentleman, put through an amendment which enables the government to regulate air pollution from ships plying Canadian waters within one mile of land. The regulations under this act were gazetted and will be found now in the Canada Gazette as P.C. 1964-324. The regulations apply, first, to smoke emissions by ships while they are in Canadian waters within one mile of land and, as so many of my constituents who live on the banks of lake St. Clair know, this represents a very important step. Second, so far as non-handfired vessels are concerned, the regulations are more stringent than those recommended by the international joint commission in the 1960 report. Third, so far as handfired vessels are concerned, a special exception is made in the case of the Detroit river to bring the regulations in line with the main I.J.C. recommendations. Fourth, penalties are provided in the form of a fine not exceeding $500 or a term of imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both fine and imprisonment. Fifth, although steamship inspectors under the Canada Shipping Act are provided with powers of inspection it does not follow that special administrative procedures will be set up by the Department of Transport to enforce the regulations, as was explained at the time by the Minister of Transport.

So far as Canada is concerned, Mr. Chairman, the adoption of these regulations puts into practice the recommendation in the report of the joint commission recommending that smoke emission standards should go into effect as soon as the governments have worked out the legal and administrative details necessary to enforce them. In other words, the Canadian government is now in a position to approve the recommendations. Recommendations of the commission are normally approved jointly by both governments. However, on the United States side of the boundary there are no corresponding regulations of general application measuring up to the I.J.C. standards.

The reason for this is largely that the United States federal government has virtually no authority, it is alleged, in the field of air pollution, although this situation was remedied somewhat in 1963 with the passage of public law 88206. This legislation permits federal financial assistance to regional air pollution control agencies and also allows the federal government to take direct action when the health or welfare of the citizens of one state is endangered by air pollution from another state.

There is now proposed a new reference to the I.J.C. for study of air pollution in the

Detroit-Windsor area. In May of 1963, as a result of complaints made by the hon. member for Essex West supported by my colleague, the member for Essex South and myself, the department made representations to the United States department of state through our embassy in Washington requesting prompt relief from air pollution originating on the United States side of the Detroit river in the vicinity of Zug island and Ecorse. So far as can be determined, the Great Lakes Steel Corporation with a plant in Ecorse, which is near Detroit, is primarily responsible for this situation. Smoke from this plant pollutes the atmosphere in the west end of Windsor and in La Salle in Sandwich west. When making representations to the state department I pointed out that preparations for a reference of the matter to the international joint commission were going forward on our side.

These represent important ventures by the international joint commission with regard to what quite properly has been referred to as a serious condition of pollution in the air resulting from several of the causes I have mentioned. This matter of pollution, of course, is not confined to the great lakes, and to the extent that the international joint commission on the Canadian side is able to prosecute studies it will have at least a persuasive effect in both countries. The house may be assured that the commission will undertake its responsibility to see that these matters are properly studied. Remedial action can then be taken by those authorities primarily concerned, when it comes to giving effect to recommendations. The authorities in the case of Canada are the provinces with their responsibility in property and civil rights. But some provinces may take the position that the cost of giving effect to the remedies suggested is one they cannot bear alone and in that event, of course, consideration has to be given as to what action can be taken to bring about the necessary and desired results.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, the committee has been treated to a disquisition on a subject that does not come up at all under the particular item we are dealing with and I can only assume that what was said by the hon. gentleman was said in a desire to impress his constituents with the action taken in regard to a problem that is not before us at all. As a matter of fact, as I listened to the hon. gentleman reading his statement and pouring forth that volume of words, I could only conclude that when he really gets under a full head of steam he pours forth over the air, whether polluted or not, a volume of words in search of an idea.

That was very apparent because what we are dealing with and what he has not dealt with is the question of what is being done about water pollution. Interesting as it is to hear of what has been done in connection with a problem that is not before us, I now return to the subject under consideration, which is Canada's share of the expenses of studies, surveys and investigations of the international joint commission including studies and surveys of the midwestern watershed, Canada's share of the expenses of the international St. Lawrence river board of control, Canada's share of the expenses of the St. Croix river reference, Canada's share of the expenses of the proposed Alaska-Yukon rivers reference, Canada's share of the expenses of studies of boundary waters pollution and Canada's share of the expenses of the Champlain waterway reference.

The minister, of course, has not dealt with the questions that were raised and I now ask him to return to the subject with some greater regard to what is before the committee than he has shown up to the present moment and to tell the committee what, if anything, has been done by the international joint commission in connection with the subject of water pollution, which we are dealing with at the moment. How many technical advisers are there in the Canadian section? What is the nature of the work they are doing? Interesting as his disquisition on the subject of air pollution may be to himself and to his constituents, and also generally, that is not the subject before us at this time; but I presume he brought it up because he has no information on the questions that have been asked him.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I am glad my hon. friend is interested in the problems that face the area from which I come. I had been asked a question about pollution—

Mr. Diefenbaker: About water pollution.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): —and I dealt with air pollution, but since my hon. friend wishes me to go on I am very happy to deal with water pollution.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is fine.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I approved a note following which the governments of the United States and Canada recognized that the waters of lake Erie, lake Ontario and the international section of the St. Lawrence river

were being polluted by sewage and industrial wastes discharged into these various bodies of water. I pointed out that the provisions of article 4 of the boundary waters treaty signed on January 11, 1909, set forth that boundary waters and waters flowing across the boundary shall not be polluted on either side to the injury of health or property on the other side. It provides the two governments with a justification for agreeing upon a joint reference pursuant to the provisions of article 9 of the treaty.

The commission was requested to inquire into and report to the two governments upon the following questions: First, are the waters of lake Erie, lake Ontario, and the international section of the St. Lawrence river being polluted on either side of the boundary to an extent which is causing or is likely to cause injury to health or property on either side of the boundary? If the foregoing question is answered in the affirmative, to what extent, by what cause and in what locality is such pollution taking place If the commission should find pollution of the character just referred to is taking place, what remedial measures would, in its judgment, be most practicable from the economic, sanitary and other points of view, and what would be the probable cost thereof?

Now, the answers to those questions will provide suggested remedies for what is admittedly a serious situation.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What is the date of that?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): This is dated October 7 of this year.

In the conduct of this investigation and otherwise in the performance of its duties under this reference, the commission can utilize the services of engineers and other specially qualified personnel of the technical agencies of Canada and the United States and will, in so far as possible, make use of the information and technical data heretofore acquired or which may become available during the course of their investigations. I cannot give my hon. friend the exact number of professional and technical people who will be engaged on this particular study. I asked for this information at noon, but as yet it has not yet been finally determined, although the work has begun.

The two governments, I am happy to say, are agreed upon the desirability of extending this reference to other boundary waters in the great lakes basin at the appropriate time. These studies do take a considerable length of time to make, but they will be carried out in accordance with a schedule that has not yet been announced. The commission is asked to advise the governments when, in its opinion, such action is desirable. When the commission will have made its report the two governments will be in a position to consider what remedial steps can be taken.

My hon. friend asked me about some of the expenses involved in these studies. Canada's share of the expenses of studies, surveys and investigations with regard to the various projects are as follows for 1964-65: in the case of the mid-western watershed, $7,500; for our share of the expenses of the international St. Lawrence river board of control, $10,000; our share of the expenses of the St. Croix river, $500; for the proposed Alaska-Yukon rivers reference, $5,000; Canada's share of the studies of boundary pollution to which I have been referring, $13,000; for the expenses of the Champlain waterway reference, $2,500, making a total of $38,500. Now, this appropriation provides for the various investigations, studies and surveys undertaken by the commission under the various references and obligations to which reference has been made.

Mr. Nasserden: If I understood the minister correctly, he stated that the reports that might be made by the joint commission would be of the type that could not be acted upon by the government of the United States as such. He implied these were matters that would have to be acted upon by the various states concerned. Has the minister, as Secretary of State for External Affairs, held any discussions with the governors or officials of these various states to bring to their attention the problem that does exist and explore the avenues that might be available to meet these problems?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): In the case of the state of Michigan I, myself, did talk, when I was minister of national health and welfare, with the then governor of the state of Michigan.

Mr. Nasserden: What year was that?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That was in 1956; I believe that was when these studies were brought in. As Secretary of State for External Affairs, I have had correspondence with Premier Robarts of the province of Ontario who, as a result of an arrangement that has been made, has been dealing with this matter, through one of his ministers, with the present regime in the state of Michigan. I presume, although I would have to ask about this, that with regard to the situation in Quebec,

there could be action taken by the corresponding governing bodies.

Mr. Nasserden: Am I right, then, in assuming the minister, as Secretary of State for External Affairs, has not taken up this matter with the particular states involved?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No; as Secretary of State for External Affairs, I take this up with my opposite number in the government of the United States who, in turn, communicates with the appropriate person in the state body.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, since we are considering the estimates of the Department of External Affairs, I would like to take this opportunity to say a few words on the deepening of the Richelieu river.

We all remember that, when the previous government was in office, some hon. members of the province of Quebec, particularly the hon. member for St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville (Mr. Dupuis) who was assigned very important diplomatic duties in Africa —which duties are keeping him away from the house today—as well as the Associate Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cardin), took a very active part in the debates and made every effort to try and convince the government that it was not only urgent but essential to go ahead with the deepening of the Richelieu river, so that an inland water route could be established between the harbour of Montreal and New York city.

However, since the Liberal government took office, we have noticed that those two hon. members have not said one word on this matter. At that time they were clamouring in order to convince the Canadian people that the deepening of the Richelieu river was essential.

I would like the hon. minister to comment on this project. I would like to know where the surveys stand and if the hon. minister is still receiving representations from the two ministers I mentioned more particularly and from those in that electoral district who are interested in that canal project.

Would the hon. minister inform us on the progress of the negotiations, and tell us if the project is practicable, or if this was just a balloon sent up by the people in opposition, when the Conservatives were in power —those who are now in a position to implement this project—so as to play on the emotions of the people?

I would like to know the intentions of the minister on this matter.

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member very well knows, many members on all sides of the house became interested in this matter. The Associate Minister of National Defence, in particular, was highly interested.

This is the situation: The investigation is completed, but we have not yet received the report of the commission. As soon as we receive that report, we will be in a position to study the facts; and I am referring not only to the Canadian government, but also to the government of the United States.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, I thank the minister for the rather vague information he has just given us, but I would like to know when we can expect to get the commission's report?

Mr. Grafftey: That is a good question.

Mr. Ricard: When does the minister expect the commission to report on that matter and how long is it since the technical survey has been completed?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I do not know; I am not a member of the commission. It is never easy to ask a judge when he will give his decision. That is a matter which comes under the exclusive jurisdiction of the commission, but I will inquire.

[*Text*]

Mr. Nasserden: The reason I raised this question today is because it is one of the most important problems with which Canada must deal, not only the government but all of us. I well recall the many statements which have been made by the minister on the importance of this problem. Today he has indicated that he was advised by hon. members representing areas in close proximity to the constituency he represents in parliament. I would have thought that one so well versed in this problem and so aware of its detrimental effects would have taken action before 18 months had gone by, since this government came to office. Consider the length of time which has elapsed between the date this government came to power and the date action was taken, that is, on October 7 and 8. It is evident that the government has been most lax in discharging its responsibilities in connection with this increasingly serious problem.

We have been told there has been no intensification of the studies which have taken place with regard to this matter. The minister has shown by his answers today that no

discussions have been held directly with the state governments across the line. I must say I am deeply disappointed at this lack of action. Anyone who takes notice of the activity going on along the St. Lawrence and the great lakes today on our side of the border cannot but realize that more action and more attention is required than the government is giving to this subject. At the present time it is clear that it is likely to become even more extensive and that pollution will be even greater in the years ahead. Now is the time to intensify this work in all phases, not only the necessary studies but the action which has to be taken. I wish to say very sincerely that I am disappointed in the minister because of the lack of attention he has given to this matter.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I am sure the hon. member is disappointed and I am sure his disappointment is sincere. But when he understands what the constitutional arrangements are he will I am sure realize he has been ill-informed in the interesting remarks he has just made.

Shortly after the present government came to office it undertook to communicate with Premier Robarts. I regret I do not have any correspondence, but I will be glad to table it next week, with the consent of the province concerned. We communicated with the premier of Ontario several times with regard to this matter. I am not complaining about the co-operation I received from Premier Robarts, because we did receive co-operation. It was necessary to have the co-operation of the government of Ontario. Perhaps the hon. member does not realize that, when the international joint commission undertakes these projects, it does not do the work itself; it has to use the technical services which are available, and in a case like this these are largely the technical services of the province. The water belongs to the province. The assistance of the officials of the province is essential in order to carry out the engineering assessments which have to be made.

So there has been no delay on the part of the federal government and I am not suggesting there was any delay on the part of the province of Ontario. They have a lot of work to do and I am sure Premier Robarts acted as readily as he could in the circumstances.

Mr. Nasserden: I hope the minister is not trying to pass the buck to the premier of Ontario or of any other province. This is a matter which requires leadership at the federal level if progress is to be made, and we expect this kind of leadership from hon. gentlemen opposite—the kind of leadership they said they would give to this country.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The hon. member knows I would not pass the buck.

Mr. Alkenbrack: I rise at this time because I, too, am interested in this serious problem which is before the government and before all of us in this country. I wish to congratulate the right hon. Leader of the Opposition for having brought this subject up for consideration. As set out in this item, Canada's share of the expenses of studies of boundary waters pollution amounted to $13,000 last year, with provision for the same amount this year. This pollution problem has markedly increased during the past year and I submit, in consequence, that the item before us is totally inadequate to enable us to meet it properly and carry out the work required.

Let hon. members consider the damage being done to our tourist industry, as well as the piteous state of the fishing industry not only in lake Ontario but in all the other great lakes as well. I submit this item should be ten times the amount set out here, and I advise the minister that he would be doing his duty to this country if he were to protect himself and his department by setting aside adequate funds to perform this task effectively. In my opinion he should leave this item open to make it possible for him to come back to this parliament, in a few months time, and secure approval for the expenditure of more money to be used in the fight against this flagrant pollution of the great lakes.

I would point out that I brought this question of the pollution of lake Ontario to the attention of the government on June 18 this year. Hon. members will find that I spoke then, as reported on page 4443 of *Hansard*, concerning the pollution of the lake by oil emissions which, we suspect, came from ships—ships from other countries which are now steaming up the new waterway and whose masters seem to think, when they get into lake Ontario, that they are back in the ocean again and can open the seacocks of their vessels and emit oil waste or any other type of excess chemical they do not need aboard. I also put this matter before the government on September 24 last, as reported at pages 8407 and 8408 of *Hansard*. At that time I placed before the government the plight of the commercial fishermen of lake Ontario. I would like to see some progress made in this connection by this government that claims

they are so interested in cleaning up the situation that exists.

I would now refer you, Mr. Chairman, to the Kingston *Whig-Standard* of September 22, 1964, where some words of wisdom are contained in an editorial. This newspaper claims that we are not adequately enforcing the laws that we have in this country with regard to pollution. I would quote just briefly from the editorial:

> The real trouble, we suspect, is that the authorities have not yet appreciated that we have a war on our hands and that the time for polite notes of admonition has long since passed.

I am sure all hon. members in this house will agree with those sentiments. I believe we must intensify the fight against this problem; and we cannot do it with a puny $13,000 which is, we might say, hidden away in the estimates. Had the right hon. Leader of the Opposition not brought this matter to the attention of the house it probably would have slid into oblivion, like a great many other measures of this government. I think we should stop the flow of raw, untreated industrial by-products and effluents into our lakes and streams. The minister has mentioned a question that was posed by, or for the international joint commission, namely, is there pollution coming from one side of the international boundary line that is adversely affecting and damaging the other side. I claim that there is. Pollution is obviously coming from every watershed that drains into lake Ontario; all our small rivers are polluted before they ever reach lake Ontario. This applies in both the United States and Canada.

We should stop effluents, as I say, and industrial pollution reaching our streams. We should also see to it that industry which uses water in their processes return the unconverted portion of this water to our lakes and streams as pure as it was when they took it out. That is possible today, I would advise the minister. There was a time, not long ago, when I believe that was not possible; but it is possible now and action here should be taken in this regard. We should also prohibit insoluble detergents being passed into our streams. We should make a continuous and concentrated study of the chemical content of all soaps, detergents and cleaning materials being marketed, to ensure no insoluble toxics are passed into our streams. We should review whatever anti-pollution laws have been promulgated by this country and the United States; and since the great lakes waters are common to both countries, the anti-pollution and conservation laws for the protection of the purity of waters and for the protection of the fish population ought to be exactly the same in each country. I would remind the minister that he should use his good offices to see that this is done. He should see that these laws are uniform, so that when they are enforced neither country is outside the pale of this common legislation.

I will not take up any more of the time of the committee, Mr. Chairman, but would remind the minister and his department that the people bordering the great lakes, those in the great lakes basin, are watching to see whether something good is done to abate this nuisance that affects so adversely all the people of this country, namely the pollution of our public and international waters.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, there is one matter I wish to raise in connection with this item. If I understood the minister correctly, he referred to health and one or two other factors arising out of pollution as the basis for the studies that are now taking place. I wonder whether the minister would tell us if the studies taking place at the present time go so far as determining the effects of the pollution on our fishing and the tourist and recreational value of these waters.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, these studies are comprehensive and I would think they would take this matter into account; but I want to make sure before I give a definitive answer.

The Chairman: Shall the item carry?

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, I was waiting to see whether any other hon. members cared to make remarks on this last item of this part of the minister's estimates. I was wondering whether the minister would consent to our reverting to the first item of his estimates and reopening it, for one purpose and one purpose alone; that is, the opportunity of hearing a report by the hon. member for Red Deer in connection with his recent trip to Africa. This would be the only opportunity we would have of hearing a report from the hon. member for Red Deer, and it is certainly a matter of great interest to members of the house and the people of Canada. I think it would be very discourteous of the members of this house if we did not provide an opportunity for the hon. member to make a report on his trip to Africa and his representations to His Imperial Majesty the Emperor of Ethiopia, Dr. Kenyatta and others. Would the minister consider doing this?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I think this is most unusual. I believe we should finish the estimates, and then my hon. friend could address himself to this point. We are on a particular item now. This question is concerned with another item. I think we have to deal with each of these items as they come along. The hon. gentleman was here this morning, and we could have dealt with this question on item 35, which was before the committee at that time.

Mr. Nesbitt: No.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Yes. We were on item 35 this morning, dealing with the external aid program of the government.

Mr. Knowles: Where have you sent him now?

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Order. Will the hon. member kindly resume his seat. The Chair would like to bring to the attention of the committee that there is a particular vote before the committee a the moment, and the discussion which has just taken place between the minister and the hon. member for Oxford is certainly not relevant to that vote. If it is the intention of the committee to discuss the possibility of reverting to an item which has already been passed, I cannot see how it can be done under vote No. 40. The minister has replied to the suggestion made by the hon. member, and I would suggest that we go on with the item before us at the moment.

Mr. Nesbitt: I am, of course, completely in Your Honour's hands and would welcome suggestions from Your Honour as to when I may make this request of the minister and do it, of course, within the rules of the house. I used this particular moment to do it because I thought, since we were in committee and rather free and easy, perhaps Your Honour might overlook a small breach of the rules. However, I would be very happy if Your Honour would suggest when I may raise this matter and make a formal request of the minister to reopen item No. 1 of his estimates, so we may have the opportunity of hearing the hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I am sure there will be plenty of opportunity.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, this procedure may be a little irregular, but if we pass these estimates it will be too late, of course, to make the request of the minister. I know the minister is in a co-operative mood so we thought he would welcome this request. I am foregoing a 30 minute discussion on water pollution in order to make it possible for this request to be accepted.

Mr. Knowles: What a choice.

Mr. Churchill: I think the house would like me to desist from that discussion but in view of the special circumstances—and they are special circumstances—I would be willing to take this course. Had the hon. member for Red Deer returned yesterday he could have spoken on item 1. He has been a special emissary abroad and we do not know—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. My hon. friend does not, of course, want to make a mockery of the rules of parliament. We are discussing the estimates of the Department of External Affairs and we are dealing with a particular item. When we began our deliberations this morning the hon. gentleman had the chance to raise this matter, at which time it would have been perfectly in order, under item 35.

Mr. Lambert: That is nonsense.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friend says that is nonsense, but that is true. All he need do is to look at item 35.

Mr. Lambert: External aid.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Of course; that is the item precisely. That is not what we are on now. I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to dispatch the business before us and my hon. friends can take whatever other procedures they wish. I see the hon. gentleman is not in his seat. He travelled for a long time yesterday but I am sure he will be available. In any event, I thought I had satisfied my hon. friend by the comprehensive statement I made last night, and he suggested that I did not need to proceed any further with it. I thought I had given all the explanations he wanted. In any event my point of order is clear.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask the minister a question?

The Chairman: Order. The minister has raised a point of order which is along the line the Chair has already taken. Members of the committee know as well as or better than the chairman that we have to be guided by the terms of standing order 59(2), which says that discussion in committee must be strictly relevant to the item before the committee. We are now on vote 40, and certainly the Chair cannot see how under vote 40 there

can be any discussion of the subject matter raised by the hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. Nasserden: May I speak to the point of order?

The Chairman: Well, it does seem to me that the matter is very clear. A point of order has been raised and has been dealt with already by a few hon. members. The Chair has given an opinion and really it seems to me that we would make better progress if we were to limit our discussion strictly to the matter before us.

Mr. Nasserden: The only reference I wanted to make was this. After all, a matter of procedure like this is a matter of common sense. This morning—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, a point of order has been raised and you have listened to two speakers. I suggest that we should not allow a mockery to be made of this house.

The Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Rosthern sought a moment ago to address the Chair and the committee on the point of order. I believe the point of order has been ruled upon and it does seem to me that the hon. member would want to abide by the suggestion made by the Chair that the subject to which he is now referring cannot be discussed under vote 40.

Mr. Nasserden: Then I rise on a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. The only reason I wanted to refer to the point of order was that a matter of procedure is really a matter of common sense. The hon. member for Red Deer was in the house this morning but no one would have thought of asking him at that time, after the journey he had just completed, to get up and make a report to the house at once. I have asked a question on the matter of pollution which is now before the house, with regard to which the minister said he would try to get information. Perhaps in the interval we could hear a report from the hon. member for Red Deer on this other matter and deal with it.

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Rosthern said that he was addressing the Chair, not on a point of order but on a question of privilege. I am sure he will admit that there is no question of privilege whatever in the point he has raised and I would therefore ask him to respect the suggestion made by the Chair, which is in effect a ruling, that the subject matter raised cannot be debated under vote 40.

[The Chairman.]

Mr. Moreau: The hon. member was certainly not showing much common sense.

Mr. Nasserden: Could the minister answer the last question regarding the reference which was given the commission, and whether it went so far as to permit them to determine the effects of pollution on the fishing, tourist and recreational values of these waters?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I said that the reference of the commission was comprehensive, and I believe would include that; but I do want to make absolutely sure and I have not the information before me.

The Chairman: Shall the item carry?

Mr. Nasserden: Before the item carries, Mr. Chairman, I should like to know whether the minister is sure about this. This is a very important matter.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I have read the terms of reference and I pointed out their comprehensive character. They are directed to the study of whether the pollution is likely to cause any injury to health or property on either side of the boundary; and if that question is answered in the affirmative, to what extent and in what locality is such pollution taking place. These are the terms of reference.

Mr. Nasserden: Although the general terms of reference were well intentioned it might have been better to spell them out in more detail so the commission knows exactly what they are doing in this regard. I see the minister is smiling when I say that. He should not smile because he himself has been unable to determine just what this reference which is before us today means. After all, the fishing industry is an important industry to Canada. The tourist industry is an important industry to Canada. The recreational value of these rivers is also important to the Canadians who live along the waterways, and the Canadians who will live along the waterways in the years ahead. I should like the minister to give some thought to broadening the reference given the commission in regard to this matter, because as I read what he has read to the committee today I do not think the terms of reference give the commission any express instruction along that line.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Well, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that the terms of reference are broad; but I fully agree with the hon. member about the recreational importance of these waters to the tourist industry. I would assure him that the study

of pollution in the waters around Essex county enables me to say there is no finer tourist centre and no finer recreational centre than the county of Essex.

Item agreed to.

L12a. Loans to the government of India to finance the purchase in Canada of aircraft and associated spare parts and equipment in accordance with a financial agreement entered into between the government of Canada and the government of India, $1,367,100.

Mr. Churchill: This is a matter then of external aid?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No, it is not; it is a matter of military assistance.

Mr. Churchill: Is India part of Canada, then?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): This is a matter of military assistance to India. My hon. friend may recall that questions were asked in this house about military assistance to India at a time when it was dealing with difficulties involving one of its neighbours. Canada agreed to make a loan to India in the amount of $12 million to provide for the purchase of Caribou aircraft and also to provide a further loan to cover the interest bearing charges of this loan. On March 9 the government approved a special intergovernmental loan to India in an amount not exceeding $12.5 million to cover the purchase of 16 Caribou aircraft and related spare parts, and equipment for the Indian air force. The cabinet decision stipulated that the loan would bear interest at the normal commercial rate of 5½ per cent but would be accompanied by a grant sufficient to defray half the interest charges up to a maximum grant of $2 million. In the fiscal year 1963-64 expenditures under this loan amounted to $11,132,982 and the unspent balance of $1,367,018 lapsed. It is necessary to submit, therefore, for revote, an amount of $1,367,100 in order that funds will be available in the current fiscal year to enable the government's total commitment to be met.

Item agreed to.

External Aid Office—

L14a. Special loan assistance for developing countries in the current and subsequent fiscal years, subject to such terms and conditions as the governor in council may approve, for the purpose of undertaking such economic, educational and technical projects as may be agreed upon by Canada and the developing countries or recognized international development institutions, $50,000,000.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, "External Aid Office" is the heading here, and the details read as follows:

Special loan assistance for developing countries in the current and subsequent fiscal years, subject to such terms and conditions as the governor in council may approve, for the purpose of undertaking such economic, educational and technical projects as may be agreed upon by Canada and the developing countries or recognized international development institutions, $50,000,000.

It is a pleasure to find that we are now well within the rules. The hon. member for Oxford, myself and others transgressed the rules a short time ago, but may we now ask the minister to consider the request made in good faith by the hon. member for Oxford, because we would like to hear from the hon. member for Red Deer?

A casual observer of this institution might, at infrequent intervals, notice a sharp partisan interplay, but normally we carry on in a co-operative spirit, just as we are now doing. Although we do differ politically with the hon. member for Red Deer, we are all members of parliament. He has been on a mission abroad at the request of the government and we have taken a keen interest in his efforts. We should like to receive a report from him. How can we obtain such a report other than by requesting it at this stage? Surely we should not ask that the house adjourn to discuss an urgent matter of public importance simply because that member has now returned. The minister's estimates will be completed shortly and we will have no opportunity then to ask for such a report.

There are not many members in this house who would question the accuracy of the minister's report about that hon. member's travels abroad, and he did give us a rather full report last night. Surely now that the hon. member is here and available he should give us an account, which I hope will correspond with the minister's account.

When that member left for abroad I think he did so as a result of a serious lack on the part of the Department of External Affairs, in that this expedition was not publicized. It was only by dint of a great deal of searching and co-operation on the part of active members of the press that we found out that this House of Commons was being represented abroad by one of its members not on the government side. That situation is hardly fair to that hon. member, because whenever members of the government travel abroad we receive press releases containing information as to their efforts. Surely when a man is given a special commission we should hear about it.

The minister will recall that we expressed some surprise that there was no one within

his department who could represent us over in Africa. When we heard about this appointment we wondered what special qualifications the hon. member for Red Deer had that placed him in a category different from other members on the opposition side.

Considering all these things together, it seems imperative that the hon. member should be properly recognized by the House of Commons. The minister has told us that he was over there on a very serious mission with regard to Canadian hostages in the Congo.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): May I point out to my hon. friend that the member for Cariboo has indicated that my hon. friend's prize, the member for Red Deer, has been contacted and he will be here shortly.

Mr. Churchill: That is good.

I noted from the minister's remarks last night that Mr. Kenyatta has said that the hostages are relatively safe, but the minister expressed some doubt about that report. We should like to find out from the member for Red Deer whether he has any information in this regard.

Mr. Prittie: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the hon. member would permit an interjection. The minister indicated he could reply to a point to which I made reference. Perhaps he could do so while we are waiting for the hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Churchill: Of course on many occasions I am only too pleased to yield to the hon. member who has just spoken, but I do not see any great haste to hear such a reply at this time. We still have a few minutes before—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Let us take all next week. We have lots of time.

Mr. Churchill: The minister suggests that he would like his estimates to continue to be considered.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I would just love that.

Mr. Churchill: And all the time we have been trying to help him get his estimates through.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Do not do that.

Mr. Churchill: The minister set up the barrier of obstruction last night. Anything that could usefully be said about Indonesia was said last night, but he prevented us from voting on it then. You know how people criticize this house for not voting on something that has been discussed.

[Mr. Churchill.]

Mr. Woolliams: He talked for half an hour so that some of his supporters could be dragged out of bed and here for the vote.

Mr. Churchill: I should like to know, when the hon. member for Red Deer appears, just what the situation is in Africa, and how close he came to the centre of the trouble area. Perhaps the hon. member could indicate the advice he would give as to what may be done in the future, because the crisis is not over. I asked the minister a question last night as to what steps could be taken by this government in the event the hostages were freed—and we hope they will be—but require assistance. If the hon. member for Red Deer could answer that question, which the minister could not answer last night, I am sure we would be satisfied.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I thank my hon. friend, the member for Burnaby-Richmond, for his forbearance. I should have dealt with his question last night.

First of all, may I say on the population problem to which he referred, that this was discussed at the United Nations general assembly and has been previously discussed at the economic and social council. The Canadian government did register an abstention on the matter. I hope my friend will realize that in registering that opinion, rather than voting for or against, the delegation was acting on instructions.

However, I listened to what my hon. friend had to say last night during his constructive and well articulated statement, and we will give attention to what he said. I will not say at this time what our attitude will be, because I want to give more consideration to this matter. As the hon. member will realize, there are many considerations involved, some of which he touched upon last night in a very clear way.

I know the hon. member regards this matter as important. He has played a significant part in planned parenthood organizations, and I respect his sincerity in this matter as I am sure he understands mine.

At this time I should like to make a brief reference to what the hon. member said about foreign service officers' pay. He was in a position to know something about this because he himself was in the department. Foreign service officers grade 1 now receive starting salaries from $4,860 to $6,060 per annum. The lower figure is for those who simply have the basic qualifications, while the top figure is for those with doctorates or equivalent academic qualifications. There are

three or four intermediate salaries offered, according to qualifications and experience.

The hon. member may be interested to know that the foreign service officer competition now taking place seems to have been successful in terms of the number of applicants. There will be interviews this year of over 300 applicants, which is almost a record. This speaks well for the interest that the young men and women of Canada have in the foreign service.

With regard to the particular item before the committee I should like to say that this represents a complete new program in Canada's external aid policy. The new loans in the amount of $50 million this year or $150 million over a three year period represent a very important new aspect in Canada's external aid program. The motives are the same as those which for the past 14 years have motivated Canada's outright grants.

Initially the terms are expected to be comparable with those of the international development association, that is, a 50 year maturity period with 10 years grace, non-interest bearing and with a service charge of three quarters of 1 per cent. The development loan program will be directed toward countries now eligible to receive Canadian bilateral grant assistance and in addition will permit a further Canadian contribution to economic progress in Latin America in close co-operation with the international development bank. My hon. friend will remember that last week we announced that $10 million had been apportioned, which represents a departure in the form of assistance by Canada to Latin American countries. Negotiations with regard to this loan and all the other loans that will be made under this vote will be carried on with various countries.

In short, parliament is being asked to provide under this vote for a new instrument to provide assistance. The loans are based on bilateral negotiations based in turn upon a consideration of projects that can best be assisted in this way. I think this represents a very important departure. It is one that was not established first by Canada but we are among the first to use this kind of assistance apart from the United States which I believe was the first country to embark on this type of program.

Mr. Nesbitt: I have just one question I should like to ask the minister before we take advantage of the opportunity to hear from the hon. member for Red Deer. Is the minister in a position to confirm the press report, which I presume he must have had at his disposal, that 800 Belgian paratroopers are based on Ascension island ready to land in Stanleyville to save the lives of the white hostages held there by the rebel government of the Congo? Apparently these troops arrived at Ascension island a few hours ago with the permission of the government of the United Kingdom and are ready to attack Stanleyville if necessary. I wonder if the minister can confirm that report, because it might be helpful to the discussion?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, there are many things about this matter I could confirm but as my hon. frend, who has had a very deep and penetrating experience of foreign affairs, knows, you do not disclose intended strategy. I know it is in the newspapers but my hon. friend will realize there are many things in the newspapers which are accurate. There are many things that might be in the newspapers which are not there. There are plans to try to relieve these unfortunate hostages and I will wait until the proper moment to disclose all the other steps that are being taken to try to relieve the situation. I am sure my hon. friend, with his deep understanding of these problems, will understand why I take this position.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, the press report indicates that this move was officially announced by the Belgian government and I was wondering whether the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the government have been informed and whether this report is correct, because it might make some difference to our discussions.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): This matter is one that is not under the control of any one government, either the Belgian government or any other.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, this type of answer does not add anything at all either to the knowledge of the house or to assuage the feelings of the Canadian people. The question asked by the hon. member for Oxford is one that should be answered. Is there a basis for this report? Is the Belgian government in this announcement placing before the world as a whole information that is not correct? I simply cannot understand this assumed attitude—I do not quite know how to describe it—of pretence on the part of the minister, that for him to give information like this which is already known world wide would be harmful under the circumstances. This is nothing but nonsense on his part and he knows it. If he had been asked for information as to courses being taken which are

not known to mankind as a whole, one could understand his attitude; but for him to raise himself up and stand on an altar of pretence in a matter such as this certainly is in line with the regular course followed by the minister in dealing with external affairs. We are interested in knowing if there is a foundation for this report. I have had some experience too in this regard and I should like to know what the minister would have done when he was sitting over here at the time we were in office and anyone on the government side had chosen to give that kind of answer.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Does my hon. friend want me to answer that question?

Mr. Diefenbaker: If the hon. gentleman will wait, I am asking for information now and we have a right to have it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, I know that those hon. gentlemen sitting opposite choose to live in an atmosphere of ignorance, but the rest of us want to know what is going on. I ask the minister to give this information. Let us at least have a picture that he has some appreciation of what is going on, for certainly the press has been very definite and clear in this regard. I am not asking him to tell us what other courses of action the government may have in mind. The government has undertaken several courses of action in this regard and they have all blown up in its face. Finally India has been called upon by the United Kingdom and two other nations, the United States and Canada, to exercise its diplomatic facilities so that apparently as of this moment, with India called in, all that has taken place heretofore has not been successful. We are not asking the minister to give information that is secret, but certainly for him to adopt an attitude of mystic silence in regard to a matter that is known to everyone through the press is not in keeping with the responsibilities of a minister.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the item carry?

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, I see that the hon. member for Red Deer is now in the house and this item is broad enough to provide him with the opportunity to give us the benefit of his experiences in Africa and to tell us about his attempts to be helpful in the matter of the release of these missionaries from Stanleyville, and also the other objectives of his mission. I was wondering whether we should not have the opportunity of hearing from him.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, before the member for Red Deer proceeds I should like to raise a point of order in view of the discussion we have had about his trip and having to do with the remarks he may make. In view of the fact that the member for Red Deer went to Africa at government invitation, under government auspices and at public expense and presumably returned the same way, I wonder whether or not the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the government are now willing to accept responsibility for all that the member for Red Deer may say to the committee this afternoon?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I do not know what will be the full purport of what the hon. member is going to say.

An hon. Member: Has he not reported to you?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): He has made a report to the government. I want to say that we are grateful to the hon. member for Red Deer for what he has tried to do in a most difficult situation, affecting the freedom and security of a good many Canadians and many others from other countries.

Mr. Howard: I am not arguing about these latter comments of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. If he is not willing to take responsibility for what the member for Red Deer now says as a result of his trip, which was made at the invitation of the government, under government auspices and direction, and paid for out of public funds, then I think we should pay no attention to what the hon. member for Red Deer says, but only to what the Secretary of State for External Affairs is willing to take responsibility for.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I want my hon. friend to know that I have the fullest confidence in the execution of this mandate by the hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Howard: But you do not take responsibility for what he is prepared to say.

An hon. Member: Sit down.

Mr. Leboe: If I may speak to this point of order; surely it must be obvious to members of this house that any report which the hon. member for Red Deer is making is one for which the minister is going to be responsible, as a report to the minister and not particularly to this house.

Mr. Thompson: At the outset, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that I am very pleased to note the interest of various mem-

bers of the house in the situation that presently centres around the insurgent held territory in the Congo, the capital of which is Stanleyville. Unfortunately, it seems to me that public opinion with regard to this very serious crisis is not too much aroused. It is only a matter of 50 years ago or less when a few hostages held in this way would have been the cause of a world war. Today we have something over 1,000 people being held as hostage under blackmail for political and military purposes. Unfortunately the world does not seem to care too much.

I am not speaking, nor do I make any pretence to speak, on behalf of the government as I report briefly on the situation as I see it. I do count it a privilege to have been entrusted with the responsibility of trying to do something for those in this situation, not only for the relief of some 33 Canadians who are amongst these hostages, but on behalf of the 16 countries that have nationals in the Stanleyville area. I say it was a privilege not only because of the fact that, as a result of my experience in Africa it was felt that I might be able to perform these duties in a way that a person not having these contacts and this experience might not be able to do, but it was a privilege because of the general good will and respect in which Canada and Canadians are held in Africa and across the world. At this point I must say that I come back feeling very proud of the fact that I am a Canadian with the hope and the wish that Canadians in Canada could do an equally good job in getting along with each other and meeting their home responsibilities as Canadians outside Canada obviously are able to do.

This situation relating to the hostages is a very difficult one. It is very difficult because of the complexity of the Congo situation. It is very difficult because, should I or any other Canadian in some position of responsibility make a false step or make a comment which could be misinterpreted by those who are responsible for the welfare of these hostages, it could mean the difference between life and death for them. I am sure therefore that every member in this house will understand and appreciate this situation and will be willing to accept the fact that it may not be possible to say everything publicly that might be said or that one might be thinking.

Now, briefly, the situation in the Congo is this: a large area in the northeastern and eastern part of the country during recent months was taken over by insurgent Congolese, sometimes better known as the rebels, a name which is strenuously objected to by most African leaders today. This, again, adds to the complexity of the situation. The insurgents have set this up as the people's republic of the Congo. In taking over this area, they have taken into their custody something like 1,000 foreign nationals who represent 16 nations. I might just identify these nations. They are the Argentine, Haiti, the United States, Canada, Great Britain, France, Belgium, Switzerland, Greece, Italy, Pakistan and India, and then four African nations, being Kenya, the Cameroons, the Upper Volta and Nigeria. These are foreign nationals carrying passports who were there on some particular assignment.

You may ask how other African nationals are there. It is the result of the fact there was working in this area of the Congo a number of United Nations agencies. I refer to the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, UNESCO and the United Nations technical assistance program. The purpose of these people being held as hostages is to further strengthen the political and military position of the insurgent authorities and forces. The situation became critical when the Congolese government forces, that is the military forces of the democratic republic of the Congo, began to close in on the Stanleyville area. These military operations, briefly, are encircling around the north, around the south, up along the eastern border which is known as the Uganda frontier, and then southwest in a pincer movement. Only a few days ago they took over the city of Kindu and several other towns farther along.

As this military operation closes in, the real problem develops as the rebel authority begins to break down. I am sure that the position is much more dangerous so far as these hostages are concerned from these radical elements within the rebel area, one of which is known as Lajeunesse, than it is from the rebel authorities themselves. It is for this reason that, should any mismove be made in so far as our efforts are concerned, and I speak now of the efforts of the 16 nations having nationals there, it could mean the slaughter of these people.

Canada has taken the initiative in trying, one, to get the international Red Cross into Stanleyville; and, two, through the facilities of the international Red Cross to arrange the evacuation of these hostages. In taking this initiative the government of Canada asked me if I would make this trip because it was felt that I happened to know personally many of the African officials on the

eastern side of Africa where contact is maintained with the rebel Congolese. I did so because it seemed to me there might be more hope of getting into communication with the rebel authorities.

I would say to those who have been interested or who have been critical of my going in the first place that it had been the original plan that during the recess I should make a trip which would involve a survey of what was being done in Africa under Canada's aid program, particularly as it relates to some of the African agencies attempting to co-ordinate the African development program. It so happens that the headquarters of these organizations are located in Ethiopia. One is the economic commission for Africa, more commonly known as the E.C.A., which is an agency of the United Nations. It is the aim of the E.C.A. to co-ordinate all the aid programs of the various friendly countries and at the same time to bring about a degree of co-ordination in the economic development of those countries to which the aid is directed. This is a reasonable and practical approach. Another organization concerned is the organization for African unity. I may say that this organization has been a dream of the Emperor of Ethiopia for many years, and when I served his government we used to spend many hours discussing how it could come to pass. So we have been familiar with it from its inception. In addition, and connected with the E.C.A. but functioning as an autonomous organization, is the African development bank which held its formative convention in Lagos, Nigeria a few days ago. Then, there is the United Nations technical assistance agency with headquarters in Addis Ababa.

It was thought that, because of my familiarity with these various organizations, my experience might be put to good account, not for the benefit of the Liberal party, as I understand, but for the benefit of Canada and her external aid program. Since we did not have a recess, as we had expected at one time, plans for this assignment were delayed, until the crisis in the Congo due to military pressure reached a point where there were justifiable fears for the well-being of Canadians who were being held as hostages.

Briefly, the following is a summary of what has been done to gain the release of these hostages. A few weeks ago the organization for African unity set up a special ad hoc conciliatory committee for the Congo. This commission was charged with responsibility for trying to work out an answer to the complex political problems of the Congo. Because this organization was in existence, it was felt that the only sensible approach to the rebels would be by way of this ad hoc commission. When I first arrived in Africa I had an opportunity to discuss this with Mr. Nkrumah, the president of Ghana and, in particular, with his foreign minister who is a member of this ad hoc commission which I have just mentioned. I soon found out in discussion with them and with officials of some other countries who had a good deal to do with this commission that the general attitude in the minds of many Africans toward these hostages was: "Let them remain there; if they can do some good in stopping the dropping of bombs from Congo military airplanes provided by the United States, or the advance of mercenary soldiers who, reportedly, are paid out of Belgian funds, they will be performing some useful purpose; but if the presence of the hostages fails to do this, let them all die together."

This is the very difficult attitude with which we were faced. While I did not agree with this attitude—it is contrary to all humanitarian reasoning and certainly it is in contravention of any of the Geneva conventions which have been signed—it is one which is, nevertheless, held by a great many representatives of the African countries. What did we do after this? Without going into all the details, may I say that we used our knowledge of the situation and the contacts we had with various individuals to appeal to two of the older men of Africa, both of whom are held in great respect and both of whom have shown they understand the responsibility of democratic government and humanitarian dealing between peoples. One of them is the Prime Minister of Kenya, Mr. Jomo Kenyatta, the chairman of this ad hoc commission. In appealing to him we felt we were making a direct approach to the rebel situation because he had been authorized to deal with the Congo situation. We consulted with many individuals in Kenya as well as with the governor general Mr. Malcolm MacDonald. We were given an assurance that the lives and well-being of these hostages were guaranteed by the rebel authorities.

We then approached the Emperor of Ethiopia on the same basis. I might say I presented to Mr. Kenyatta a telegraphic letter from the Secretary of State for External Affairs to the effect that it was the hope of Canada that he, Mr. Kenyatta, would use his good offices to intervene in this hostage

situation. As we discussed the matter with the Emperor of Ethiopia it became evident that this elderly gentleman, who is regarded with such great respect across the world and who is looked on by other Africans as more or less the founder of modern Africa, possessed a deep understanding and appreciation of the issues which were involved. So the weight of the influence of these men was added to the appeal made to the rebels, first of all, to allow the Red Cross to enter and, second, to permit the Red Cross to arrange for the evacuation of the hostages.

In all these discussions Dr. George Hoffman, who is delegate general to the international committee of the Red Cross in Africa, was present. He had found it impossible to reach some of these senior authorities. Thus we were able to assist him and, in return, his presence lent weight to the argument we were putting forward, namely that this situation must be dealt with on humanitarian grounds and separated entirely from the political aspect. I may say that in addition to this general appeal for intervention and consideration on the part of the two elder statesmen of Africa I have mentioned, we came up with the idea that it would be a very good thing if the nations which had nationals among the hostages could get together to form what we called, for want of a better term, a concilium in order that they as a group, rather than unilaterally, might present their request for the objective we had been endeavouring to secure through direct negotiation. I am pleased to say that in the latter days of the negotiations both in Kenya and in Ethiopia I was joined by one of the most experienced Canadians in the Congo situation, Mr. Michel Gauvin who is a senior officer in the Department of External Affairs. At the present time he is in Nairobi more or less leading this effort to get these nations together and in recommending that the good services of India might be used, because India has a number of nationals involved as well.

This is the point at which we left and came home. We came home for the purpose of passing through Europe and contacting as many of the nations concerned as possible to encourage them to take part in a joint appeal.

All of us are sorry that it should be the case, but as those who know something about the situation realize, it was not possible in the present circumstances to gain the outright release of these hostages. The rebels were not willing to release them. Every means of persuasion has been used. Direct contact has been made through the representative of the rebel authorities, a man named Thomas Kanza, who spends his time outside the rebel held area of the Congo negotiating for and representing the Stanleyville authorities. I would be most happy if I could report to the committee that we were able to gain the consent of the rebel authorities to meet the Red Cross and grant the evacuation of these hostages. They apparently do not intend to do so. As the military situation worsens, it is obvious that they have more reason and are more intent on keeping control of these hostages than ever.

I might just say in summing up this matter which I have briefly surveyed that as I left Addis Ababa the day before yesterday I issued a statement which was intended to emphasize again the purpose of my visit and the desire and will of the Canadian government. I might say before I read this statement to the committee that we received word just a couple of hours before we released the statement that Dr. Carlson, the American medical missionary who had been condemned to die, had been given a reprieve. We felt this was a very definite step in the right direction. We were encouraged by it and we made this statement with the intention that it might further encourage consideration by the rebel authorities to grant amnesty to the hostages. I will now quote from this statement because I think it is of interest to all of us and, as it has been released to the press, it is a public document:

> As I leave Africa to report to the government of Canada on my mission, I believe it is only fitting that I should set the record straight with regard to the purpose and the results of my mission as it relates to the hostage problem in the Congo.
>
> I came to Africa at the request of the Canadian government in order to contact a number of friendly governments and exchange views with them on matters of mutual concern.

Particularly as it relates now to the new African organizations:

> Within my terms of reference, I was requested to deliver to the Prime Minister of Kenya, Mr. Jomo Kenyatta, in his capacity as chairman of the ad hoc commission on the Congo, a message from the Honourable Paul Martin, the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, expressing the concern of the Canadian government for its nationals in the Congo who are in the area of Stanleyville and about whom we have had no news since the start of hostilities last July. I was instructed also to see His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie I, whom I know personally, having served in Ethiopia from 1943 to 1958, and to call on the secretary general of the organization of African unity, His Excellency Diallo Telli.
>
> In reply to Mr. Martin's message which I delivered, Prime Minister Kenyatta assured me that he had made several appeals to the Stanleyville authorities and in response had received assurance

that the foreign civilians in Stanleyville would not be harmed. In a subsequent telegram he expressed the hope "that the lives of the persons concerned"—those in Stanleyville—"will not be in danger".

I was received by His Imperial Majesty, the Emperor of Ethiopia, on four occasions. The Emperor expressed grave concern over the fate of the Canadians and other foreign nationals held as hostages. I likewise discussed the matter with the minister of foreign affairs, Ato Ketema Yifru who, on returning from Kenya where he had conferred with Prime Minister Kenyatta and other Kenya officials—

Perhaps I might break in here to say that the first action the emperor took in this regard was to send his foreign minister, along with other senior officials, with myself back to Nairobi to carry on these negotiations. Coming back to the text of the statement:

—informed me that he also had been assured that there was no reason to fear for the lives of the foreign nationals held by the insurgent forces. During the past week end this has been re-emphasized by Mr. Thomas Kanza, the representative in East Africa of the Stanleyville authorities who on several occasions has given his firm assurance that the hostages were in no danger and there was no reason to fear for their lives.

Yesterday—

That is, the day before I left Ethiopia:

—I met His Excellency Diallo Telli, who told me Mr. Kenyatta was doing everything humanly possible for the protection of foreign nationals in Stanleyville. Mr. Telli referred me to Mr. Kenyatta's statement to the effect that Stanleyville authorities had given him assurance that foreign nationals were not in danger.

Might I just say, Mr. Chairman, that the reason I reviewed this as I did was to place the responsibility for the well-being of these hostages back on the individuals who had given me those assurances. I felt it would again place some degree of responsibility—at least the maximum which we could obtain—for their safety on the individuals who had given me these assurances. Continuing with this text:

During the course of all these discussions I continually emphasized the fact that my purpose in urging the release of the hostages through the international committee of the Red Cross was solely on humanitarian grounds, and should be considered as such apart from all political implications. I explained that Canada would very much like to see the African nations, particularly those represented on the ad hoc commission of the organization for African unity to use whatever influence they had on the Stanleyville authorities to allow the international committee of the Red Cross to be permitted to enter Stanleyville in view of the imminence of an attack by the forces of the democratic republic of the Congo. I explained that the holding of the hostages by the Stanleyville authorities is in violation of all international conventions and that they are being denied even the good offices of the international committee of the Red Cross.

[Mr. Thompson.]

I believe that this statement had some good effect, because very shortly after the text had been presented to the Ethopian minister of foreign affairs and to the secretary general of the organization of African unity by Mr. Gauvin—that is, two hours after I had left—a further message was sent by Ethiopia to Mr. Kenyatta urging him again to contact directly the Stanleyville authorities and emphasize the importance that the lives of these hostages be carefully safeguarded. A second effect of this was that I believe it speeded up the agreement amongst the member nations of this so-called concilium in such a way that today they have met in Nairobi and have agreed to ask India to take the lead in making their appeal. I think this was a very wise decision; I believe that India can have a great deal of influence.

I might briefly close my remarks, Mr. Chairman, by referring briefly to the situation that obviously is disturbing to all of us in so far as concerns the report that Belgium has placed certain troops on the Ascension islands ready for military intervention in the Stanleyville area. I know nothing about this, no more than any of us do who may have seen the report in the newspapers. On the other hand, it is the Belgians and the Americans who have the greatest number of nationals at stake, there being something over 700 Belgian nationals and some 60 Americans, a fair proportion of them being consular representatives which the rebels themselves have said are being held in confinement. I neglected to say earlier that the Canadian hostages, unlike the Americans, Belgians, Italians, and I believe one other nation, are merely being held under house arrest or compound arrest. I do know something of the concern of these nations for the large number of their nationals. We held many discussions with representatives of these two governments as well as representatives of other governments concerned in the area; but whether or not there is any truth in the story that the Belgian government has decided to take this action, I do not know. I merely refer to this because I can well understand their fear as the forces of the government close in in the Congo. Again, Mr. Chairman, may I emphasize to hon. members of the house that the situation is extremely critical.

It would be a terrible blow to the peace of Africa; it would be a very difficult situation for the organization of African unity, and it would further complicate the very difficult situation existing in the Congo, not to mention the atrocity it would represent on

any basis of humanitarian thinking, if these people should be destroyed. Therefore what we say and what we have done, and what will be said and what will be done, before the situation is cleared up is something which must be taken with the greatest of concern, forethought and carefulness, bearing in mind that any misstep might result in the tragedy that we are all so concerned about.

Let me say in closing that this experience has been a privilege for me. In spite of some of the criticisms which have been made, if the situation were to arise again where I might be asked to carry out such an assignment I would be very happy to do so. I cannot emphasize too much to the members of this committee the regard in which Canadians and Canada are held, not only by the nationals of Africa but by all those with whom we came in contact. By offering our good services and taking the initiative in an effort to free these hostages we were doing something which perhaps no one else could have done, and I am sure all members of the committee will understand this.

I could go on and make a few remarks about external aid but I think I might do that a little later on, if it is considered relevant, as at this time we are closing our deliberations on the estimates of the Department of External Affairs. I will just leave this statement as it relates to the hostages by itself, because we do not want to do anything to detract from the urgency and the gravity of the situation.

Item agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: This completes the estimates of the Department of External Affairs.

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Indian Affairs—

15. Administration, operation and maintenance including expenditures on works on other than federal property, grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, recoverable expenditures under agreements entered into with the approval of the governor in council with the governments of the provinces and territories and with local school boards in respect of social assistance to persons residing on Indian reserves other than Indians and the education in Indian schools of children other than Indian children, and to authorize the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to provide, in respect of Indian commercial activities, for the instruction and supervision of Indians, the furnishing of materials, the purchase of finished goods and, notwithstanding any other act, the sale of such finished goods, $47,742,400.

The Deputy Chairman: The committee will now proceed with the examination of the estimates of the Indian affairs branch, vote No. 15. This item is to be found on page 62 of the blue book, the details on page 65.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, I had the opportunity on another day when these items were before the committee, as did other hon. members, to make a few comments, but since that time there has been another development in the field of Indian affairs which I think is worth a comment or two. Incidentally, I understand that just within the past few days—the move may still be taking place —the Indian affairs branch, along with other offices under the minister's jurisdiction, is moving into a brand, spanking new building. Many of the personnel are there already. I hope the atmosphere of freshness, vigour and newness which exists in this new building will also have some effect on the minister and his officials, so that they may come up with fresh, invigorating approaches and policies in regard to Indian affairs.

Since the last time these items were before this committee a federal-provincial conference has been held on Indian affairs. This was a conference from which the native Indian people were excluded. Because of the exclusion of the very people whose rights and freedoms were being debated in that conference there has developed a very large degree of resentment against this government and against the provincial governments for participating in a conference held behind closed doors, and for discussing and debating and doing heaven knows what else with Indian affairs and the rights of the people themselves.

The reason given by the minister for holding this conference in secret was that it was a dominion-provincial conference, and dominion-provincial conferences have traditionally been held behind closed doors. This reasoning may be sound if this conference, as with conferences in the past, had been about fiscal arrangements, taxes, statistics or dollars and cents, but at this particular conference the federal and provincial governments were not dealing with cold, inanimate statistics but with human beings, a group of human beings incidentally who populated this part of the world countless thousands of years before Europeans ever dreamed it existed. This conference dealt with our first Canadians and their basic rights, their fundamental freedoms, their position under the law and the whole field of their social activity.

I echo, Mr. Chairman, their resentment as being excluded from this conference. They do not know what went on behind these

closed doors and I do not know that they will ever know. But certainly they should be fully advised if any similar conferences are held in the future. Regardless of the expressions of view of certain provinces the minister should insist, in his position as minister responsible for the provisions in the British North America Act concerning Indians and the land reserved for Indians, that any future conferences should be open, and that the native Indian people should be able to sit in on, participate in and listen to what is taking place with respect to their rights and freedoms. Because, as I said earlier, these native people are not statistics or taxes or cold, inanimate objects; they are human beings for whom we should have a far higher regard than was the case with this particular dominion-provincial conference.

Incidentally a suggestion was made in connection with conferences which I think the minister should reject or say something about. This was the position taken by the province of Quebec—what the other provinces said I cannot say at this stage:

> The Quebec delegation believes in the need for future federal-provincial conferences following the present one.
>
> In our opinion, these conferences should be held not only between ministers but also between the senior officials.
>
> It could be left to the federal government to convene these conferences but, in our mind, the provinces should play an active part in their preparation and especially in setting up their agenda.

I suggest to the minister that even though Quebec is his own province he should reject that sort of proposal, because all it does is carry on the proposition that these conferences which take place in secret represent the form of conference which should be followed in the future. The minister should tell the native people that he made an error in holding this last conference behind closed doors, excluding the native Indian people from it, that he does not wish to repeat that error at any future conference, and that so far as his government is concerned future conferences will be open to the native people.

It is true that following the conference, both as the communiqué mentioned and as the minister himself said in reply to questions in this chamber on November 22, there have been continual references to the idea that consultation should take place with the Indian people before anything is done. I submit that consultation will mean relatively little to the Indian people unless they are told fully, openly and honestly what the positions are that were taken by the respective provincial governments behind those closed doors.

The proposition is being held out to these native people that they might be in a better position by accepting the jurisdiction of the various provincial governments. One of the things the native people will be concerned about before accepting that proposition is the attitude adopted by this, that or any other provincial government. They do not know what that attitude is and they will not be able to discover the attitude expressed at these conferences. How are the native people going to know what the position was that was taken by the province of Quebec at that conference? How are they going to know what are the proposals the province of Quebec put forward at those discussions? How are the native people in Alberta going to know what the government of Alberta proposed at that conference? If the minister continues to say that what went on at that conference is privileged and cannot be disclosed, then the native people will never find out.

I do not intend to single out the province of Quebec, but I do happen to have some information about the representations it made at that conference. I should like to refer to one other proposal made by that province about education, and this is of vital concern to the native people of the province of Quebec. This will also be of concern to the native people of other provinces, if a similar proposal was put forward by other provincial governments. Let me read part of this proposal:

> The province of Quebec gladly accepts the proposal of the federal government to the effect that, when feasible, the Indian reservations be incorporated in the school districts of the province, providing, evidently, that the Indians contribute, one way or another, their fair share toward educational costs.

When reading between the lines, what does that mean to the Canadian native people? I do not intend to give my interpretation of it, but shall state only what the native people feel and fear as a result of this proposal. They are afraid their Indian reserves will be incorporated in the school districts, and a land tax immediately imposed for educational purposes. These lands will then be liable to seizure and sale, if the native people are unable to meet the school taxation which might be levied.

The minister did say that there was a protection in this regard in the British North America Act. I wish he would expand on that and indicate where that protection is, or what led him to that conclusion. There is a

protection section in the Indian Act to the effect that Indian lands are exempt from taxation, except those taxes which may be levied by the bands themselves for their own purposes. However, I remind the minister that laws have been changed before in respect of Indian affairs, and because there is now a protecting section in the Indian Act is no guarantee that it will remain, regardless of what the minister has said.

Mr. Woolliams: And if jurisdiction is transferred to the provinces your statement is even more accurate.

Mr. Howard: If jurisdiction is turned over to the provinces the whole protection is gone, and the Indian people will be at the mercy of heaven knows what.

The key point of all this discussion is that proposals were made by the minister and his government which still remain secret. Behind those closed doors various provinces made proposals which also remain secret. While there was some reference to the proposals by the province of Saskatchewan contained in a Regina newspaper, and I recall also seeing something in a newspaper about what the province of Manitoba suggested, these were selected references of what took place at these discussions.

You are now going to commence a program of conferences with native Indian people to discuss with them whether they will accept provincial services such as welfare, health measures and education. Can you stand up now and say that at that same time there will be a full and honest disclosure by the provinces of the proposals that they put forward at those closed door conferences? It is not the final agreement that may be arrived at between the federal government and the provincial governments that is of importance to the native people, but rather what is in the back of the minds of the provincial government officials. We owe it to these native people to tell them freely and honestly all about the detailed discussions which took place at those meetings, if the provinces will not do so. We owe it to the native people of the various provinces to be honest with them and declare fully the intentions of those provinces.

The minister will appreciate even more than I that the native people have grounds for continuing suspicion of governments, and I am not referring alone to his government. As long as these suspicions exist, that there is something underhanded taking place, the minister will not be in a position to make any really progressive steps in the field of Indian activities. This is one thing which must be cleared up before the minister can hope to develop anything worth while for the native people. The governments must have open, honest and frank discussions with them.

One other point of concern to Indian people to which I should like to make reference is the manner in which these conferences are going to take place. At page 9652 of *Hansard*, the minister stated that he was going to give clarifying explanations about this matter, and then said:

> This consulting procedure will operate at two levels.
>
> First, in every province of Canada, there shall be held a conference to which all Indians will be invited—

Does that mean that in the province of British Columbia there will be facilities available for more than 40,000 Indian people to congregate in one place?

Who is going to be responsible for the financing of the transportation of native people to these conferences? The minister talks of a conference in each province, so presumably there will only be one in each province, which will be held at a central location. Unless the public treasury is willing to finance the travelling of native Indian people so they may attend these conferences it will mean that the points of view which will get across at the conferences will be those of the native Indian people who live closest to the conferences and will be able to attend because their transportation costs will not be great. It will be the point of view of those bands who have a sufficient amount of money in their treasuries to pay the expenses of their representatives. It will not be a broad, general, representative point of view.

I think the minister owes it to the country and to the native people particularly to explain in great detail the mechanics by which these conferences will be held, how the native people are going to get there, where the conferences are going to be held, how long they are going to last, what procedure will be arranged for the discussion of ideas, what procedure will be used to reach conclusions at the conferences. Will there be voting by the people there or will there just be some sort of gathering of opinions and an attempt to assess the reaction? All of these mechanics and fine details need to be explained as soon as possible so that the native Indian people will know just where they stand with respect to these conferences. Then the minister went on to say:

After this consultation and provided the Indians agree—

I have just dealt with that point. How are you going to determine the extent of their agreement, by vote, or what is going to take place?

—that such provincial services would be desirable, there shall be a second method of consultation: the bands will be consulted—

I am omitting some words in order to retain continuity of thought.

—that is, the councils of those bands will be consulted in order to ascertain if they wish to take advantage of a program to be established in a province—

And so on. We want to know in greater detail just how this consultation procedure is going to operate. Will there be mechanics for voting set up? Will there be in the case of the bands, as I suggested earlier must also be done at the conferences, a full, honest and open expression of what is in the minds of the provincial governments so that it may be determined whether or not there are any nefarious schemes involved in this transfer of administration? These are details that the bands also want to know about. The minister went on to say:

Third, it was decided at the conference to set up, in each province, a standing Indian affairs committee which will be consulted on any administrative question concerning the Indians.

How are you going to set up these administrative committees? Are they going to be selected by the Indian affairs branch? Are they going to be selected by the minister? Are they going to be selected by the provincial governments? Are they going to be elected? Are the native Indian people themselves going to choose their own representatives on these standing Indian affairs committees? What is the fine definition of the word "consultation"? The Indians are vitally concerned about this point. "Consultation" runs throughout the whole aftermath of the dominion-provincial conference where, if anywhere, consultation should have taken place.

It is very easy to consult with someone after you have made a decision as to what you are going to do. The dominion and provincial governments can come to some agreement and in fact may well have come to some agreement behind those closed doors. I know that the native people are not merely going to accept the bland statement of the minister about consultation unless they know what consultation means. Does consultation mean that you are going to be bound by the decision of the native people or, as has been the case so often in the past, does it mean you are merely going to speak with them about a certain subject matter and then go ahead and do what you like anyway and try to look for support?

It has not been beyond the activities of Liberal governments in the past to attempt to hand pick native Indian people who support their point of view in order to use them as a consensus in making changes with regard to Indian affairs. I was going to say that this was what the present Minister of Transport did, but it probably was Walter Harris who was the first minister of citizenship and immigration. In any event, this is what the Liberal government did with regard to the amendments to the Indian Act in 1951. Their consultation procedure involved hand picking native Indian people who they knew would support them, and then saying that the opinions they expressed represented the consensus of the Indian people: "We have consulted them and they have told us this and we are going to put it into effect." The amendments to the act in 1951 were a most disgraceful and arrogant show of a desire to control all Indian affairs from the ivory tower of the minister's office, because it was at that time the minister's power was extended so that the native people could do practically nothing without first obtaining the permission of the minister.

I was reminded of this when I heard the message program over one of the radio stations at home. This is a public service to some of the remote villages. On this program the Indian agent or Indian superintendent, as he is now called, gave permission to a lonely couple in an Indian village whose child had died to proceed with the burial of their child. This sort of thing is ridiculous. Over the message program the Indian superintendent gave permission to Mr. and Mrs. So-and-so to go ahead with the burial service for their child who had died.

The 1951 amendments gave the minister virtual power of life and death over the native Indian people and their band councils. That is not the type of consultation the native people want now and its is not the type of consultation that any member of the house wants for the Indians, if he thinks seriously about the matter. I think it is up to the minister to explain in full detail what he means by consultation and what democratic processes are going to be put into effect and are going to be guaranteed so that the native people will control their own destiny, and so that some politician will not control them

merely because he happens to think it is the wise and smart thing to do.

There are many other things I mentioned earlier, about which I should like to talk, which involve details of the activities of the Indian affairs branch in my own riding of Skeena. However, we have agreed to confine consideration of the remaining estimates so that they will be completed by next Friday and I do not want to transgress the opportunity and right of other members to comment on some of these matters. But because the minister has not had the opportunity so far I would urge him to take all the time he requires to reply, not only to my proposals but to those that other members have made on the various occasions that the estimates have been before the committee, in order that we will have a full explanation of the attitude of the department and the minister, and so that the Indians will not be left in the dark and will have as complete and understanding as is possible of the manner in which the government intends to deal with their rights. After all, as I said earlier, they are human beings and deserve perhaps a far greater degree of consideration in this parliament than any other group of human beings in Canada. I am including the Eskimo people in this reference. We should be prepared to give them this consideration.

Mr. Baldwin: I have a few comments to make on this item, some of which I have delayed for some time. I did not speak on the first item of the minister's estimates because I thought it might be wise to wait until now so that my comments could be concentrated. First of all, I should like to take this opportunity of congratulating the newly appointed assistant deputy minister. I know of his work in Alberta and I am sure he will bring a great measure of satisfaction, experience and knowledge to this department. As a matter of fact, this appointment did not go as far as had been originally suggested in the joint committee report on Indian affairs. At that time I believe we considered the establishment of a separate department. However, this move goes a long way and it is long overdue. I am happy to see that the move has been made and the position is occupied as it is.

It is quite obvious, as the hon. member for Skeena has said, that the government is now giving serious consideration to what are, in effect, very drastic, very sweeping changes in the administration of Indian affairs. In doing so they will tend to shift jurisdiction, responsibility or administration or possibly a combination of all three. This, of course, is indicated in the press communiqué released following the conference the hon. member for Skeena mentioned. Let me make it quite plain that this was also a matter to which we referred in the joint committee. Personally, I believe this is a move in the right direction. There were a number of briefs presented by Indian bands indicating concern about the possibility, which was posed to them during a meeting of the committee, of a change of jurisdiction from the federal to the provincial government. My own view is that it is not right that we should have two sets of laws pertaining to groups of people in this country and that the ultimate, most desirable result, will be to have, as circumstances permit and people themselves require, jurisdiction put into the hands of provincial governments so that there will be an integration of the rights and responsibilities of the people of Canada.

Having said that, I must say that we must move with the utmost care, the utmost caution, not only to see that equity is done but to give the appearance of doing equity. In our dealings with the Indian people in the past, this has not been the case. The suspicions which they have indicated they possess are suspicions which they are certainly entitled to harbour because of what has happened in previous years. There must be the most careful, sympathetic consideration given in each instance to each band, each group, each section, each district and each area. It must not be done by wholesale regulations issued from Ottawa and bearing on all parts of the country.

We have to make it crystal clear that there will be no compulsion, no force of any kind. Any changes which will be made will only be made after the fullest consultation, discussion and advice. In the final analysis, the choice will be the choice of the Indian people themselves. I have had some experience with the Indian people in my area, and there are many thousands of them there. I can think of a number of cases in which departmental officials have attempted to compel these people to have closer contact with the white people with a view to fitting them into the white man's world. These conditions were not acceptable to the Indians within the area, as was proven by the results. I am not going to go into the details, but there is not the slightest doubt but that there are as many problems as there are Indians. Perhaps there is not an Indian problem so much as there are many Indians who have problems.

It is obvious to me therefore, Mr. Chairman, that consideration is a condition precedent to what I propose to deal with subsequently. I am not raising the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in, I think it is the Sikyea case, otherwise known as the case of the lame duck, but I want to extract from that case the fact that by a decision of the territorial court of appeal, which was confirmed in the Supreme Court of Canada, the Indian treaties have now been relegated to a position where they have very little legal effect. I do not think there is any question about that. The statement made by Mr. Justice Johnston, who delivered the judgment of the territorial court of appeal after hearing the case at Yellowknife, indicates that this is the situation. I feel this is going to have the effect of increasing the existing suspicions that so many of the Indian people have with regard to the rights which they feel should be theirs under the terms of these treaties, and as to the intentions and policies of the white man, particularly the white man's government.

This, in turn, is bound to have some effect on the proposal of the government in connection with the Indian claims commission. I believe the terms of this commission are now being considered. In my view, they will have to be substantially widened from those originally contemplated. They will have to be made more equitable, and benefits extended to people and situations which were never originally contemplated when the first measure was being introduced. There is no doubt at all, Mr. Chairman, about the fact that this decision downgrading the Indian treaties and the benefits which they were intended to confer upon the Indian people, is going to be detrimental. Certainly, as a result of the decision the use of the word "treaty" becomes absolutely meaningless. These treaties do not have the effect of treaties.

It does not do any harm to refresh our memories by examining some of these treaties very briefly to ascertain just what was said. I think that this was done very well by the hon. member for the Northwest Territories when he was speaking on these treaties some time ago. I have here a treaty which affects the Indian people in a very large area of northwest Canada. One particular section which I think is of interest reads as follows:

> And Her Majesty the Queen hereby agrees with the said Indians that they shall have right to pursue their usual vocations of hunting, trapping and fishing throughout the tract surrendered as heretofore described, subject to such regulations as may from time to time be made by the government of the country, acting under the authority of Her Majesty, and saving and excepting such tracts as may be required or taken up from time to time for settlement, mining, lumbering, trading or other purposes.

This section should be read in connection with a letter which accompanied the treaty because it indicates the frame of mind with which the Indian people approach the execution of these treaties, and makes even more unfair the conditions which now have been attached to the treaties and the effect which they are having. I have here a letter dated September 22, 1899 sent to the superintendent general of Indian affairs in connection with the signing of this particular treaty, treaty no. 8. I should like to read this paragraph from the letter—the agent who negotiated the treaty is discussing the difficulty he encountered when he was negotiating on this matter of hunting and fishing privileges with the Indians.

> Our chief difficulty was the apprehension that the hunting and fishing privileges were to be curtailed.

How right the Indians were in having those apprehensions.

> The provision in the treaty under which ammunition and twine is to be furnished went far in the direction of quieting the fears of the Indians because they admitted it would be unreasonable to furnish the means of hunting and fishing if laws were to be enacted which would make hunting and fishing so restricted as to render it impossible to make a livelihood by such pursuits.
>
> But over and above the provision, we had to solemnly assure them that only such laws as to hunting and fishing as were in the interest of the Indians and were found necessary in order to protect the fish and fur bearing animals would be made and that they would be as free to hunt and fish after the treaty as they would be if they never entered into it.

In addition, some consideration should be given to the appreciation the Indian people had as to the effect of these treaties. The white man believed in the personal and private ownership of land, but the Indian had an entirely different concept. This was made very plain during the meetings of the joint committee at which we heard a most interesting witness, a Mrs. Worthington, who has had a lot of experience and done a lot of research. At page 108 of the transcript of the evidence given before the joint committee in the year 1959 this interesting paragraph appears:

> The tribe are tenants and in a sense trustees. The Indians may have granted loans to the whites. They possibly granted rights to pass overland, to lend the whites use of land, the right to cultivate it, to use its waters, animals, birds, fish, but with the expectation that at the end of the loan the

whites would return the land, the waters, and that the animals, fish and birds would be replenished, the scars healed.

Of course, this conception came into conflict with the use of the land made by the white man. After the treaty had been signed, the white man felt himself free to deal with the land as he saw fit. There was no true meeting of minds. What the Indians thought when they agreed to these treaties was not what the white man thought. And, of course, the recent decisions in the Supreme Court of Canada confirm that the white man's view is the one which must prevail. For these reasons I submit that when the Indian claims commission is established the minister and his officials should give the most careful consideration to the requests and to the briefs which I am sure the Indian people are presenting. Let there be no stone unturned in the effort to ensure that the terms of reference to this commission will be wide enough to ensure that all legitimate complaints will be dealt with fairly and equitably. I think, too, that in all justice the government should consider amending the Indian Act so as to place these treaties in a far higher category than that in which they have been placed as a result of the recent decisions of the supreme court, and requiring the courts to give effect to such a clause. I know we have to be reasonable. We cannot turn back the clock and give the Indians back what they once had, even if that were desirable. But I think we must start immediately to put them in a position they would have enjoyed but for the effect of downgrading the treaties.

I wish now to make a suggestion in connection with education. There has been established in the last year and a half in the northern part of Alberta a vocational training school which, while it is open to all young people, was specially designed to permit the Indian peoples of northern Alberta and the territories to receive a trade training which would enable them to find a place in society. It has been found that many of the Indian boys and girls attending this school are not equipped scholastically, although grade eight rather than grade nine has been accepted as being the minimum standard required for individuals, to deal with the subject matter being taught. It was suggested in a brief submitted to the Department of Labour, copies of which I believe I sent to the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, that a number of satellite schools be set up throughout the area so that the young people who would ultimately be going to this training school might receive better training than in the past and consequently, when they did arrive at the school, would be better able to profit from the instruction given to them. I have made a point of visiting this school on several occasions. Excellent work is being done there. The principal, Mr. Bill Thomas, is a full blooded Indian who has had a notable career in business, industry and education. He is doing a wonderful job and it was inspiring to watch these young Indian people equipping themselves, side by side with white people, with skills which will serve them well in their careers. However, in order that best advantage may be taken of the facilities offered by this school it is necessary that the additional step I have mentioned should be taken. I suggest that the minister and his officials establish liaison with the Minister of Labour whose department is charged with responsibility in connection with these vocational schools, so that an educational program may be made available.

Finally I wish to say something about agriculture. There are a number of areas in the north country where the Indians might well avail themselves of opportunities to take up farming. Unfortunately there is one hindrance; they find they are unable to take advantage of credit facilities such as are generally available today under the terms of the Farm Credit Act, the Farm Improvement Loans Act and the bill recently passed by this house, the farm syndicate machinery bill. The reason is that the Indian people have no title to their land; they farm only under a certificate of occupation. Consequently they are not eligible for credit under any of the various bills I have mentioned. I suggest that the minister should give serious consideration to this problem and consider whether arrangements could not be made to enable the Indian people to have access to credit of this type in order to improve their farms, purchase machinery and help themselves attain a higher standard of living. The opportunities afforded to them should be brought in line with those afforded to white settlers in similar circumstances.

There is one other matter I should like to mention. I asked the minister a question on the orders of the day about ten days ago—whether or not when he proposed to make adjustments in connection with the transfer of jurisdiction and responsibility in connection with Indians to the provincial governments he thought it would be necessary to do so by bringing a measure before parliament to have an amendment made to the Indian Act. His answer was that it was not necessary. I

realize this is not the occasion on which to enter into an argument as to the law, but I have reason to believe that if the changes which are now contemplated are of the nature which appear to be outlined in the press release, in the communiqué, there will have to be changes in the Indian Act. I believe the executive does not have the power to make these changes. From the viewpoint of legality, therefore, I think it is essential that the matter be brought into the house, and I believe that from the viewpoint of propriety as well changes of this nature should be considered by parliament and not merely by the executive.

The hon. member for Skeena a moment ago referred to the question of taxation. I think that is dealt with, if I recall correctly, by section 86 of the Indian Act, which in fact prohibits the taxation of lands of Indians, individually or in bands, in Indian reserves. But as one goes through the Indian Act section by section it seems quite apparent that sweeping changes of the kind contemplated, having in mind that the federal government is charged with the sole and exclusive responsibility under the British North America Act for matters relating to Indians, would not be possible without there being first secured the approval of parliament. I would urge the minister and his legal advisers to make quite certain, before these changes are brought about, that they are doing something by executive decree which they have the right to do, because I have grave doubts whether this right exists.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take up too much of the time of the minister because I hope to hear him reply at length to the comments of the hon. member for Skeena and the hon. member for Peace River; but as an honorary chief of the Ojibway band of Christian island, in the southern part of Georgian bay—an honour that I share with the hon. member for Simcoe East—I have been asked by the band to make a simple request of the minister of citizenship. I would point out that you do not use the term "immigration" when you are speaking of the Indians of Canada and addressing the minister. I have been requested to ask the minister of citizenship if he will consider granting $6,000 to the Ojibway band of Christian island for the installation of a marine telephone line from Cedar point to this island. They have occupied the island for several hundred years. This is one of the finest Indian reservations in the country, and they are absolutely cut off from the rest of Canada by a stretch of water of 1½ miles. The nearest telephone service to them is a municipally-owned line in the township of Tiny, with 235 co-operative subscribers. We are unable to spend $6,000 to bring in one or two telephone lines to Christian island, and if the Indian affairs branch would appropriate only $6,000 for this purpose, it would help the Indian band immensely.

Under vote 15 we are voting money and authorizing the minister of citizenship to provide instruction and supervision and to furnish materials in respect of Indian commercial activities. These Indians on Christian island are now operating a commercial pheasantry; they raise 4,000 or 5,000 pheasants a year. The hunting season is open seven months of the year, from September 1 to March 31, and yet would-be hunters from Hamilton, Toronto, Oshawa and large urban centres in central Ontario are unable to get in touch with them by telephone. There is a radio-marine telephone, which has been in operation for about two years, in the Indian agent's office to communicate with Midland; but you cannot talk to the island except during the hours when the office of the superintendent of Indian affairs on the island is open, and it is not open during week ends, when most of the hunting is done.

For an expenditure of merely $6,000 the Indians on Christian island would be put in touch with thousands of would-be hunters who are willing to spend money on the island in their pursuit of pheasants for seven months of the year. It would also give direct access to the mainland. They are now leasing cottage property sites on the island, which is becoming big business. As vote 15 covers advances by the minister for commercial activities of the Indians so they may be self-employed, I strongly urge that he give consideration in the current year to spending $6,000 for a marine telephone cable from Cedar point to Christian island Indian reservation in the southern Georgian bay.

Mr. Leboe: Mr. Chairman, I will take only a couple of minutes. My interest in the Indian dates back quite a long time. In the days of the 'flu epidemic back in 1920, as a result of the discovery of a number of very serious situations throughout the province at that time it so happened that it was ascertained that Indians dead, alive and dying were all occupying the same beds. The end result was that my father, although he had a very large family of 11 living children at that time, took three Indian lads and helped to raise them. As a matter of fact, they grew up with the

rest of the boys, including myself. Further than that, in the lumber business operation it was our privilege to have in the Babine lake area a complete crew of Indian lads working in the saw mill industry. We found them to be a little bit on the irresponsible side, naturally, because it was not in their make-up to stick with the job for any length of time. However, this was solved very simply by having the chief become responsible for seeing that we had a crew every morning. Believe me, there was no doubt in the world that every morning we had a full crew—maybe not the same ones, but we had a full crew every day, because the chief made sure that if one Indian disappeared another took his place.

Over the years I have been advocating that we get into a situation where we can somehow have one jurisdiction. I am glad the government is looking into this proposition and working—we hope all the way—with the Indians themselves to accomplish this very, very desirable result. Previous speakers have dealt very fully with this question and I want to commend the hon. member for Peace River and the hon. member for Skeena on their speeches today and the questions that have been put. We will be looking forward with interest to the answers that will be coming forward to some of these questions, and there is no need to deal with them further at this time, Mr. Chairman.

The important thing, in my view, is that whatever society needs to do in order to carry on, if there are some things that society is going to deprive the Indian of, let us see that the Indian gets something better in return. This is possible, surely. I think it should be borne in mind at all times that if for some reason in the development of society some things have to be taken away from the Indian, we should return to him more than we are taking away. This is quite possible, of course. With those few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the estimates passed. I am sure several hon. members would like to take part in the debate this afternoon. I would just like to say thank you to the government for their apparent interest, and I would ask them to pay very close attention to the remarks made by the hon. member for Peace River and the hon. member for Skeena.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, I have but a few observations to address to the minister responsible for Indian affairs, and they have to do with an Indian band in my area, the Weymontachie.

A few weeks ago, I got in touch with the minister to try and provide those Indians with decent accommodation. During a visit I made to the Sanmaur area, where their reserve is located, I noticed that their accommodations were—no, I would not say poor—just non-existent. Their village dates back to some 50 years and the houses are even older, so that those Indians prefer, even right in the middle of January, to live in tents. Conditions there are almost inhuman.

I, therefore, asked the minister to press this affair and find a solution to the housing problem facing this Indian band.

The radar station located but a few miles from where this Indian band lives was closed recently. I then suggested to the minister that this Indian band be established in that abandoned radar station. Those Indians could take advantage of appropriate schools and even of a hospital, and benefit from all necessary services. The minister told me that after consulting with some high officials who deal with those Indians, he had come to the conclusion that it was impossible to transfer them to that location, because they could not be provided with the education and other necessary services. I wonder then what are these essential services which are not to be found in Parent.

Eventually these people will have to be moved because I know that the Quebec government intends to build a hydroelectric dam in that county and that part of that area will be flooded. Therefore, we have to think about relocating that Indian reserve. I would like to ask the minister if he has given serious consideration to finding a solution. If the solution I have suggested is not agreeable to him, I would urge him to find another one, because it is essential to provide suitable accommodation for that Indian band as soon as possible, as well as educational and medical facilities, in short, all that is necessary from a humanitarian point of view.

[*Text*]

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, at this hour I almost hesitate to take part in this debate, but for a number of years I have looked forward to saying something about the Indian affairs branch of the department, and on each occasion seemed to find myself in much the same position in which I find myself today. However, I should like to say a few things and I will try and be brief, so that

others who may want to make a few remarks may do so.

There are a few Indian reserves in one part of my riding, and every time I visit them I must say I am appalled at the conditions I find there. When I look at the estimates of the department over the years going back a considerable period of time, I am appalled at the amount of money spent and at the little positive result we have seen. I believe the purpose of the department, if it is anything, should be to create a new dignity for and respect toward these native people of our country. I cannot help but ask the question whether or not we are achieving that today, with the expenditures we are making and the way they are being used.

In saying that I am not being critical of those who work in the department. One has only to visit any of the reserves in my area to realize that something more is needed. I believe one of the things which is needed is a greater sympathy for the Indians, greater independence for them and a less paternal outlook on the part of the department, as well as perhaps a little more co-operation with those agencies which exist locally to try to help these people. I understand that at the present time it is very difficult indeed for an individual on a reserve to secure assistance in a case where he is the boss of the enterprise he is trying to manage. I know the situation with regard to this particular matter. There are many who perhaps are not ready for that full measure of confidence that the department would like to give; but there are some, and an increasing number, who I believe could be given much more confidence than the department and its officials are giving them today.

As I talk to those who have been very close to reserves in years gone by I get the impression that this situation seems to be getting worse with the passage of the years, and that there has been some deterioration in the character of those who might have become very good citizens of our country. I believe one of the essentials is to create a spirit of initiative, a sense of self-respect and pride; and I want to leave the thought with the minister that perhaps a partial answer to this might be to encourage some resettlement of those who are desirous of such resettlement, without any loss of treaty rights presently existing. This might give them a better opportunity to take part in the life of the community in a province or in the country at large. From speaking to some of them I find they are very disappointed at the way some of their fondest hopes are neglected, sometimes discarded, by officials of the department, including officials of the department in Ottawa when a matter is sent down to headquarters for decision.

I believe that we have a good staff generally, but in recruiting staff for the department I think more consideration should be given to a preference for people who have proven through experience that they have sympathy for and the understanding of the Indian people. These people are found in any area where there is a reserve. I believe that if these people are recruited to the staff of the department and given a little training and instruction, though they might not have much formal training otherwise, they might get a grasp of what is the department's policy, which I hope of course is one which will give more and more responsibility to the individual on the reserve.

Other hon. members have dealt with other various aspects of this matter and I will not go over them. I will not mention any personal cases which may have come to my attention, though there have been one or two. I should like to see the department try to give these people the same opportunities they would give anybody else in this country, and this can only be done by giving them more responsibility than that which the department seems to be prepared or able to give them today.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the estimates of this department will get through today, and I am sure many hon. members agree with me there. I will not be too lengthy, but like the hon. member for Peace River I should like to congratulate the new assistant deputy minister, Mr. Battle. On many occasions when we were attempting to work out Indian problems on the reserves in the constituency of Bow River he was extremely helpful. He is one official who at that time, while working in that area, was liked and respected by the bands of Indians. I hope in his position now he will be able to exercise some influence upon the department of Indian affairs.

I was very impressed by the speeches made by the hon. members for Skeena and Peace River, and felt that they touched upon an important problem facing the Indians, particularly in relation to these so-called conferences. As pointed out by both those speakers, when we are considering amendments to the constitution affecting Indian rights we should keep in mind the Indian treaties which were signed by officials of Canada and the Indians.

I have in my hand a copy of the book "John A. Macdonald, the old Chieftain" by Donald Creighton, from which I should like to read one paragraph, because of its reference to these treaty rights. I have sent photostatic copies of this paragraph to all the chiefs of the various reservations in Alberta because it emphasizes some of the history behind the treaty of 1886. This is what Creighton says about John A. Macdonald, the old chief. Macdonald had left Winnipeg early in the day in the year following the completion of the railway, and Mr. Creighton writes:

> But the darkness of the long summer day had already fallen when the train finally pulled up at Gleichen, the little station, east of Calgary, in the heart of the Blackfoot country. Chief Crowfoot, who in the dark days at the beginning of the northwest rebellion had pledged the loyalty of his tribe to Macdonald, was waiting, a little on his dignity, for he had been led to expect the visitors nearly three hours before; and it was not until very early the following morning that the Indians, who had come to the rendezvous in full force, began to assemble for the pow-wow. The lesser chiefs—Old Sun, Eagle Rib, Medicine Shield, Running Eagle, Little Plume—sat about portentiously in full war-paint and feathers. Crowfoot alone was in his oldest clothes—in memory, he informed Macdonald, of the dead Poundmaker. His face, with its well shaped features and fine lines, was shrewd and proud and intelligent. He told the listening Indians that Macdonald was the "biggest man" they had had among them for a long time. He begged Macdonald to banish the fears of the Indians for their children's nourishment and welfare. Then the Indians did a dance, and presents were distributed; and Macdonald gave Crowfoot a dark broadcloth suit with silk facings—a proper suit of mourning.

It is only about two weeks ago that I stood in a hall at Gleichen on the Blackfoot reservation in the very place where John A. Macdonald met Chief Crowfoot.

When the people at that time signed these treaties they understood that certain rights would be guaranteed. I was very pleased at the way the hon. member for Skeena referred to the so-called consultations. It seems to me the kind of consultation we should have if, as I think we do, we have respect for these treaties, is by way of plebiscite. As the hon. member so ably stated, the proposed consultations would be with hand picked individuals, whom the department, the minister or others, wanted because of the influence they might have on programs to be outlined.

I should be very disappointed if this government placed the administration of Indian affairs under the jurisdiction of provincial governments, because this administration is one of those things delegated by section 91 of the British North America Act to the federal government. Certainly these rights should not be used to satisfy the desires and ambitions of certain provincial premiers. After all, these rights are based on treaties. Last evening we heard discussion about giving $350,000 to Indonesia. I wish we could persuade the officials of some weekly magazines or newspapers to send their representatives across this country to take photographs of the homes in which our Canadian Indians are living. Several newspapers have suggested that I am extreme in the language I use. Perhaps what is extreme to some is not extreme to others. I have visited the reserves at Morley and at Gleichen, and with the exception of the new housing development which is progressing very slowly, these people live in hovels.

Mr. Bigg: And they are the best.

Mr. Woolliams: The hon. member suggests that those are the best homes. If they are, I should not like to see the worst.

It is all very well for the minister to smile, and I am not blaming him by any means for this situation which has existed for a long time, but the Indians are living in destitute circumstances, and let us not forget that fact. I see an hon. member shaking his head. If he has any doubts about what I am saying I invite him to go there and see for himself.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Chairman, we are not smiling at what the hon. member is saying, but at the way in which he is saying it.

Mr. Woolliams: You were shaking your head as though you were not in agreement. I hope you are in agreement, because the situation there is appalling. Their standards of living, even under the most native conditions, was much better than has been the case since our arrival.

These people are paid $5 treaty money per month. That amount was established some 100 years ago. What effect has the inflationary trend alone had on the value of that monthly payment? What is it worth today? Just as a matter of interest I consulted the dominion bureau of statistics about a lawsuit in which a $30,000 judgment had been given, and was informed that it would now be worth only $25,000. That would indicate there has been a decrease in the value by at least one fifth, and one can readily see the change in value of the $5 treaty money over the 100 year period.

If we are going to wage that war on poverty talked about so often by the President of the United States and others, we should

establish one of our battle lines on the reservations of this country. I do not wish to speak in incendiary terms, but if there were more of these people and they were organized, we would be faced with a rebellion in this country. No other class of people in this country would put up with the poverty and standard of living we find on these reservations.

Changes are constantly being made without consultation with the native people. Two hospitals to which the women went to have their babies were closed without consultation. These women must now travel to hospitals elsewhere. While I realize some changes must be made, the Indians find that they are being made at great inconvenience to them. How is an Indian husband receiving his $5 per month expected to take his wife from the reserve at Gleichen to a hospital in Calgary to have her baby? Sometimes he is even forced to beg a ride from other people. These are the actual circumstances that these people must accept. Not one word of what I have said is exaggerated and I have never before described these circumstances in the kind of terms I intend to use this afternoon. The circumstances are disgraceful.

If a newspaper editorial writer wishes to write another statement to the effect that Eldon Woolliams speaks in extreme language, let him send his newspapermen to these areas to observe for themselves the poverty stricken conditions and disgraceful circumstances under which these Indians are forced to exist. I am not now referring to the housing development which was commenced under the Conservative administration—and even it moved very slowly. There are only a few houses completed and I do not know who chooses the families to live in them. I do know, however, that the majority of homes occupied by Indians are nothing more than hovels. We constantly refer to and talk about missionaries going to underdeveloped countries of the world where the inhabitants are living under substandard conditions. We had better look to our own backyards, because they certainly need cleaning up.

In reference to Indian claims, let us immediately set up a program so the Indians can bring their claims before a proper commission. Surely that could be done quickly. There is a case now pending with reference to the Blackfoot reserve involving several million dollars. I do not know anything about the facts, but do you know what the chief of the Blackfoot reserve tells me? He tells me that the documents he wants to prove the claim have been refused him day after day. Some people say they have disappeared entirely so that their claim will never be proven. How does the department deal with these people?

I hope that Mr. Battle, with the sympathy I know he has for these people and who understands the circumstances, will exercise his influence so that in that regard they will receive better treatment. There are things that should be said in this regard. The whole of the rights of the Indians are based on treaties but, as the hon. member for Skeena said, how can the Indians trust the white man? These treaties were signed and certain rights were guaranteed the Indians. Certain standards of living were guaranteed them. You may say that there are always two sides to these matters; but these people who are living with us and among us as Canadians and with Canadians, are the real Canadians, and we have reduced them to a standard of living lower than that of the peasants 50, 75 or 100 years ago in certain places in Europe and Asia. So we have an obligation to the Indians.

There is just one thing I should like to say about the kind of consultation that should take place. Let us give the Indians a plebiscite before changing the jurisdiction. Let us give them a standard of living that is realistic. Let us see that they receive the treaty money about which they talk. We talk about a contributory pension plan but it will not affect these people because they have nothing to contribute. To be realistic they should be getting at least $50 a month and the kind of homes that will enable them to live in dignity with their families. I say, set up the claims commission immediately, respect their treaty rights and let us declare war on poverty among the Indians. This may be one of my shortest speeches but I have never been more sincere. Let us have something done in this regard.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, I understand we have to go to the other place at 5.45 and I am wondering what the intentions are with regard to these estimates and whether or not they will be followed through on Monday.

Mr. McIlraith: No, Mr. Chairman. The arrangement was that on Monday the justice estimates would be called for one day, so I am unable at the moment to say when we will come back to these estimates.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the point just raised by the hon. member for Port Arthur I would hope that the house leader, in arranging for further consideration of these estimates and in view of what he has

said about the understanding respecting Monday, of which we are all aware, will take into consideration the fact that certain other estimates took longer today than some of us had anticipated and that one of the most neglected subjects during this entire session has been the question of Indian affairs. We really have not had the kind of opportunity we would have liked to have to hear the minister's views on certain questions.

Mr. McIlraith: I am quite aware of that. I had expected there would have been that full opportunity today. I realize there has not been but all I am able to say at the moment is that on Monday we will consider the justice estimates. However, I will certainly try to take account of what has happened today. Our expectations with regard to today were somewhat different, but I will try to see how an opportunity to complete these estimates properly can be worked into the program.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak at length on this topic and I am not going to have the time to do so now. I want to raise what I think is the major problem in connection with the Indians. It is a problem that has not been touched upon in this debate and I have not raised it before because of a natural hesitancy in connection with the subject. But I have come to the conclusion that it is the most vital problem in connection with the Indians. I have seen it in depth in my own part of the country. It is the factor that is demoralizing the situation more than anything else and destroying most of the progress. I am not making these remarks with any bravery in bringing this matter out into the open, but I believe we have got to talk about it and we have got to ascertain the position and stance of the Indian affairs branch with regard to it. We have got to find out how they are going to meet it. It may be we will be told it is perhaps not the main problem throughout the country but only in the part of the country I represent.

I am talking about the problem of alcoholism, overdrinking and all the consequences and difficulties that flow from it. We are beginning to take a greater and greater interest in the Indians. I am, as a member of the house, and I have at least 7,000 Indians in my riding. There are a number of reserves and also a great number of Indians who are nomads. I have increased my knowledge but at the same time decreased whatever confidence I had in my own ideas or in the ideas of the Indian affairs branch to move with speed to meet the problem.

There are two matters that are never talked about but which seem to me to be central, and the major one from my point of view is alcoholism and drinking, and the effect of drinking upon these people and their place in society. The other is a very controversial subject that is touched on occasionally. I refer to the whole question of religion, the religious approach and the relationship of the religious communities, mainly Anglican and Roman Catholic, to the Indians on their reserves and in the missions.

In my own travels I have never encountered any missionaries or other people working with the Indians for whom I had any disrespect. I have a tremendous admiration for some of these people whose lives are full of hard work and filled with frustration because of the inadequacy of response, either in religious or social terms, to their teaching and the work they do. But if we are going to have a realistic appraisal of the Indian situation it seems to me that we need to know more accurately what the effect is of the religious association with Indians across the country, and we simply have to know much more about the problem of alcoholism and drinking.

I want to give some examples to indicate why drinking is a problem. Many of you may remember that a few years ago the regulations regarding drinking in Ontario were altered so that Indians could play the part of normal citizens in the use of beer parlours and so on. At that time I was one of those who believed very strongly that they should have this right. I did not want to see them segregated from the same opportunities that all the rest of us have, and I have not changed my opinion in that regard. But when I go to communities such as Sioux Lookout, Armstrong, Nakina, Beardmore, Macdiarmid, Heron Bay and other places in my riding and see some of the consequences of the opening up of opportunities to drink, when I see the extent of all the difficulties that follow from this overdrinking, it makes me realize that, in a way, this is a crime that our free society with its mores and practices commits, because of the effect upon these people who have not really been a part of this society and have not been brought up in our tradition.

Recently at a certain place in my riding—I am sure some of the people in the Indian affairs branch will know about this—a considerable spending program was completed for a school and teacherage. Almost before the carpenters had cleared out, nearly every window in this new building was broken and

other damage was done. By whom was it done? It was done by teen age girls and young fellows. I do not know what the police court evidence may disclose, but I understand a couple of them are now in jail. This was the result of drinking. It was not a random incident in that particular location. There have been thousands of incidents like this.

Just a day or two ago there was an annual meeting or pow-wow when the treaty money was handed out and a new band council was picked. Within two days the chief was in the hospital, after being almost kicked to death by his fellow councillors of the band. All of them had been involved in a big drinking session. This is incident No. 2. I could name, in connection with that group of Indians, many others, perhaps dozens of incidents like this which indicate the breakdown in morality.

One of the most shocking things that happened in my constituency happened to one of the simplest and noblest characters I have met, a Roman Catholic priest. He was attacked by Indians who were drinking. This man had laboured in the community and had given a great deal to it. However, aroused by the noise and tumult of this kind of session, things exploded and went too far. How you get an analysis of the effect of this kind of drinking upon Indians, I do not know.

May I just give one last example to point out to hon. members what is involved, and the difficulties of the Indian affairs branch? I received a letter from a young Indian couple to the effect that winter was coming on, their house on the reserve was completely inadequate, and could I ask the Indian affairs department to do something about it. I went to see the young couple. It was a long drive of 150 miles through the bush. I got there to see them sitting in their house. You could see the dust from the yard blowing through the cracks in the house, and I got very worked up about this, to think that the branch had done nothing for them. They gave me this story. They were a very contrite, soft spoken couple and I accepted their story. Incidentally, there was nothing wrong with the young man or young woman; they were not crippled. I spoke to the Indian affairs branch, and was told they had provided the couple with paint, Ten-Test and all the materials necessary to fix up their house. The branch had trucked them in all that distance. What had this young couple done? They had taken the material almost as soon as the one truck was off the reserve, carted it away and sold it. What followed was that they went on a week long drunk and left their children alone. As a consequence we had the children's aid people coming in.

This state of affairs is desperately serious. It is at the core of almost every problem I know of in relation to the Indians in northwestern Ontario. If the minister knows anything about the Indian situation, he will know that they are in as desperate a situation as anyone else anywhere. There is a breakdown here that relates to work. A couple of years ago, I talked with some of the Abitibi foremen up near a place called Auden. They had tried to work some Indians into the pulp cutting operation. Auden is up in the north corner of lake Nipigon. The reports from the union stewards and the foremen agreed that these Indians were able-bodied and strong enough to do this type of work. They have all the skill. But what happened? After they had worked a few days and there was a bit of money piled up, a cheque came along. As soon as the cheque came along, they took off. In this particular case of which I am speaking, they had not paid their union dues. They just took off, and they were gone for several weeks. Their money lasted them that long. A couple of them finally came back, and they were in very bad shape because again they had been off on a long boozing session. They could not understand why the company was hesitant about hiring them again. The company did hire them again and the very same thing happened as soon as the first cheque came along.

Two years ago, I visited another Abitibi camp down near Regan. Again, there is an Indian reservation near there called Mobert, and this has been one of the busiest cutting areas Abitibi has had. There are over 100 able-bodied men and I do not know how many women on that reserve.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall I rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again?

Progress reported.

Resolutions adopted in committee of supply this day reported and concurred in.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

A message was delivered by Major C. R. Lamoureux, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Deputy Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable house in the chamber of the Honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the house went up to the Senate chamber.

And being returned:

Mr. Deputy Speaker informed the house that the Deputy Governor General had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills:

An act to provide for the establishment of harbour commissions.

An act to repeal certain acts of the province of Newfoundland respecting harbours and pilotage.

An act to provide for the establishment of electoral boundaries commissions to report upon the readjustment of the representation of the provinces in the House of Commons and to provide for the readjustment of such representation in accordance therewith.

It being ten minutes after six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

[The following items were passed in committee of supply this day:]

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Loans, investments and advances—

External aid office—

L14a. Special loan assistance for developing countries in the current and subsequent fiscal years, subject to such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may approve, for the purpose of undertaking such economic, educational and technical projects as may be agreed upon by Canada and the developing countries or recognized international development institutions, $50,000,000.

B—International joint commission—

40. Salaries and expenses of the commission and Canada's share of the expenses of studies, surveys and investigations of the commission, $151,500.

Loans, investments and advances—

L12a. Loans to the government of India to finance the purchase in Canada of aircraft and associated spare parts and equipment in accordance with a financial agreement entered into between the government of Canada and the government of India, $1,367,100.

L13a. To extend the purposes of the account mentioned in Vote 630 of the Appropriation Act No. 2, 1954, to provide advances for medical expenses as well as to posts and to employees on posting abroad and to increase to $1,500,000 the amount that may be charged at any time to that account; additional amount required, $400,000.

A—Department

External aid office—

35. Economic, technical, educational and other assistance as detailed in the estimates, $75,600,000.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, November 23, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

NEW MEMBER

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that the Clerk of the House has received from the chief electoral officer a certificate of the election and return of Mrs. Margaret Rideout, for the electoral district of Westmorland.

NEW MEMBER INTRODUCED

Mrs. Margaret Rideout, member for the electoral district of Westmorland, introduced by Right Hon. L. B. Pearson and Hon. H. J. Robichaud.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1964-65

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting supplementary estimates for the financial year ending March 31, 1965, was presented by Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council), read by Mr. Speaker to the house, and referred to the committee of supply.

EDUCATION

STUDENT LOANS—STATEMENT RESPECTING OTTAWA CONFERENCE

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, last week I promised to make a statement at the beginning of this week respecting the administration of the Canada student loans plan.

On Monday and Tuesday, November 16 and 17, officials responsible for administering the Canada student loans plan in all the participating provinces, together with representatives of the province of Quebec and the territories, met in Ottawa with officials of the Department of Finance for the purpose of reviewing the operation of the Canada student loans plan. This was the first opportunity for such a general review since the initiation of the plan last September.

Provincial representatives expressed the unanimous view that the plan has met a real need for a large number of students. Many students attending universities and other institutions this year would not have been able to attend in the absence of the plan. Many other students, who might have managed to attend without the benefit of the plan, are able to devote more time and attention to their education because their financial burdens are now less demanding. In spite of its late start, the plan has already proved to be an outstanding success.

A total of 29,000 students had received certificates of eligibility for loans as of November 13. The average loan under these certificates for the academic year is about $680, for a total amount of approximately $19.8 million, representing 73.3 per cent of allocations for the loan year ending June 30, 1965. I ask the permission of the house to include in *Hansard* a table which gives the breakdown of these figures by participating provinces and territories.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Editor's note: The table referred to above is as follows:]

Student Loans Plan

Canada Student Loans Plan
Report on certificates of eligibility issued as of November 13, 1964

Provinces and Territories	Provincial Allocation	Number of Certificates Issued	Total Amount Authorized	Percentage of Allocation Utilized
Newfoundland	$ 1,176,000	498	$ 320,230	27.23
Prince Edward Island	232,000	340	231,984	99.99
Nova Scotia	1,736,000	2,107	1,387,635	79.93
New Brunswick	1,416,000	1,746	1,157,117	81.71
Ontario	12,440,000	14,590	10,885,139	87.50
Manitoba	1,968,000	1,669	1,106,808	56.24
Saskatchewan	1,908,000	2,398	1,450,390	76.01
Alberta	2,852,000	2,445	968,320	33.95
British Columbia	3,236,000	3,203	2,296,909	70.98
Yukon	24,000	10	7,200	30.00
Northwest Territories	48,000	7	7,000	14.58
Totals	$27,036,000	29,013	19,818,732	73.30
Quebec	12,964,000			
	$40,000,000			

Mr. Gordon: I am pleased to report that students are making effective use of the plan to a greater extent than was expected when the plan was discussed in advance with provincial officials last summer. With few exceptions the loan certificates are issued by bodies already accustomed to furnishing student aid. This has greatly facilitated speedy implementation of the plan and minimized risks of overborrowing and abuse.

As I reported to the house on July 14, we expected that financial provision would be ample, based on the assumption that approximately one student out of three might make use of the plan and that the average loan would be about $500. I added, however, that if perchance actual needs outran our expectations we would bring the matter back to parliament. In practice, financial provision on this basis is proving about right in some provinces, rather more than sufficient in a few cases, and less than sufficient in two provinces.

In the discussion of subjects put forward by the provinces at last week's conference it became apparent that many of their administrative problems were the result of varying traditional practices in handling student aid, and a general desire emerged to seek a greater degree of harmony in these practices. To this end it was agreed that special reports would be prepared during the next two months on three subjects; the criteria for judging student needs; questions relating to students from one province making use of loans under the plan in another province; and the whole question of standards and criteria for the designation by provinces of educational institutions under the plan. It was agreed that pending consideration of these reports there would be no basic change in present practices. I should add that representatives of the province of Quebec will be associated with these studies.

I have already mentioned the fact that the financial provision for this year is proving adequate or more than adequate in the case of all but two provinces, where the demand for loans is outrunning the allocation made under the act as passed by parliament this summer. In these circumstances many students, particularly those who had postponed making financial arrangements for the second term of the academic year, could be faced with the interruption of their education because of financial difficulties. The government has considered this situation and decided to seek approval from parliament to increase the guarantee authority of the Canada Student Loans Act in the current loan year by $8 million, this amount to be available for allocation to provinces upon application to meet additional requirements in the loan year ending June 30, 1965. A special item for this purpose is included in supplementary estimates "C" for 1964-65 which have just been tabled. At the present time it is expected that only two provinces will exceed the provincial allocation for this year. Accordingly, if this turns out to be the case, less than one half of this proposed additional provision is likely to be utilized.

The alternative payments under the act to a non-participating province relate to actual disbursements by the federal government in the administration of the act. Such payments will, of course, automatically rise to the extent that enlarged allocations are utilized.

I should emphasize that the special financial provision which the house is being asked to consider will apply only to the current loan year and will not alter the provincial allocations for subsequent years as now provided for in the act. I have outlined the nature of the studies which provincial and federal representatives have already undertaken. Against the background of these studies, a more general review of the Canada Student Loans Act, of the loan limits which it provides and of the formula on which those limits are to increase year by year, will be made when the full results of the current year have been collected and reviewed.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am sure all hon. members will welcome the success which the student loans plan has achieved in meeting the financial needs of so many students across Canada in extending their education and training. This has been due in no small measure to the fine spirit of co-operation shown by provincial educational authorities and lending institutions.

Hon. George C. Nowlan (Digby-Annapolis-Kings): Mr. Speaker, the house has listened with a great deal of interest to the statement just made by the minister with respect to the administration of the student loan fund. As he has said, certain difficulties have arisen in connection with the administration, and I am very happy to know that apparently the conference last week was prepared to deal specifically with those administrative problems.

I had hoped that possibly the minister would make some statement with respect to scholarships in connection with the student loan fund, but I presume that is a matter which we can look forward to at some not too distant date, because it is certainly something which the people of Canada expected of this government when it took office.

The minister referred to the three points which I understand were agreed upon last week, and I think it is well that there has been some hopeful agreement in that connection. However, I am sure all hon. members have heard of the difficulties which have arisen as between the provinces with regard to the means test basis. Some provinces have been much stricter than others in that regard. I know one province which, because of the short time available, is still using the application form which they provided for their own student loans years ago, and is much stricter than under our regulations or what should be our regulations. This brings up the old problem of reconciling the prerogative of the province which administers education with the responsibility of the federal government which pays the bills. It is well to know that careful study is being given to this matter.

Then there is the further problem of the residential qualifications that certain provinces require. I had a rather pathetic case the other day, and I am sure many hon. members have had such cases over the last few weeks. In this particular case the man happened to be in the armed forces, but he might have been in any other employment. He was transferred from one province to another, and was told that in order to get a loan in the province to which he had been transferred he would have to be a resident for a year. He could not get a loan from the province he had left because he was no longer a resident there. This question of residence must and should be dealt with in order to clarify this ambiguity. This difficulty affects only a few, it is true. The great majority of students are realizing a great deal of help from this legislation. However, there are these two points respecting the means test and residence which need to be ironed out, and a degree of co-operative federalism should be attained in the near future.

In so far as the standards of educational institutions are concerned, this is something that has been with us for a long time. We have it in connection with university grants. I am sure there is machinery available by which the problem can be ironed out, and we look forward to some standardization on that basis. The other day I had a case of a student going to the United States, and of course he could not get a student loan. I believe a loan was obtained later on. All these matters are bound to arise, of course, in connection with a measure which is in its preliminary stages. We appreciate what has been done for the students so far, but there are many other difficulties which have to be ironed out. I hope they will be ironed out in this conference to which the minister has referred.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance made a statement respecting the application of the Canada Student Loans Act.

I have already asked questions in the house concerning this act, and I did not receive any

other answer than the following: the government of the province of Quebec can ask its own questions and apply for its own information.

I have also mentioned that we Quebec members in the House of Commons, also represent that province and that we were entitled to obtain that information.

In the statement he made today the Minister of Finance did not see fit to answer the questions we asked him concerning this federal student loans legislation.

Now, according to this legislation a province which does not want to participate in this student loans plan will receive an equivalent and appropriate compensation from the federal government.

On several instances we asked the Minister of Finance to tell us what amount of money the federal government gave the province of Quebec as its equivalent and appropriate share of those student loans which are being granted the other provinces. The Minister of Finance has never replied in the past. Today he makes a statement concerning what his government guarantees in nine provinces. However, he forgets, he neglects or he does not want to reveal the amount the federal government returned to the province of Quebec under that section of the act which provides for an adequate compensation for the province of Quebec.

In my opinion the Minister of Finance gave us an incomplete statement. We are entitled to know the whole truth about this matter, and we want to know how much the province of Quebec received under this act, and if it has received anything at all.

If the Minister of Finance did not give anything yet, let him say so. We will know then that the Minister of Finance put through another piece of legislation concerning the provinces where provisions of the act dealing with the province of Quebec have not been applied. If he gave anything, let him say so and it will reassure everybody. But we believe the Minister of Finance should make a full statement and not hide the facts nor the truth; he should tell us exactly what amount the province of Quebec received under this act.

[*Text*]

Mr. Gordon: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I, of course, have not failed to give all the facts. As hon. members know who have read the act, the amount payable to the province of Quebec cannot be ascertained accurately until the end of the year.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I am sure all hon. members will support the proposal advanced today by the Minister of Finance. At this point I would merely like to say there is a large body of opinion among all parties in the house which feels there are unnecessary complicating factors when you have to work out the administration of this plan with the provinces. There is a feeling in the house that to be a resident of Canada is alone sufficient and that many people suffer hardships because of the added qualifications. We would like to see changes made so that Canadian residency will be sufficient qualification.

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to direct to the Minister of Finance, and I hope he will find it easier to answer than the question posed by my seat mate, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Cameron), a moment ago. My question arises out of his statement earlier today about the student loans plan administration. Can the minister satisfy my curiosity, in view of the fact that he did not mention which two provinces need additional funds beyond the original provided; and can he also inform the house how many credit unions have been certified to operate under the plan and in which provinces?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): In reply to the first question, Mr. Speaker, the two provinces are the smallest and the largest, Prince Edward Island and Ontario.

In reply to the second question, I shall be glad to obtain that information. There are a considerable number of credit unions which have been certified, but I do not have that information at my fingertips. I will ascertain the facts and give them to my hon. friend tomorrow or next day.

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. I should like to ask the Minister of Finance whether it is expected that the item in supplementary estimates (C) regarding student loans will result in all qualified applications for student loans in Prince Edward Island being met by the banks for the current year?

Mr. Gordon: That is the purpose of the estimate. I cannot give a categorical answer because I do not know the numbers involved, but I think the amount will be adequate.

PENITENTIARIES

ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

On the order: Government notice of motion:

November 20—The Minister of Justice—The following proposed motion:—That a special committee, consisting of 15 members to be designated by the house at a later date, be appointed to consider the state of penitentiaries under the control of the government of Canada and the plans of the government in relation thereto with powers to: report from time to time its observations and opinions thereon; send for person, papers and records; adjourn from place to place; sit during sittings of the house; and print from day to day such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the committee, and that standing order 66 be suspended in relation thereto.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to section 2 of standing order 21 this government notice of motion stands transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders at the next sitting of the house.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CANADIANS IN ACTION AT HONG KONG

Question No. 1,958—**Mr. Webb:**

1. How many Canadians went to Hong Kong to serve during the last war?

2. How many were killed in action or died there?

3. How many are still alive?

4. How many are receiving more than 55 per cent pension?

5. What, if any, are the future plans of the government with regard to these veterans?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): 1. 1956.

2. Killed in action or died of wounds,	290
Deaths from other causes,	267
Total	557

3. In June, 1964 there were 1,272 still living.

4. Three hundred and four.

5. An investigation to compare the physical and economic positions of Hong Kong veterans to that of siblings who served in other theatres of war is now under way. Future plans of the government with respect to these veterans will be formulated following consideration of the results of this investigation.

Questions

ARCHITECTURAL COMPETITIONS

Question No. 2,113—**Mr. Gelber:**

What architectural competitions have been held in Canada in the 15 years by federal, provincial and municipal authorities for public buildings?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): In 1952 and 1953 an architectural competition was held to choose an architect for the proposed new building for the national gallery of Canada.

The government has no information available with respect to competitions held by provincial and municipal authorities.

TENDERS FOR RURAL MAIL ROUTES, AMHERST, N.S.

Question No. 2,172—**Mr. Coates:**

Is it the intention of the Post Office Department to call tenders for R.R. Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 7, Amherst, N.S., when these contracts expire, in view of the fact that the Post Office Department considered it necessary to call tenders for R.R. No. 2 in order to alter the route of the service so that it would start and end at the Amherst post office an alteration which will be necessary for the aforementioned rural routes?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): The existing contracts for Amherst R.R. Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 7 will not expire until 1967 and 1968. These contracts will be reviewed prior to expiration.

CANADIAN MONEY SUPPLY

Question No. 2,214—**Mr. Latulippe:**

1. As of the most recent available date, what are the constituent factors of the money supply, and what are the respective amounts thereof?

2. What was the total amount of the money supply as of the months of December 1944, 1954 and October 1964?

3. As of the most recent available date, what were the amounts of (a) money in coin (b) bills of the Bank of Canada (c) people's deposits in the eight chartered banks (d) Canada savings bonds (e) treasury bonds?

4. Are the amounts of money deposited in credit unions and trust companies included in what is referred to as the money supply and what are these amounts?

5. What proportion of our money supply is guaranteed by gold in the vaults of the Bank of Canada?

[*Translation*]

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): 1. There is no official definition of "money supply" but the term is commonly used to refer to the total amount of currency outside banks and deposits at chartered banks, both including and excluding

government of Canada deposits. The figures for October 21, 1964 are as follows:

	($ millions)
Currency outside banks	
Bank of Canada notes	1,857
Coin	215
Deposits at chartered banks	
Government of Canada deposits	360
Personal savings deposits	9,026
Other notice deposits	1,426
All other deposits (less float)	4,463
Total	17,347
Total excluding government of Canada deposits	16,987

2. Currency outside banks and deposits at chartered banks

	Dec. 31/44	Dec. 31/54	Oct. 21/64
	(millions of dollars)		
Total	5,892	10,314	17,347
Total excl. Govt. of Canada deposits	5,185	10,137	16,987

3. (a) On October 21, 1964 the total amount of coin was $247 million, of which $32 million was estimated to be held by the chartered banks and $215 million by others.

(b) On October 21, 1964 the total amount of Bank of Canada notes outstanding was $2,298 million, of which $441 million was held by the chartered banks and $1,857 million by others.

(c) See answer to 1.

(d) and (e)

Government of Canada Securities Outstanding at October 28, 1964
($ millions)

	Canada Savings Bonds	Treasury Bills	Other Direct & Guaranteed Securities	Total
Held by:				
Bank of Canada	—	498	2,571	3,069
Chartered banks	—	1,164	2,419	3,583
Government accounts	—	35	594	629
Others	4,893	433	7,368	12,694
Total	4,893	2,130	12,952	19,975

4. The commonly used definition of money supply described in answer No. 1 above does not include deposits in credit unions and trust companies.

Credit unions and caisses populaires, Dec. 31, 1962: deposits, $905 million; shares, $611 million.

Trust companies, second quarter 1964: deposits and demand certificates, $911 million; deposit receipts and guaranteed investment certificates, $1,413 million.

5. The Bank of Canada owns no gold. Under the terms of the Currency, Mint and Exchange Fund Act (section 25(i)) the bank is not required to maintain a reserve of gold against its liabilities.

[*Text*]

*ROYAL COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS ON PUBLICATIONS

Question No. 2,244—**Mr. Woolliams:**

Does the government intend to implement any of the terms and conditions of the O'Leary commission to prevent other Canadian magazines and periodicals from disappearing because of bankruptcy?

[Mr. Pennell.]

Mr. Jack Davis (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Measures to strengthen the position of periodicals published in Canada are envisaged in legislative amendments which appear in *Votes and Proceedings* of March 11, 1964. As indicated on previous occasions it remains the government's hope that this legislation can be dealt with as soon as possible.

HOUSING SURVEY, NAVAL PERSONNEL, HALIFAX

Question No. 2,263—**Mr. Coates:**

1. On whose instructions was the survey initiated into housing needs of naval families in the Halifax area?

2. How many personnel will be involved in the survey in question?

3. What is the estimated time allocated for completion of the survey in question?

4. Is one of the objectives of the survey to provide integrated naval housing within the community?

5. Has the committee, established by Postmaster General Nicholson, been instructed to act on the results of the survey in question?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): 1. At the request of the Atlantic command, R.C.N., a joint committee of navy and C.M.H.C. personnel was set up in October to investigate the problem of housing accommodation for naval personnel in Halifax. One of the first steps taken by that committee was to undertake a survey to determine the housing conditions of naval personnel.

2. All married naval personnel in the Halifax area are being asked to complete the survey questionnaire. (Approximately 7,000).

3. The questionnaire has been distributed and returns are expected by mid November. The resulting information will then be tabulated and analysed.

4. The object of the survey is to provide a factual basis for an assessment of the housing needs of naval personnel.

5. The function of the committee, after considering the results of the survey and other information on the housing situation in Halifax, is to make recommendations for action.

CONTRACTS TO ENAMEL AND HEATING LTD., AMHERST, N.S.

Question No. 2,267—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What new contracts have been awarded to the aircraft division of Enamel & Heating Products Ltd., Amherst, N.S., since July 1, 1964, by the Department of Defence Production, and what is the total amount of the contracts in question?

2. What subcontracts have been awarded to the aircraft division of Enamel & Heating Products Ltd., Amherst, N.S., by prime contractors with the Department of Defence Production, and what is the total amount of the contract awards in question?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): 1. Twelve contracts have been awarded to the aircraft division of Enamel & Heating Products Ltd., Amherst, N.S., since July 1, 1964 to a total value of $331,661.14. In addition, three amendments to contracts issued prior to July 1, 1964, have been awarded to the company increasing the value of these contracts by $13,444.59.

Grand total of all contracts and amendments issued subsequent to July 1, 1964, $345,105.73.

1 Contract, 12 modification kits for Neptune aircraft fuel and oil system. Amount of contract, $133,391.16, (awarded as a result of competitive tender).

1 Contract, R & O modification and reduction to spares of MN-1A dispensers. Amount of contract, $114,000.00.

Questions

10 Contracts, Supply of CS2F airframe spares and miscellaneous items, $84,269.98.

3 Contract amendments, Supply of CS2F airframe spares, $13,444.59.

2. Subcontracts from D.D.P. prime contractors have been issued to Enamel & Heating Products Ltd., Amherst, N.S. to the values shown below. These subcontracts are open ended in nature and are being progressively increased as suitable workload becomes available.

Canadair Limited	$82,664.08 (estimated)
The de Havilland Aircraft of Canada Ltd.	$32,150.00 (estimated)
	$114,814.08

COFFEE SHOP, TORONTO AIRPORT

Question No. 2,283—**Mr. Martin (Timmins):**

1. What is the name of the firm who operates the coffee shop at the Toronto international airport?

2. Does the firm who operates the coffee shop have a concession and, if so, what monthly rent or other revenue accrues to the Department of Transport?

3. Does the Department of Transport have any control over the prices charged by this coffee shop and, if so, has such control ever been exerted?

4. What cut of meat is served by this coffee shop as a ribeye steak at $2.95, and what is the average size of one serving in ounces?

5. Has the Department of Transport received any complaints, or other representations, regarding over charging by this coffee shop and, if so, what action was taken, or will be taken?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Cara Operations Limited operates the restaurant concession in the aeroquay including the coffee shop at Toronto airport.

2. The rent is calculated on a percentage of gross food sales with an annual guarantee as follows: 14.2 per cent of total annual sales up to $1,200,000; 15.2 per cent of total annual sales up to $1,600,000, if total sales exceed $1,200,000; 16.2 per cent of total annual sales if total sales exceed $1,600,000, or $201,000, per annum. The company is paying $16,750 per month representing the annual guarantee prorated over 12 months.

3. The agreement between the department and the company contains a clause whereby the company agrees to charge prices comparable with prices in similar establishments in the greater Toronto area. During the years in which the company has operated at the airport, it has maintained a comparable price level, and therefore the department has not found it necessary to take any action in this regard.

4. The ribeye steak is the centre cut of the meat trimmed from the standing rib. The average size of serving in the coffee shop is nine ounces.

5. The department has not received any complaints regarding over charging in the coffee shop.

POST OFFICE SERVICE, TOBERMORY, ONT.

Question No. 2,285—**Mr. Loney:**

1. How many householders are served by the post office at Tobermory, county of Bruce?
2. What is the number of the rental boxes?
3. What are the dimensions of the boxes?
4. What is the approximate number of householders served by general delivery?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): 1. At present, 207 (including 66 served by R.R. No. 1); summer, 402 (including 133 served by R.R. No. 1).

2.

Type "A"	144
Type "B"	12
Type "C"	6
Total	162

3. Type "A", 4" wide, 5½" high, 13 13/16" deep; type "B", 6" wide, 5½" high, 13 13/16" deep; type "C", 12" wide, 5½" high, 13 13/16" deep.

4. At present, 28; summer, 125.

*DUNDAS STREET ARMOURY, LONDON, ONT.

Question No. 2,286—**Mr. Irvine:**

Is the Dundas street armoury in London, Ontario to be turned over to Crown Assets Disposal Corporation for resale and, if so, on what date?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): The question of accommodation for reserve units will be reviewed following implementation of the reorganization recently announced. Until the review has taken place it is not possible to forecast what disposition will be made of individual buildings.

TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT AIRCRAFT

Question No. 2,287—**Mr. MacRae:**

1. How many aircraft are in the establishment of the Department of Transport?
2. What are the types of these aircraft and what is their value?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Thirty nine fixed wing aircraft and 18 helicopters, the latter of which are operated for the Canadian coast guard service.

There are two additional Bell 47 helicopters owned by the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys which are operated by the Department of Transport.

2. Beechcraft D18S, Beechcraft B55, de Havilland Beaver, Pipe Apache Aztec, Douglas DC-3, Vickers Viscount, de Havilland Heron, Lockheed Jet Star, Bell Helicopter, Sikorski Helicopter.

Book value as of November 12, 1964, $3,140,693.

TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT PURCHASE OF "JET STAR" AIRCRAFT

Question No. 2,289—**Mr. MacRae:**

1. Has the Department of Transport recently purchased a "Jet Star" aircraft and, if so, what was the cost of this aircraft?
2. Is this aircraft used for inspecting and testing runways?
3. Does this aircraft have any other function?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1, 2 and 3. The department has not recently purchased a Jet Star aircraft. As indicated in *Hansard* on page 6250 for July 13, 1960 one was ordered and later acquired at a cost of $1,136,000; and has been in use since that time for special transportation, for evaluation of performance of radio navigation aids at high altitude, and other navigational monitoring.

EFFECTS OF AIR POLLUTION ON HUMANS

Question No. 2,293—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. Is the government conducting or supporting research into the effects on humans of air pollution in (a) urban areas (b) rural areas and, if so, at which institutions and under whose direction is such research being carried out?
2. What have been the findings of each research project carried out within the last year?
3. For each of the last five years, what has been the cost to the government of such research?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. Under the national health grants, support is being given by the Department of National Health and Welfare toward research into the effects of air pollution in urban and rural areas at the following institutions: University of Montreal under the direction of Dr. F. J. Tourangeau and Dr. E. Robillard; University of Western Ontario, London, under the direction of Dr. N. M. Lefcoe; University of Toronto, under the direction of Dr. A. W. Brewer and Dr. J. M. Beekmans; University of British Columbia, Vancouver, under the direction of Dr. F. E. Murray and Dr. D. O. Anderson.

2. As each research project supported within the last year is being continued in the present fiscal year, the results are not available at the present time.

3. 1959-60, $30,454; 1960-61, $28,457; 1961-62, $21,496; 1962-63, $52,353; 1963-64, $69,695.

VALUE OF ARTIFICIAL SWEETENERS IN WEIGHT REDUCING

Question No. 2,313—**Mr. Mather:**

Have artificial, low calorie sweeteners a proven value in weight reducing?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Under conditions of rigid clinical control, where it can be established that the calories eliminated by the use of artificial sweeteners are not replaced through other foods, some advantage in weight reduction has been demonstrated. Where such clinical control is lacking, the calories tend to be replaced through use of other foods and no benefit of significance is considered to accrue.

NAPPAN EXPERIMENTAL FARM PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,316—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many permanent seasonal employees were associated with the Nappan experimental farm from 1954-1955 to the present?

2. What was the payroll at the Nappan experimental farm for each year from 1954-55 to the present?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): 1. (Continuous-(permanent)): 1954-55, 44; 1955-56, 46; 1956-57, 47; 1957-58, 48; 1958-59, 48; 1959-60, 52; 1960-61, 54; 1961-62, 54; 1962-63, 53; 1963-64, 54; 1964-65, 54.

(Seasonal): 1954-55, 3; 1955-56, 3; 1956-57, 4; 1957-58, 10; 1958-59, 11; 1959-60, 13; 1960-61, 15; 1961-62, 15; 1962-63, 15; 1963-64, 13; 1964-65, 10.

2. 1954-55, $123,024; 1955-56, $128,578; 1956-57, $148,048; 1957-58, $164,936; 1958-59, $179-492; 1959-60, $209,864; 1960-61, $233,723; 1961-62, $242,585; 1962-63, $252,974; 1963-64, $265,-341.

UPWARD REVISION OF MAIL CONTRACTS, MANITOBA

Question No. 2,333—**Mr. Mandziuk:**

Is the Post Office Department giving consideration to revising upward the mail carrier contracts in Manitoba to take care of the increased gasoline tax in that province and, if so, will increases be made retroactive to the date of the tax coming into force?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): The Post Office Act and mail contracts presently provide for the adjustment of contract rates under specific circumstances and when certain stipulations have been met. No provision is made to automatically compensate contractors for increased taxes of any kind. Should a mail contractor find himself in a difficult position as a result of increased operating expenses, he may submit his case to the department where it will receive every consideration within the provisions of the law.

INVITATION TO PRIME MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,353—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Prime Minister receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Mr. Jack Davis (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): No invitation was received.

INVITATION TO EXTERNAL AFFAIRS MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,354—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Secretary of State for External Affairs receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No.

INVITATION TO TRANSPORT MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,355—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Minister of Transport receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The answer is no.

INVITATION TO DEFENCE MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,356—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Minister of National Defence receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): No.

INVITATION TO PRIVY COUNCIL PRESIDENT TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,359—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the President of the Queen's Privy Council receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the

100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): No.

INVITATION TO NATIONAL REVENUE MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,363—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Minister of National Revenue receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): No.

INVITATION TO ASSOCIATE DEFENCE MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,364—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Associate Minister of National Defence receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): No.

INVITATION TO PUBLIC WORKS MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,366—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Minister of Public Works receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): No.

INVITATION TO SOLICITOR GENERAL TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,368—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Solicitor General receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. J. Watson MacNaught (Solicitor General): No.

INVITATION TO POSTMASTER GENERAL TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,373—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Postmaster General receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): No.

INVITATION TO MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,377—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Minister without Portfolio receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. Yvon Dupuis (Minister without Portfolio): After reviewing the records of the Minister without Portfolio, it has been determined that no invitation has been received to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year.

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS, ARMED FORCES

Question No. 2,382—**Mr. Doucett:**

What is the total number of commissioned officers serving in our military service as of September 30, 1964 (a) in Canada (b) outside Canada (i) in the Canadian army (ii) in the Canadian air force (iii) in the Canadian navy?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): As of September 30, 1964 the total number of commissioned officers serving in the Canadian forces is as follows: (a), (i) 5,504; (ii) 8,967; (iii) 3,159; (b), (i) 968; (ii) 1,090; (iii) 193.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

PENSION AND OLD AGE SECURITY PAYMENTS IN 1975

Question No. 2,010—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

1. In the year 1975, how many individuals is it estimated will receive retirement pension payments from the Canada pension plan?
2. How many of these people will be receiving the maximum benefit?
3. How many will be receiving old age security?
4. What is the total amount of retirement pensions estimated to be payable in that year (a) from the plan (b) from old age security?

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

EXTRADITION OF MEN CHARGED WITH NARCOTICS SMUGGLING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I may address a question to the Minister of Justice and ask him if it is correct that two men, Mr. Leo

Rivard and Mr. Charles Groleaux, are being held in Bordeaux prison and that the United States is seeking to have them extradited to face a charge of dope smuggling. I want to ask the Minister of Justice whether any complaints have come to him that persons in high positions in Ottawa have sought to bring influence to bear by calling on Mr. Pierre Lamontagne, who is a lawyer acting for the United States government, in order to grant these men bail. I would ask the minister whether this complaint came to him, whether he indeed ordered an investigation by the R.C.M.P., as I am told he did, what was the result of that investigation, and whether any charges are to be laid as a result of it.

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to answer the first part of this question today, but I can obtain the information within a matter of minutes as to whether these two men are being detained at Bordeaux jail at the present time. Would the hon. gentleman agree that as my estimates will be before the committee in about half an hour, just after the question period, this might be a good time for me to report on that matter?

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister, when he is supplied with the information which he tells the house will be available to him, during the discussion of his estimates make a full statement to the committee regarding all the circumstances surrounding the allegations which have been adverted to by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam?

Mr. Favreau: I just answered that question, Mr. Speaker.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REPORTED STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT RESPECTING LABOUR CODE

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the Minister of Transport?

Can the minister tell us whether he is acquainted with the statement made by the president of the Canadian National Railways, Mr. Gordon, to the effect that the new labour code proposed by the government will be detrimental to labour-management relations; if so, does this statement reflect the minister's views and will it result in changes being made in the labour code?

[*Text*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has asked a rather complicated question to which I do not think I could give an answer very easily without examining it very carefully.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, may I put a supplementary question to the Minister of Transport?

Could the minister simply tell us if he is acquainted with the statement made by the president of the Canadian National Railways, Mr. Gordon, concerning the new labour code?

[*Text*]

Mr. Pickersgill: Yes, sir. I have been given by Mr. Gordon this morning a copy of the observations that he made at the study conference held by the economic council of Canada. I believe these papers have all been made public by the economic council and for that reason, if it would be of any convenience to the house, I would be very glad to table this document so that all hon. members can see precisely what it was that Mr. Gordon actually said. If I have the approval of the house I will be glad to table the document.

Mr. Speaker: Does the house give consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Transport, relating to the question asked earlier by the hon. member for Lapointe, having to do with the views of Mr. Donald Gordon concerning the proposed Canada labour code. In view of the fact that the House of Commons has already given second reading to this bill, will the minister tell us what reply he made to the representations which Mr. Gordon made to the Minister of Transport?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, these representations, as the hon. gentleman is pleased to call them, were not representations made to me. These remarks were contained in a speech made by Mr. Donald Gordon some time ago to a panel of the economic council; therefore I did not feel that I was called upon to say anything whatsoever about them. In fact I only became aware of the speech this morning when Mr. Gordon was kind enough to give me a copy

of the document which was subsequently released by the economic council of Canada.

I might say, however, that having read what Mr. Gordon said, it seems to me that his main point was that he did not question in any way whatsoever the right or the responsibility of the government or parliament to take any action it sees fit, but that he hoped some of the realities which appear to him as a railwayman will be taken into account in dealing with this matter. As this was a panel on labour-management relations it does not seem to me to be a very revolutionary statement.

REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTING CLOSING OF LIMOILOU SHOPS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lucien Plourde (Quebec West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport.

Could he tell the house if he has received from the Quebec city council a resolution asking that the C.N.R.'s decision regarding the closing of the Limoilou car repair plant be reconsidered?

I do not think the minister heard my question.

Some hon. Members: He did not understand it.

Mr. Plourde: I shall repeat my question, Mr. Speaker.

Could the minister tell the house if he has received, from the Quebec city council, a resolution asking that the C.N.R.'s decision regarding the closing of the Limoilou car repair plant be reconsidered?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is a question for the order paper.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Since this plant is going to be shut down in the next few days and that by putting this question on the order paper the answer would come after the shutting down of the plant, I wonder if, in these circumstances, in view of the fact that the Minister of Transport was ready to answer, you would not allow him to do so on account of the urgency of the matter, as it has been done in the past?

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

[*Text*]

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, if I might be permitted, I would be very glad to inquire whether any representations have been received. I regret to say that I have been away from Ottawa since Thursday evening and have not had an opportunity this morning to check all the documents that my staff had ready for me.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Could the Minister of Transport make a statement tomorrow on this subject?

[*Text*]

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly answer the hon. gentleman's question tomorrow if I cannot obtain the information later today.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Plourde: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Could the Minister of Transport on that occasion come to a decision that would not let this plant be closed without consideration having been given to both sides of the matter as well as to the baneful effects this action could have on those concerned and on the whole population of Quebec city?

[*Text*]

Mr. Pickersgill: I will look into that, sir.

INDUSTRY

SALE OF CANADIAN INTERESTS OF HAWKER-SIDDELEY GROUP

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance based on a story which appeared in this morning's *Globe and Mail* regarding the negotiations now going on for the sale of the Canadian interests of the Hawker-Siddeley group. Can the minister give us any information as to whether this sale is to Canadian purchasers or to foreign purchasers?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): No, Mr. Speaker.

PUBLICATIONS

INTENTION OF GOVERNMENT RESPECTING PENDING LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Prime Minister a question

about periodicals legislation. It is rather complicated, but I think it is relevant. Last night some of us heard him say he could not give details as to intentions respecting the periodical legislation before giving them in the house; yet we have on the order paper, in the motion of March 11, the details expressed in the resolution. I want to ask the Prime Minister, does this indicate that the government is not going to proceed with this resolution and is going to introduce another resolution that will be much different in its content?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member need not draw that conclusion.

Mr. Fisher: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister indicated about ten days ago that he would make an interim statement on this particular matter. Can he give us any indication when that is likely to come?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, as soon as we know when we are likely to be in a position to proceed with this resolution—in other words, as soon as we dispose of one or two items that are now before the house—I will then be in a position to inform the house as to what subsequent legislation will be taken up before Christmas. I would like to think this would be one of them.

THE SENATE

INQUIRY AS TO REFORM MEASURES PROPOSED

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the Prime Minister would tell the house if the house need not draw the conclusion that it is not the Prime Minister's intention to proceed with Senate reform, in view of his remarks of last night.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member read too much into my remarks of last night.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NATO—PROPOSED ATLANTIC NUCLEAR FORCE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Prime Minister what the attitude of the Canadian government will be, or is, on the matter of the establishment of an Atlantic nuclear force. In that connection, so far as the multilateral force is concerned I think there has been general support of the stand taken by the government. It represented the views we expressed after the conference between Prime Minister MacMillan and the late President Kennedy, but the recent suggestion from the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom is one upon which I think the house and the country should have the views of the government.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the reported proposal of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom respecting an Atlantic nuclear force, which would presumably replace the proposed multilateral nuclear force, has only been made within the last day or two, and we have not yet received sufficient detailed information on this matter to give the house any statement as to what our attitude might be. As soon as we are in a position to do so I will be very glad to inform the house.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister say whether any suggestion has been made as to what Canada's contribution to this new force would be? I repeat that so far as the multilateral force is concerned, that received the general approval of the government and we had already taken that attitude while we were in office. This new proposal, however, is such that I would ask the Prime Minister to assure us that before any decision is made by the government in this regard, parliament will have the right to look into this very important matter.

Mr. Pearson: To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, no specific proposal has been made regarding Canadian participation. I do not know whether the prime minister of the United Kingdom has gone even that far in his consideration of this matter. But I repeat that as soon as we are in a position to do so and have sufficient information on which to base an opinion, I will be glad to make a statement in the house.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Will the Prime Minister, before a decision is made by the government, allow a day's discussion in connection with this most important matter, which is one that will represent in the years ahead either a step forward or, as some regard it, a most retrograde step?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I think it would not be unreasonable to wait and see whether a formal proposal is to be made. No such proposal has yet been received, and I think

it would be premature at this stage to indicate a view as to whether a day should be set aside for discussion of it until we know more about the details.

CONGO—INQUIRY AS TO SITUATION RESPECTING HOSTAGES

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I will refrain from asking a question connected with the Prime Minister's debut on television last evening.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The applause provokes me to say that if I did there would be questions asked for the rest of this afternoon, because everything was left up in the air. However, I want to ask the Prime Minister whether he has any word that would be helpful to the house in connection with the hostages held prisoner in the Congo. This is something upon which the house and the country are most anxious to have the latest report, and I hope the Prime Minister will be able to give it.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, perhaps before I try to answer that question I might thank the right hon. gentleman for his friendly publicity for my broadcast last night, which I understand is going to be repeated tonight. May I add how much I regret that the football game in Vancouver made necessary the postponement of his own broadcast.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I did not have any broadcast.

Mr. Pearson: Then I may have been misinformed.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): When are we going to see your film?

Mr. Pearson: In dealing with the right hon. gentleman's question, something which is in my mind and which is a very serious matter, all I can say in addition to what was said on Friday is that I am informed that the situation to which my right hon. friend referred is still as critical as was indicated in reports made to the house on Friday. The Belgian and United States governments have taken certain precautionary measures which have been referred to in the press, and these have involved the transfer aboard United States planes of a Belgian paratroop battalion to Ascension island, where it is stationed with the authorization of the British government.

[Mr. Pearson.]

This is in the character, I am informed, of a precautionary measure which would enable the United States and Belgian governments, if necessary, to effect a rescue operation.

There have also been news reports that a number of foreign hostages in Stanleyville, the ones we have in our minds, have been transferred by the rebels to a location outside the city which might make this kind of rescue operation more difficult, if reports are accurate; but we have nothing to indicate or to confirm that they are accurate.

On Saturday in Geneva 12 countries including Canada issued an appeal to all concerned—and since Saturday three other countries have joined in this appeal—to allow the International Red Cross to fulfil its humanitarian duties toward the civilian population, including the foreign hostages, in the Stanleyville area. That, Mr. Speaker, is all I can add to what was said on this matter on Friday.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, this is naturally one subject upon which all of us feel very keenly. I realize the difficulty of action being taken which might be considered as not helpful, but I wonder, in view of the extraordinary power and influence of Prime Minister Kenyatta and also the president of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah, whether it would be considered appropriate to get in touch with them and have them personally go into that country and communicate with the leaders of the rebels. It is a terrible situation, one which I know exercises the minds of the government; but knowing the influence of these two men, both commonwealth leaders, I wonder whether the Prime Minister would give consideration to taking the initiative in this regard, for I feel that the influence of these two men might be of decisive effect.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I understood that negotiations are now also going on in Nairobi between representatives of the rebel authorities in Stanleyville and, I believe, the Belgium and United States representatives, with the assistance of Mr. Kenyatta, for the purpose indicated by my right hon. friend. But I will be very glad indeed to take this proposal under immediate consideration and see whether we can help in the way he has suggested.

HARBOURS

VANCOUVER, B.C.—PROPOSED LOCATION OF NEW GRAIN ELEVATOR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Last week he promised to

give me an answer with reference to the report of the national harbours board concerning the location for a grain elevator on Burrard inlet; and to say whether, first, the report would be tabled and, second, whether public hearings would be held by the board at which representations might be made.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I must commend myself for my own prudence in not answering the first part of the hon. gentleman's question, because there is no report at all in the possession of the harbours board. What does exist is a report which I am informed was made by the C. D. Howe Company for the Saskatchewan wheat pool, which is the property of the pool and which it would not be competent for the government of a free country to table in the house unless the pool wanted it tabled or wanted it made public in its own way. They were seeking to find the best site and they obtained advice on the matter.

As for the second question, I think I did answer it the other day. The harbours board would be glad to hear any proper representations by persons who are in any way seriously affected by this matter, which is one of great urgency. I am sure the hon. member, who was once premier of Saskatchewan, will realize that it is just as important to have adequate facilities for the shipping of our wheat as it is to grow the wheat itself.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am also aware that there is a deadline of February 15 for five firms to tear down their plants and move them, and for men to be relocated, which is a very short period of time. Is there any chance that the national harbours board would be prepared to extend this deadline for at least another couple of months?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter on which I would not want to give a snap answer, but I will consult the harbours board.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN

CHEQUES ISSUED BY HAL BANKS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State. I wonder whether the Secretary of State is able to inform the house when the government will be in a position to produce copies of the documents requested in the notice of motion for production of papers No. 186, which the government agreed to produce last Wednesday?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Soon, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Justice affecting his estimates. Motion 186 asks for the production of documents concerning the Banks case. Particularly in view of the fact that the Prime Minister said last night on television that he did not think there were any cheques passed to the Liberal party but there may have been to individual members, does he not feel that these documents should be returned to the House of Commons before we proceed with the justice estimates?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants to put his question to me quite clearly so that I can understand what it is about, I will be happy to receive it.

Mr. Woolliams: I will put it very clearly. Would the Minister of Justice consider tabling those documents today before we proceed with the estimates of the Department of Justice; that is, those documents with reference to the Banks case. Jack knows all about it.

Mr. Favreau: There are no documents in the possession of my department in relation to the Banks case.

Mr. Woolliams: A further supplementary question to the Prime Minister. I believe he said on television last night that there were no cheques passed over by Banks to the Liberal party but that there may have been cheques passed to individual members of the Liberal party. Has he any explanation in this regard?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, that is a paraphrase of what I said. I can only say in answer to the other question put by my hon. friend, which was in order, that I will look into the possibility of producing the documents immediately.

INQUIRIES OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reg Cantelon (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I had intended to ask a question of the Secretary of State for External Affairs dealing with the publication, "Progress of the Columbia plan, 1963," but since neither the Secretary of State for External Affairs nor his parliamentary secretary are present I will put it on the order paper.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister and ask him whether he has changed his intention to call an election in the spring as a result of the advice he received from the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Francis) that he could not run at that time?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am receiving advice on this subject from a great many sources, including some across the way. All I can say is that an election will be called when it is necessary.

TRANSPORT

P.E.I. CAUSEWAY—INQUIRY AS TO CONSTRUCTION START

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance, prompted by newspaper reports concerning the P.E.I.-N.B. causeway. Can the minister advise whether the government has now decided that this vital project will be commenced in 1965 and, if so, is it to be with or without a railway?

Mr. Speaker: Surely this is also a question for the order paper.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Speaker, with great respect may I indicate my desire to debate this at ten o'clock.

TRADE

WHEAT—SUBSIDY ON EXPORTS BY UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not in his seat I should like to direct my question to the Prime Minister. Now that it is obvious that the dumping of export grain by the United States is contrary to all ethical practices in the trade markets, and in view of the fact it is subsidizing this grain, would the Prime Minister not consider at this time making a strong protest to the United States about this unethical trade practice?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the importance of this matter was underlined by members on both sides of this house, I think last Thursday. The matter is under investigation; the Minister of Trade and Commerce will be in his seat later this afternoon, at which time he may have something to say about it.

[Mr. Cantelon.]

FINANCE

MEASURES TO ENCOURAGE CANADIAN INVESTMENT IN WEST INDIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Because of the government's special concern in the economic well-being of the British West Indies, will the minister consider the desirability of a system of tax incentives to encourage Canadian investment in industrial development of the British West Indies?

Some hon. Members: Order paper.

Mr. Speaker: Surely that is a question for the order paper.

An hon. Member: Debate it at ten.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that I will debate this at ten o'clock.

NATIONAL FILM BOARD

REPORTED POST-SYNCHRONIZATION OF FILMS IN FRANCE

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, last week the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer) asked me the following question:

> Could he tell us why the government allows the national film board, an agency financed with the Canadian taxpayers' money, to have its films dubbed in France, thus depriving Canadian artists of needed and quite important revenue?

I want to inform the hon. member that since February 1962 all film dubbing (from English into French and vice-versa), as required by the national film board, has been carried out in Canada.

Moreover, as from September 1961, the film board entrusted its dubbing to a commercial company newly established in Canada and specializing in this sort of work. After a few experiments the company having satisfied the technical and artistical standards of the board, the latter continued to supply them with work and, for almost three years all dubbing required by the board has been done in Canada.

[*Text*]

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal and other services—

1. Administration including the office of the superintendent of bankruptcy, grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, gratuities to the widows or other dependants of judges who die while in office and authority to make recoverable advances for the administration of justice on behalf of the governments of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory, $2,109,600.

The Chairman: When this vote was being considered on October 7 last the hon. member for Yukon proposed an amendment, as follows:

That vote No. 1 of the estimates of the Department of Justice be reduced by the sum of $16,999.

Is the committee ready for the question on the amendment?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, the minister announced on orders of the day that he would be making an opening statement with respect to the matter raised by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam and myself. I understand the whip's office was informed that the minister would be making a brief opening statement. I wonder if we might hear that statement now.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, the opening statement which I intend to make relates to the functions of my department generally and to two aspects of the activities of my department.

[*Translation*]

The Department of Justice—

[*Text*]

Mr. Douglas: Before the minister starts, may I ask whether he is going to make the statement referred to in the course of this general statement?

Mr. Favreau: Not in the course of my general statement, but this will arise in the course of the discussion of my estimates. I intend to answer any questions later if questions arise. I will consider that matter as a question, but it will not be part of my opening general statement.

Mr. Douglas: The minister will make it at the end of the general statement?

Mr. Favreau: Yes.

[*Translation*]

In a general sense the Department of Justice comprises several branches or sections of the public service which are the responsibility of the Minister of Justice.

The strictly legal functions are discharged by the law branch. I should mention also the Bankruptcy Act administration, the Combines Investigation Act administration and the Parole Act administration.

The minister is, moreover, responsible for the administration of the Supreme Court of Canada, of the Exchequer Court of Canada and of the penitentiary system.

The Minister of Justice is also responsible to parliament for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the restrictive trade practices commission.

He also has jurisdiction in matters of patents, copyrights, trade marks and industrial designs.

Under the Criminal Code the attorney general of Canada is attorney general as concerns the Northwest Territories Act and the Yukon Territory Act.

I intend today to make some remarks concerning that function of my department having to do with the administration of the penitentiaries and our projects in the field of reform.

During the last few years the Canadian penitentiary service has experienced important progress. However, in order that such progress be rational, the government thought it appropriate to approve in principle a new development program, the implementation of which would take place between 1964 and 1973. This program I intend to explain briefly to the house today.

The primary function of the Canadian penitentiary service is to protect society against individuals bent toward crime, and this through preventive detention and reform training during imprisonment. These measures should reduce recidivism but, in the long run they increase the normal costs of penitentiary operation; on the other hand, they should return to our society, as useful citizens, people who, otherwise, might be a threat to it.

In order to ensure adequate reform training for the inmates, the following requirements have to be met: surveillance, physical and body needs, education, as well as economic, psychological, moral and spiritual needs.

Consequently, the inmates will be scattered in various institutions, according to the requirements of detention and security.

The training program in every institution will be prepared according to the needs for reformation of the inmates.

In each region in Canada there will be organized a penitentiary system comprising the following institutions: special detention

institution, maximum security, medium security and minimum security institutions.

In each of the four regions the following will also be provided for:

(a) reception centres to be used for purposes of reception and diagnosis so the inmate can be sent to an appropriate institution;

(b) institutions for juvenile delinquents, medium security type, to be used for the detention and training of inmates from 16 to 25 years of age;

[*Text*]

Mr. Woolliams: I wonder whether I could interrupt the minister briefly. I am not trying to embarrass him in any way, but he has been speaking about young offenders and I should like to ask him a question. Some months ago a return was made showing the number of young offenders held in custody in our penitentiaries. Are they still in the penitentiaries? Has there been any change in that situation since the return was made?

Mr. Favreau: I have no figures as to changes. There certainly or probably must have been changes by way of promoting young prisoners from one institution to another, because to the extent that accommodation is available it is the policy of the penitentiaries system to try to detain young offenders in these specialized institutions. But there may not have been substantial changes, and this is precisely why we are providing for those types of institutions in each region which I know the hon. member understands and agrees are essential.

[*Translation*]

(c) hospitals for the purpose of offering medical and psychiatric services; finally

(d) a kind of institution yet unknown in Canada: predischarge centres to house inmates who have almost completed their full sentence and who, consequently, must be reintegrated into society.

Each institution will have facilities to apply programs of activities offering inmates occupations, constructive pastimes, religious services, contacts with their families, with social agencies and with representatives of the public, a classification process, education and technical training.

The plan will be achieved in two stages: the first phase, which is already begun, will extend from 1963 to 1967; the second, from 1967 to 1973.

According to a comprehensive survey of the trends of institution population in the past, it is anticipated that the inmates will number 8,500 in 1967 and 10,500 in 1973.

[Mr. Favreau.]

The accommodation needed in the years to come will depend on the increase in the number of inmates and the need to keep apart certain types or certain classes of inmates. The type and the number of institutions to be built will depend on the need to separate, the degree of danger that they represent and the need to offer a special training to certain classes of inmates.

The immediate purpose is to set up for 1967 a uniform detention and training system in each of the four regions in Canada so that each inmate can be confined with a degree of security desirable and so that each can take advantage of the training most appropriate to his needs. The policy restricting the maximum population of each institution to 450 will be maintained. The treasury board has already approved substantial expenditures to provide for the carrying out of that project.

A special detention unit has been built and is already in operation at the British Columbia penitentiary and three more will be built in Dorchester, N.B., St. Vincent de Paul, Quebec, and Millhaven, Ontario.

In 1965, the construction of a maximum security institution will get under way at Ste. Anne des Plaines, Quebec, and in 1966, the construction of another institution will start at Millhaven, Ontario.

A medium security institution is being built in Cowansville, Quebec, and recently a contract was awarded for the construction of a medium security institution in Springhill, Nova Scotia.

In a few months, tenders will be called in order to undertake the construction of two other medium security institutions, one in Warkworth, Ontario, and the other in Drumheller, Alberta. An institution for the treatment and training of drug addicts, male and female, is under construction in Marsqui, B.C.

[*Text*]

At this point I wish to recall that in January last the then minister of justice, Hon. Lionel Chevrier, announced that in the fiscal year 1965-66 a new prison for women would be constructed in the vicinity of Cornwall, Ontario. Developments in the penitentiary service since that time lead to the conclusion that the construction of a new federal prison for women should be postponed for some years.

Mr. Fairweather: That is the best way to get Chevrier out of the basket he was in.

Mr. Favreau: This is the best way to be objective and have justice done.

The average daily population in the existing prison for women at Kingston, Ontario is 120 inmates. Of these more than 50 are narcotics addicts from western Canada. At the present time a new narcotics addict treatment institution is being constructed at Matsqui, British Columbia. When completed in September, 1965 it will provide accommodation and training facilities for 150 female inmates. At that time the female narcotics addicts from western Canada will be transferred to the new institution, where they will have the benefit of a program of treatment and training especially designed for their needs. The female narcotics addicts of eastern Canada will continue, that is for the present, in the women's prison at Kingston.

There is a conflict of opinion on the question of whether the narcotics addicts can best be rehabilitated through a treatment program involving addicts alone, on the one hand, or through a program of training involving association with non-addicts. The Matsqui experiment will make it possible, over a period of three or four years, to determine which technique is more effective. Accordingly I propose postponing the construction of the new prison for women until the results of the Matsqui operation have become apparent.

The prison for women at Kingston has accommodation for 150 female inmates; 50 inmates can be confined in bright, modern rooms constructed, I am pleased to advise hon. gentlemen across the way, in 1960. With the opening of the Matsqui institution and the transfer to it of some 50 narcotics addicts from western Canada, the result will be that the great majority of females confined in the prison for women can be accommodated in modern, clean surroundings. As for those in the small minority, great care will be taken to make such use of the remaining accommodation as will assure the fairest and best possible treatment in every respect.

In the general program, the additional construction that will be required to achieve the 1967 objective is as follows; four new reception centres and three reception centres to be developed from existing facilities; three minimum security institutions; three new medical and psychiatric centres and a fourth to be developed from existing facilities; four prerelease hostels to be obtained by using existing houses owned by the crown or by purchase; administrative facilities for two maximum security complexes; the modernization of certain buildings in three of the existing maximum security institutions that are an integral part of the new program; two staff colleges, one in the Quebec region and one in the western region, to replace present inadequate facilities for the training of penitentiary service officers.

If the foregoing program of institutional development is carried out, it will mean that by 1967 Canada will have a federal prison system that will rank with the best in the world. It will mean a conclusive end to that oft quoted slander that, by the United Nations standards, Canada ranks 44th among the nations of the world in so far as the quality of its prisons is concerned. In anticipation of the completion of the development up to 1967, plans are being made for developments during the period 1968-1973.

There is, of course, no way of determining accurately at this time what our 1968-1973 requirement will be. It is to be hoped that the reformative program for inmates now being carried on and to be further developed in penitentiaries will reduce recidivism. If this happens the number of institutions required during the period in question will be fewer. On the other hand, there may be some other sociological factors at work that might increase the number required over what is contemplated as a result of past experience. The provinces may develop their probation services further, with the result that committals to penitentiary may be lessened. The operations of the parole board may result in more paroles and in fewer penitentiary committals than has been the case thus far. Amendments to the Criminal Code may result in fewer penitentiary committals.

Whatever happens, there is nothing inflexible about the proposed program. The penitentiary service will prepare, in June of every year, a statement of penitentiary population with predictions of accommodation and training requirements based upon the experience of the preceding ten years. On the basis of this study there will be a prediction of requirements for the succeeding ten years, upon which can be based the penitentiary service estimates for the succeeding fiscal year and forecasts of requirements for the ensuing four or five years.

This method of operation, if carried into effect, will have the twin result of ensuring that our penitentiaries do not become overcrowded and, therefore, less effectual, and planning for the construction of an institution can be carried on at least three years prior to the time when the institution will be required.

Buildings are, of course, essential for the custody of inmates. However, the determin-

ing factor in so far as the reform of the inmate is concerned is the quality of the training program that he receives. Effective training of inmates can only be carried out by competent staff. It is with the objective of improving the competence of staff that the penitentiary service has, within the past year, required every newly recruited officer to receive three months of induction training. Formerly no such period of specialized training was required.

It was to achieve this standard of training that a new staff college was recently opened at Kingston, Ontario, and existing facilities were converted to staff training purposes at St. Vincent de Paul, Quebec, and New Westminster, B.C. The program calls for construction next year at St. Vincent de Paul of a staff college that will provide similar facilities to those that are now available at Kingston.

I said earlier that the construction program which I have outlined is not inflexible. I intend to take into full account the representations and submissions which will be made to me in this connection by specialists and other knowledgeable citizens and organizations. In this respect I wish to repeat that it is my intention that two committees be established without delay.

A resolution is being placed on the order paper providing for the establishment of a special committee of the house to look into and report upon the state of penitentiaries throughout Canada. If established by the house this committee will have full occasion to visit Canadian penitentiaries, interview inmates, ascertain the physical accommodations such as kitchen facilities, sanitary conditions, medical, dental or other services. It will have access to the plans already completed as well as those being developed for our construction program. As the committee will have power to report from time to time, it will be able to submit views even for the purpose of possible modification of our short term construction program.

A second committee, which will be a special committee of experts in many ways similar to the Fauteux committee, will be appointed by the government to study, report and make recommendations upon the whole corrections field in Canada. This will include such matters as arrest, bail, personal recognizance, remand and detention pending trial, sentencing, detention under sentence, rehabilitation methods and instruments, probation and parole. The study of that specialized committee will, of course, involve all aspects of the criminal law which are related to the matters which I have just enumerated. That second committee will have the benefit of both the interim and final reports of the parliamentary committee.

Through these two committees all those interested in the field of correction and penal reform in Canada, and who wish to make their views known, will have ready access to the government before the formal statement of an over-all philosophy and policy of Canadian correction is made.

[*Translation*]

Before leaving this question, I wish to recall that lately the personnel of the penitentiaries was the object of many unfair and unkind criticisms in the press and in radio and television reports. Those criticisms followed the statements made by a former inmate of the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, convicted of having been one of the leaders during the riot which occurred there in 1962.

That man was mistreated at that time, and when the incident was brought to the attention of the commissioner of penitentiaries, the latter appointed an independent commissioner to investigate this matter.

After a serious inquiry, the investigating commissioner stated in his report that eight officers belonging to the personnel were involved in that affair. The report also showed that the officers had thus acted after flagrant provocation.

The report also stated that five of those officers either had left their jobs or had been suspended; the report recommended disciplinary action against the other three. That measure was taken.

The conduct of those eight officers is not typical of that of the officers in the penitentiaries branch. Most of the penitentiaries officers, and there are more than 3,000 of them, are patient and devoted men who perform difficult and dangerous duties under difficult circumstances. Those persons do not deserve to be criticized by the Canadian public; they deserve our gratefulness.

[*Text*]

In respect to the matters with which the combines branch of my department is concerned, I wish to make a few comments about the act itself. It is my view that the Combines Investigation Act should be considered at all times as an integral part of the economic policy of the government of Canada, and should have a definite role to play as part of that policy. As the government's economic policy develops, the principles declared in the

legislation ought to be reviewed from time to time to ensure that they are making their optimum contribution to the over-all economic policy for Canada. I intend, therefore, to consider whether or not the substantive provisions and the procedural machinery in the legislation require any revision to bring them into line with the needs of our developing economy and of the general economic policy of the government.

One important matter to which I wish to give serious attention in this respect is the extent to which it might be possible to support legislation in this field under the head "trade and commerce" in section 91 of the B.N.A. Act, so as to give greater scope for the application of non-criminal remedies in enforcing the act.

As the committee is aware, the present legislation has been upheld as constitutionally valid by the Supreme Court of Canada on the ground that it is criminal law. The fact that proceedings under the act in the courts are criminal in nature poses particular problems in enforcement and creates considerable rigidity so far as adjusting monopolistic situations is concerned. I therefore am exploring the extent to which it may be within the power of parliament, without necessarily abandoning the criminal law technique, to extend this legislation into the non-criminal field with a view to providing additional and more flexible remedies for dealing with unwarranted restraints upon competition.

As an example which I have already cited to the house on a previous occasion, I have in mind that the greater use of injunctive remedies could, in many circumstances, bring about perhaps more quickly and more effectively necessary adjustments to correct restrictive situations. Indeed, a start has been made in this direction by the administration having obtained in several recent cases injunctions without prosecution under the present criminal provisions of the Combines Investigation Act.

I should like to emphasize that I am stating here merely what general consideration I am giving to these matters, and I am not announcing any decision as to government policy. However, as I have informed the house already, certain recommendations in this field are now the subject of discussion between myself and my colleagues in the cabinet, and any decision arising out of such discussion will be made known in due course in the proper way.

[*Translation*]

Here I should like to add a word concerning the disclosure of investigations carried out by the director, especially in view of the keen interest some hon. members have shown for the application of the Combines Investigation Act in particular cases.

As hon. members know, whenever I am asked if the government has undertaken or will undertake an investigation under the Combines Investigation Act, I always answer that the matter will be brought to the attention of the director of investigations and research, under the provisions of the Combines Investigation Act, and that the director will take whatever steps the act requires, but that in accordance with the usual practice, no information will be supplied to indicate whether an investigation has been undertaken with regard to a particular group of companies or individuals before such information appears in a published report.

That policy has been followed for many years by the various ministers of justice and it is in keeping with section 28 of the act which stipulates that any inquiry under the act shall be conducted in private, except that the president of the restrictive trade practices commission may order that all or any portion of any proceedings before the commission or any member thereof shall be conducted in public.

Parliament has protected the public interest in the judicious application of the act by requiring that the director, who is a high official, enjoying a high degree of independence, should undertake an investigation each time he has reasons to believe that the act has been or will be violated. The director can also be activated, if I may use that word, through a proper request made by six Canadian citizens or the Minister of Justice. The public is well informed at all times about the administration of the act through the periodic reports of the restrictive trade practices commission, special inquiries, court proceedings and the annual report of the director which has to be submitted to parliament.

[*Text*]

The Chairman: Order. Has the minister the consent of the committee to go beyond the allocated time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Favreau: I will not be long, Mr. Chairman.

[*Translation*]

It can be taken for granted that the director makes a satisfactory preliminary examination of any complaint he receives to determine whether he is required by the law to undertake an investigation. The procedure is the same for any merger brought to his attention, whether or not a complaint has been laid.

However, it would not be in the public interest to reveal, before all the facts have been evaluated, including the arguments and explanations presented by the parties concerned, any information concerning an investigation carried out to determine whether individuals or corporations have broken the law.

To act otherwise would almost necessarily be prejudicial to public interest for two main reasons: it would impair the orderly conduct of the investigation and serious injustices could be committed against those whose conduct is being scrutinized because the general public could conclude too early, before it is in possession of all the facts, that the people concerned must be guilty since an investigation is being carried out. I suggest that such a state of things would be contrary to our concept of the sovereignty of the law.

Two main aspects of public interest have to be reconciled: the policy of parliament, as reflected in the law, which requires that all investigations be carried out confidentially, except in those cases where the law provides for publicity, and the interest of the public which requires that the latter must be sure that the administration always carries out its obligations conscientiously and efficiently and that cases of public interest, within the meaning of the act, are handled judiciously.

Naturally, it is most important that hon. members be on the alert so as to be in a position to recognize any situation which should be looked into. Quite properly, they should constantly draw the government's attention to particular situations and they should seek to ensure that the government remains aware of the importance of applying efficiently the Combines Investigation Act. Still, the immediate disclosure of the director's activities in particular cases is not necessary to enable the house to fulfil its supervisory role, in view of the publicity provided for by parliament in the act.

Consequently, for all these reasons, I shall maintain the policy whereby information is withheld on the existence or the details of inquiries in progress, under the Combines Investigation Act, until a report is published, unless the public is already aware of it either because the trade itself has revealed its existence, or because the case has been taken to court, or for any other valid reason.

[*Text*]

Mr. Chairman, I was asked by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam shortly after three o'clock, followed by a question from the hon. member for Yukon, whether—if I restate the question incorrectly, will the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam please correct me—in the case of one Rivard, against whom extradition proceedings had been taken at the instance of the United States government, some pressure had been brought to bear by any member of the civil service or any person employed by the government of Canada, so that the full effect would not be given to these proceedings. If the hon. member has something else in mind to be added or included in this question, I would like him to say so before I give my answer. Is that the whole of the hon. member's question?

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, this is part of the question. I would appreciate having that part answered. There are many more details of this question about which I would like to ask the minister, but this is the core of the question to begin with.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, as a result of information placed before the R.C.M.P. by a person acting in this particular case, the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. reported the matter to me and it was immediately decided that the R.C.M.P. would undertake an inquiry into the matter. I must state that this was the first moment in my life as Minister of Justice that I had heard of that particular case, except through reading about it in the papers; but there had never been any representations made to me directly or indirectly. This is a case with which the Department of Justice as such, through its legal branch, is concerned in holding a watching brief.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, would the minister have offhand the date on which he first became acquainted with this situation?

Mr. Favreau: Subject to being corrected by the commissioner, it was approximately in August; maybe September.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, would the minister say who the person was who went to the mounted police?

Mr. Favreau: For the moment I do not care to comment on that too much. I will say why later on. I was saying that the

instructions in this case were given directly to counsel by the United States department of justice itself, which had retained counsel in Montreal. It was decided—

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the minister would allow me to intervene just for a moment.

Mr. Favreau: Perhaps I could finish my comments on that particular point.

Mr. Nielsen: I simply wish to suggest that for the benefit of the minister and of the cabinet as a whole it would be better to have the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration in the chamber to hear the minister's explanation and what will follow.

Mr. Favreau: These are my estimates, Mr. Chairman, and I suppose the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration is fully justified in not being in the chamber today. He is outside Ottawa today. I understand he will be in the house tomorrow. I do not know when his own estimates are coming back before the committee.

Mr. McIlraith: They have been passed.

Mr. Favreau: I am told they have been passed. An inquiry was made immediately, upon my recommendation, into all aspects of this matter. When the inquiry was completed, the R.C.M. Police felt there was not sufficient evidence to recommend a prosecution. The commissioner of the R.C.M. Police and myself went through the report, which is of substance and had been prepared by the R.C.M. Police. It was our joint assessment of the evidence that there was no case for the laying of information on the state of the evidence obtained. In this respect the file is kept by the R.C.M. Police as the continuing file, and the R.C.M. Police, of course, is taking into consideration all additional material which might be brought to their attention.

As far as the minute details of the file, the names of witnesses and the persons interviewed are concerned, I am advised by the R.C.M. Police that this forms part of the contents of a report made by them which, as in the case of all reports of the R.C.M. Police to the minister, remains confidential in the public interest. For that reason I believe it would be unfair for me to comment further.

I know the purpose of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam is not to elicit in this house—I know this and I assert it very sincerely—information not directed at a particular proceeding, which might only serve, until such time as the facts were confirmed, to cast doubts on people without the resulting benefit for the state of further proceeding in the matter. For these reasons I think it would be a betrayal of my duties as Minister of Justice to reveal more details. I think it is also my duty to repeat to the committee that there has been an inquiry, and that the R.C.M. Police, the commissioner and myself, on an assessment of the whole evidence, do not feel or believe that there is sufficient evidence to justify the laying of information in the present state of the material obtained. But I myself am fully aware that, should additional evidence convince us that if a charge were laid it would have a chance of success, there will of course be further proceedings.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the minister might answer one question before I begin my general remarks. I hear an hon. member opposite laugh. This is an extremely serious matter, as he will come to realize as we go along. I wonder whether the minister would tell the members of this committee whether he referred the report and the file of which he has spoken to the law officers of the crown for an opinion as to whether or not sufficient evidence existed on which to base information? If so, when was that reference made to the law officers of the crown?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, it is not the practice of the R.C.M. Police or the Minister of Justice to refer matters to the law officers of the crown for opinions unless (a) the matter is brought to the attention of the minister for that purpose or (b) he is satisfied that there is room for opinion. There has not been a formal submission to the law officers of the crown in this case.

Mr. Nielsen: If the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam has one or two questions to ask in this respect, Mr. Chairman, I would yield the floor to him before I embark upon my remarks.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, before we get into a general discussion of this matter I should like to say that I agree with the minister that no one wants to cast reflections on any individual or to create doubts in the public mind. Therefore I can understand the minister's reticence about naming names and pointing to specific individuals. On the other hand, I hope the minister will understand our responsibility as members of parliament when there seem to be indications, which are now further substantiated—

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, may I just rise to say that I yielded to the hon. member for the purpose of his asking a question, not to make a speech.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, I was not going to make a speech; I was only going to make a point and then ask a question at the end of it. The minister will recognize that we as members of parliament have a responsibility when there are indications that some attempt has been made to subvert justice. We particularly have a responsibility to question whether or not the examination to which the minister has referred can be completely unbiased if some of the persons who are affected are those in senior civil service positions or in the house itself. For that reason I should like to ask the minister whether any consideration has been given by the government to referring this matter to a judicial investigation, turning the material over to a judge, in order that it might be looked into, rather than having names tossed out in the house, which might be unfair. At the same time, if nothing is done to press this matter it may be that attempts to subvert justice will be overlooked, and it would be difficult to persuade the public that there were not political considerations involved in not pressing this matter further. I would ask the minister whether any consideration has been given to a judicial investigation or inquiry.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, the commissioner and myself were so convinced on the state of the evidence—and I repeat, on the state of evidence collected—that there was no possibility of a successful charge being laid that we have not given consideration to this aspect. However, as the matter involves—I do not say implicates but involves—certain persons who were at the time in the employ of the government of Canada, I think I have the right to disagree with the suggestion which has just been made by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam. If he has in mind that, because of the delicate nature of the facts and the possibility that certain people may be judged in a way which would be tantamount to making useless smears or innuendos or insinuations, this reference or hearing should be in camera, I would be ready to decide right away that that would be appropriate and to advise the government to order immediate holding of such inquiry by way of reference to a judge of a very high court. Would that be satisfactory?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, I find this suggestion just as astonishing as the reply of the minister, and he will realize why I find it so astonishing before I am through. His department in the normal course of events refers these matters to the law officers of the crown for an opinion. I heard him this afternoon—I do not have his words verbatim but I paraphrase—say that when the inquiry which he said he immediately demanded was completed the R.C.M.P. felt that there was not sufficient evidence to warrant prosecution. Then the minister went on to say that the commissioner and himself had gone through this very long detailed report, had made a joint assessment of the evidence, and would not lay an information and complaint. I find it unbelievable that the minister would place himself in this position. I find it unbelievable that he would place not only himself in that position but also the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. by deciding whether or not sufficient evidence was contained in the report on which to base the laying of a charge. That is not the minister's job and he knows that, and it is not the job of the commissioner of the R.C.M.P., and he knows it. It is properly the job of the criminal law section of his department to make such a decision.

What the minister should have done as soon as he received that report was refer it to his criminal law section and obtain their independent opinion. The minister knows as well as I do that the offenders in this case, and I do not hesitate to name them, were actually employees, one of the minister's office and one of the office of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Both of these employees have now left.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, that is an absolute lie, because nobody involved in this case, implicated as an offender by the hon. member, is a member of my department or has ever been a member of my department. Unless the hon. member for the Yukon is ready to repeat what he said outside to the newspapermen, under his responsibility as a citizen, and not under the screen of parliamentary immunity, I ask him to withdraw what he just said.

The Chairman: Order, please. May I suggest to the minister that the word he used may have gone beyond what he had in mind. He did use the word "lie".

An hon. Member: Withdraw.

The Chairman: That word is not acceptable in our debates.

Mr. Favreau: The statement of the hon. member for the Yukon was that one of the

offenders, and I repeat, one of the offenders was a member of my office, and that is not true.

The Chairman: There is a distinction, in that the minister can say that the statement is incorrect or untrue, but he cannot say it is a lie. I suggest to the minister that for the orderly conduct of our business it might be better if he limited his statement to saying that what the hon. member has said is untrue, rather than saying it is a lie. I feel that is one word, among others, that should be banished from our discussions. I ask the minister to co-operate with the Chair.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I should like the gentleman to withdraw his untrue statement.

Mr. Favreau: The hon. gentleman has not withdrawn his statement, and I ask him first whether he will accept responsibility for his statement and, second, will he on the basis of cowardice not repeat what he has said outside this house?

The Chairman: Order. It is a matter for debate whether the hon. member's statement is true or untrue. It may be true, untrue, correct or incorrect, and the minister has the right to doubt the veracity of the statement, but he cannot say it is a lie. Our rules are clear and the minister is aware of the many precedents to support that suggestion of the Chair. I would ask him to amend his statement, as has been suggested by the Chair.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, as far as semantics are concerned, you will recall that I corrected myself and replaced the word "lie" by saying that his statement was untrue.

The Chairman: I suggest that in view of the minister changing the word "lie" to the word "untrue", the committee should be satisfied.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect to you, I do not think the committee is satisfied. By stating that what the hon. member said was a lie he has in effect called the hon. member a liar. In addition to that, by accusing the hon. member of cowardice, he has called him a coward. Both those words should be withdrawn.

The Chairman: Order, please. I did not hear the second word to which the hon. member has alluded, and I do not think it was said. The first word was said and the minister has altered his statement, and, therefore, in effect the word has been withdrawn. If the hon. member feels the minister should state that he withdraws the word "lie" and changes it to the word "untrue", I would ask him to do so for the satisfaction of the Chair.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, the minister is going to hear a good deal during the course of my remarks to which he is going to take exception. I suggest to him that he receive my remarks, as hon. members of the committee might receive them, in a calm, unemotional state, so that he may assess them coolly and carefully. I am purposely avoiding indulgence in histrionics, such as that just displayed by the minister. I suggest to the minister that, as the minister with a portfolio as responsible as his, one of the first attributes requisite to a proper discharge of his function is self-control.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could rise on a point of order in a calm and judicial manner.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: My point of order is this. The hon. member for Yukon has expanded this incident by making a statement about something that is within the knowledge of the Minister of Justice, although he gave us absolutely no evidence whatever. He has merely made an assertion that the facts were within his own knowledge. The Minister of Justice has said that the statement is untrue. I suggest that if the hon. gentleman has that regard for justice which he professes, he should give us the evidence first and draw deductions later, instead of commencing by making statements about things with which he may or may not be familiar. He should not make broad general statements for the sake of getting them in the newspapers, having nothing by which to prove them.

An hon. Member: That is not a point of order.

The Chairman: Order. I will side with the hon. member for Yukon before he says anything, and draw to the minister's attention the fact that there really is no point of order here.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, throughout orders of the day I noticed the Minister of Transport squirming and holding hurried consultations with the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Justice.

The Chairman: Order. Perhaps now I should ask the hon. member for Yukon to return to the subject matter before the committee.

An hon. Member: Withdraw the statement that it is a lie.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. member should withdraw his personal attack.

Mr. Nielsen: I withdraw any reference to the fact that the minister was squirming. He was jumping around like he had ants in his pants.

Let me say that I intend, if the minister will be patient, to provide him with the facts as I know them. I am sure that the Minister of Justice, and some of his very prominent officials, whom I see in the gallery, once they have heard these facts will come to the same conclusion I have reached, and I am sure members of this committee will also come to those conclusions.

I should like to commence my remarks by saying that it is not my intention, to use the minister's own words, to raise innuendoes or smears, or to crucify any innocent person. However, certain facts have come to my attention which indicate quite strongly that there have been offences committed, under the Criminal Code of Canada, offences which the minister and the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. apparently have concluded are not founded upon sufficient evidence to warrant prosecution. Here I differ with the minister because on the basis of my information offences do exist which warrant prosecution under the Criminal Code of Canada.

The next immediately following information was obtained by me from public records. It is available to anyone who wishes to inspect those records and concerns the names of those who were involved in the commission of offences in Laredo, Texas, as it happens. On June 19—I think that is the date in which the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam was interested—one Leo René Maranda Rivard was arrested and arraigned in Montreal. He was arrested with Charles Emile Groleaux or Grosloup—you will have to forgive my French pronounciation—one Joseph Raymond Jones and one Julien Gagnon.

These gentlemen, if we can call them that, were charged with two counts, first, importing and smuggling heroin into the United States between January 1, 1963, and May 27, 1964 and, second, conspiracy to smuggle 35 kilos or 76 pounds of heroin into the United States from Mexico on October 10, 1963, in league with the following individuals, Jorge Eduardo Morena Chauvet, Paul Mondolini—I am sure that name will ring a bell in a good many minds—

An hon. Member: Never heard of him.

Mr. Nielsen: For the hon. member's information, he is a member of the notorious crime cartel known as the Mafia—Frank James Cuppola, Roger Beauchamin, Joseph Michael Caron, Joseph Raymond Jones—I have given that name already—Julien Gagnon—I have given that name already also—whose alias is Jerry Massey and Charles Emile Groleaux or Grosloup, all in connection with the Laredo, Texas incident.

The minister is aware of those facts and I am sure he will not contradict me thus far. For those who are interested, this information is available from Mr. Pilon in Montreal who is special clerk of the extradition court there. It is available to the public at large. I do not know what the hon. member is laughing at. I had no reference to any member of parliament.

On July 19 Rivard was arrested, was arraigned and applied for bail. July 10 was the first sitting day of the extradition hearing and the trial went on from August 20 to 27. On September 14 the decision was postponed to September 25 and on September 25 an extradition order was issued. Between September 25 and October 10 a writ of habeas corpus was applied for. I have not got the exact date but I am sure the minister knows it. According to the information I have, which dates back to the middle of last week, that particular application has not yet been heard.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member for Yukon will allow me, this might be a good point to complete the information which was sought a few minutes ago by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam and which the hon. member has also requested.

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Yukon has the floor, of course, but if he wants to yield to the minister to allow the minister—

Mr. Favreau: I thought he was yielding.

Mr. Nielsen: I yielded for a question. The minister had full opportunity to give us this information and he did not do so, but now that the heat is on and pressure is being applied he all of a sudden wants to rise.

Mr. Favreau: There is no heat and there is no pressure.

Mr. Nielsen: Perhaps the minister might permit me to conclude my remarks. If there are any inaccuracies he wishes to correct or additions to the record he wishes to make I think that is the time for him to do so. I would point out to the minister, however, that he had ample opportunity to make a full reply both to the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam and to myself.

The situation that triggered off the investigation of which the minister speaks has to do, not with these judicial proceedings as such but rather is confined to the bail application. That is all we are concerned with here. I might point out, however, before proceeding that two of the names I read out, Paul Mondolini and Cuppola, according to research done by Alan Phillips and published in September, 1963, in a two part article in *Maclean's* magazine, are members of or connected with the notorious international crime cartel, the Mafia, and the Cosa Nostra of New York.

I want to preface these remarks by saying that had it not been for his integrity and his high regard for his profession the efforts made to bribe and coerce the counsel acting on behalf of the United States government would have succeeded. I do not think the minister will take issue with that. The integrity that this gentleman of the Quebec bar displayed is an outstanding example to all members of his profession and, regrettably, not followed frequently enough. The minister is aware of that as well.

At this point may I say I regret very much that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration is not in his seat because this matter involves his office and I would have thought that the Minister of Justice, having foreknowledge of what I would be speaking about today, would have exerted every effort to ensure that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration was in his seat. The executive assistant to the minister at that time, Mr. Raymond Denis, offered a bribe in the amount of $20,000 to counsel who was acting for the United States government on the bail application with the request that he not oppose the bail proceedings which would in effect have allowed Mr. Rivard out on bail and presumably to go the way of Banks.

Mr. Woolliams: No wonder Banks got out.

Mr. Nielsen: To his undying credit counsel acting in this case said, "No, I will not accept $20,000", nor any other sum for that matter. But the matter did not stop there. It was then that the executive assistant to the Minister of Justice himself, Mr. Lord, entered the picture. I think he was an innocent dupe or perhaps one might even go so far as to say that because of his immaturity, because of his youth and his lack of knowledge as to why he was being requested to do what he was eventually requested to do he did something which I am sure he would never have done in the full light of maturity, and in the light of all the facts of the case. He called Mr. Lord, and he called to the same counsel and suggested to that counsel that he go easy on the bail application and made representations for the purpose of having counsel acting in this case for the United States government, not oppose the bail application. Now, these are the facts, and the minister knows these are the facts.

Mr. Favreau: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman. When the hon. member for Yukon says that the minister knows these are the facts, does he imply that I was aware of these facts at the time when he alleges they took place?

Mr. Nielsen: I am satisfied from my information that these events occurred without the minister's knowledge. However, that does not mean that the minister acted properly thereafter. I will be highly critical of the manner in which the minister treated this whole affair, but I will grant him this at the moment, that at the time of the Denis phone call—I am sorry that should not be a phone call, it was a personal confrontation—and at the time of the Lord phone call, there was no knowledge, so far as my information discloses, on behalf of the minister that Denis and Lord had done what they did. I am sure that if the minister knew about it, it would have stopped there—at least, I would expect that of a responsible minister of the crown. The fact remains—I can find no other way of putting it—that these tentacles of this international cartel dealing in narcotics extended into the very offices of two ministers of the federal government. This is what surprises me, that it could get this close.

I find it difficult to believe that Lord appreciated to the full extent the consequences of what he was doing. I knew Mr. Lord personally, and my own knowledge of him personally, backed up by subsequent information I was able to obtain, leads me to the belief he did what he did in an innocent way. I do not say it was unintentional because what he did, in my view—and here the minister may differ with me—was an offence under the Criminal Code, section 119 which makes it an offence to in any way

pervert the course of justice. I will be reading that section into the record in a moment or two.

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police took statements from Mr. Lord. They took a statement from his new executive assistant, Mr. Letendre. They took a statement from Mr. Denis. I must presume they took a statement from counsel who was acting for the United States government, and they took other statements as the minister knows. They made other investigations, the details of which are contained in the report to which the minister has already referred. When these circumstances were brought to the minister—

Mr. Favreau: Would the hon. member yield to a question in view of the seriousness of the matter? I take it that the hon. member for Yukon is not suggesting or implying that at the time Mr. Lord made the phone call to counsel acting on behalf of the United States government, he made any offer of material benefit to counsel?

Mr. Nielsen: That is quite accurate according to the best of my information, that there was no offer of valuable consideration by Mr. Lord. However, again to the best of my information, he did say that, you know, government work could all of a sudden stop coming your way unless something were done to see that you did not oppose the bail application. This is my information. I believe the minister will find that is in the police report.

It was at this time, much to the credit of the minister, that he did act, and Denis and Lord are no longer working for the ministers concerned. Denis was fired and Lord is now in Oxford, England, studying at Oxford University. I understand that, from time to time, he is on Mr. Chevrier's staff over there. This may or may not be true. In any event he is furthering his studies.

An hon. Member: It is not true.

Mr. Nielsen: I did not hear the hon. member's interjection. Perhaps he treats this lightly, but I do not and I am sure none of the other members do, either.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, will the hon. gentleman again yield to a question? In view of the date of the departure of Mr. Lord for Oxford, will the hon. member agree, in order that the record be completed, that more than ten months and approximately a year before he left his duties he had already advised Mr. Chevrier, and subsequently myself at the beginning of my tenure of office, that at the end of September, 1964, he would be leaving for Oxford?

Mr. Nielsen: I have had discussions with Mr. Lord, and of course with others, and I quite agree with the minister, that Mr. Lord had long had the intention; whether it was a year before these circumstances or more, I could not say. However, the relevant facts remains that Mr. Lord did what he did, and Mr. Lord is no longer working for the minister. I do not mean to imply by that, although the minister may wish to enlighten us on this, that Mr. Lord was fired. I do say Mr. Denis was fired. I want to be as accurate as possible in these circumstances.

Let us, for a moment, examine what the responsibilities of an executive assistant are and examine the provisions of the Criminal Code. Here is where I feel the minister comes in for severe criticism. The suggestion may be advanced that he did not act because of the proximity of these individuals to the political offices which are held by the two ministers concerned, one being himself. The minister will no doubt explain fully once I am through. The offence of obstructing under the Criminal Code of Canada is set forth in section 119(1) and I am reading from Tremeear's code, sixth edition, which was put on the market within the last 12 months or so:

> Everyone who wilfully attempts in any manner to obstruct, pervert or defeat the course of justice is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for two years.

This is a rather broad section, and the minister is aware of the application of it. I suggest to him that section is applicable certainly to Mr. Denis who made the cash offer to counsel and, in all likelihood, to Mr. Lord, who made representations with respect to the cutting off of government work unless the bail application was not opposed.

The next relevant section is section 100(1)(b) of the Criminal Code which reads as follows:

> Everyone who gives or offers corruptly to a person who holds a judicial office...any money, valuable consideration, office, place of employment in respect of anything done or omitted to be done or omitted by him in his official capacity for himself or another person, is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for 14 years.

This section may well be applicable in the case of Mr. Denis, although a very nice question arises as to whether or not counsel in this particular instance was an official within the meaning of that section, but this is a matter upon which I am sure the law officers of the crown could advise the Minister of

Justice. I have high regard for the legal knowledge of the commissioner of the R.C.M.P., but that is not what he is there for —to judge whether or not evidence falls within the particular provisions of the Criminal Code.

The next relevant section concerns extortion and is section 291(1):

> Every one who, without reasonable justification or excuse and with intent to extort or gain anything, by threats,—

And I draw those words to the minister's attention:

> —by threats, accusations, menaces or violence induces or attempts to induce any person, whether or not he is the person threatened, accused or menaced or to whom violence is shown, to do anything or to cause anything to be done, is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for 14 years.

What is a judicial proceeding? A judicial proceeding is defined by section 99(c)(i) and (iii) of the Criminal Code. It means a proceeding:

> (i) in or under the authority of a court of justice or before a grand jury,

And:

> (iii) before a court, judge, justice, magistrate or coroner,

Certainly the bail application was a judicial proceeding within the meaning of the Criminal Code.

Section 99(d)(i) defines "office" as follows:

> "office" includes (i) an office or appointment under the government—

Section 99(b)(i) sets forth that "government" means:

> —the government of Canada.

Here the nice distinction arises as to whether or not counsel acting for the U.S. government held an office within the meaning of this definition. He was not acting wholly for the Canadian government. His client, in essence, is the U.S. government, but nonetheless the minister is fully aware how these appointments come about. When the United States requires counsel to conduct Canadian proceedings for it there is no doubt in my mind that the channel of communication is through his office, and certain recommendations are made—selections are made—

Mr. Favreau: The channel of communication is not through my office. There is just a watching brief, but counsel is retained directly by the United States government.

Mr. Nielsen: I was not suggesting the channel went through the minister's office, because I presume there are certain channels through external affairs which are followed in formal matters. However, having acted as counsel for the crown under both Liberal and Conservative governments—I dare say I will never act under a Liberal government again—but having acted as crown counsel for many years under both governments I know how these recommendations come about; and the minister is fully aware of that, as well as the Minister of Transport, who once aspired to be a magistrate, I believe, in the studies of law in Newfoundland.

Mr. Pickersgill: I am not aware of this and I think these revelations the hon. gentleman hinted at would be very edifying to some of the laymen in the committee.

Mr. Nielsen: I know the Minister of Transport is extremely touchy on this. It is a very delicate matter, as the Minister of Justice has said, and I am being very careful as to how I refer to it. It is a matter which I feel should long ago have been exposed by the government, and I feel that it is because of the political embarrassment involved that it has not been revealed before this. But of far more serious connotation is the fact that a prosecution has not yet been commenced, an information has not yet been laid against Mr. Denis who made the bribe offer.

I can understand the feelings of the Minister of Justice with respect to Mr. Lord. I can even appreciate them; but I certainly cannot, as a member of the bar, appreciate his not ensuring that an information was laid in the case of Mr. Denis, because here you have a system of justice which has a certain structural procedure erected within the Department of Justice for the purpose of considering, independently of the politicians or the R.C.M.P., the adequacies or inadequacies of evidence. But the Minister of Justice has disclosed to us that he has not referred this matter to the criminal law section of his department for their assessment, a criminal law section which was established and grew up over many years with excellent personnel, excellent professional people in it. Here is a matter which should have been referred to them and it has not been.

In effect what the minister has told us today is that in concert with the commissioner of the R.C.M.P.—I did not include him, the minister did—he made a judicial decision. I do not think the minister will quarrel with the circumstances regarding Mr. Denis' activities as I have laid them out, and surely these circumstances constitute what we know in law as a prima facie case, a case at first

blush that an offence has been committed, and it is not upon the minister and the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. judicially to weigh those circumstances and come to any conclusions whatsoever. That is the function of the courts of this country. That is my understanding of what judges and juries are for.

Mr. Favreau: Will the hon. member yield to a question? Does the hon. gentleman agree that in relation to the laying of charges there is vested in whomever intends to lay a serious charge a sense of necessary responsibility which ought to prompt him to act in a way where he is showing that in the laying of the charge he is taking into account all norms, that of Christian charity, that of justice, and is doing away with any sort of smear by innuendo by the official fact of laying the charge?

Mr. Nielsen: I commenced by saying it was not my intention to smear anybody or arouse any innuendo.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: If any hon. gentleman wishes to accuse me of smear tactics in the light of the facts I have disclosed this afternoon, and the non-denial by the minister as to the truth of those facts, let him rise. This is a matter which I feel as an opposition member I have a responsibility to expose, not for any ill-considered motive or reason but by reason of the fact that we have had a bribe offer made to a counsel of high integrity, acting for a friendly government, in a case which involves the international traffic in narcotics, and these are circumstances which disclose that the power of these criminals extends to the very offices of crown officials.

This is the extent of the message that I am trying to get across to committee members, and I say that it is an indictment of the actions of the minister that he has not referred this matter to the proper law officers of the crown, to whom it should have been referred, to obtain their opinion. It is an indictment of the minister to have acted with the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. in a judicial capacity, which is not his function. This is what we have courts for, and I say that it is an indictment of the activity of the minister in making the decision that he did, shelving the matter. I would like to hear the minister inform this committee when he replies—as he has already told us he has not referred the matter to the law officers of the crown in the criminal law section—about that matter and explain it. He was an associate minister of the department and I acted as crown counsel under a previous Liberal government—as a matter of fact, I only acted as crown counsel under a Liberal government—and he knows the procedure, as I do.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I must advise the hon. member that his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Go ahead.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we let the hon. gentleman continue—on his own responsibility, of course, not ours. But he asked me a question and I think I should answer it at the moment. First I must say that the file about which the hon. member for Yukon is speaking and to which he refers is a live file with the R.C.M.P.; the matter has not been closed. Any further information—as I have said in answer to a question of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam —is being put on file. All I said was this: There are hundreds of files which presently have not been referred to the attention of the law officers of the Department of Justice by the police, about which there might have been a lapse in investigation because the police are not yet satisfied that there is a case to send for opinion to the Department of Justice. The reason I personally have decided that until further evidence were obtained it would not be fair to lay a charge is only because the laying of charges in a case where one knows there is no chance of judicial success is an act of smear, a lack of charity and an injustice. The laying of a charge must be based on the knowledge that there is sufficient evidence to go to trial.

Mr. Bigg: A prima facie case.

Mr. Favreau: The laying of a charge must also be conditioned by the certainty that all possible evidence has been gathered, and also by the certainty that there is no occasion to obtain more evidence. None of these circumstances exist in the present case. My responsibility, as far as I am concerned, is this.

Mr. Woolliams: The theory is fine, but that is not how it works in practice.

Mr. Favreau: If in the present case I had personally ordered the laying of a charge, I would have betrayed my conscience and acted against the principle that would govern an honest citizen, because I might have brought about the condemnation without trial—and this is what has been done this afternoon—of two young men whose future ought not to be placed in jeopardy except

with the certainty that the course of justice may be followed and pursued to a successful end. That is the only reason why, on the present state of the evidence, no charges have been laid.

The hon. gentleman for Yukon may feel that for any purposes whatsoever he owes it to this house to disclose the facts; but I would double dare him to tell this house that he has facts which he knows would bring a conviction against any person on the basis of the information obtained by the R.C.M.P. The file is open. I think the best way to assess the minister's conduct on this occasion is to notice my reaction to the suggestion made this afternoon by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, namely that the matter be referred to a high court judge to determine whether or not there is sufficient evidence. If I had something to hide, I would not have acceded readily to that suggestion. The reason I did is that I knew that the hon. gentleman was preparing to unveil part of what is in the confidential file, taking the responsibility to make public knowledge matters, without proof, on certain references which may not for the moment be sufficient ground for instituting legal proceedings. If the matter could be heard in camera, then no reputation could be hurt or smeared unjustly, except for due cause.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, the minister's concept of what his responsibilities are is absolutely astounding.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nielsen: I find it unbelievable that he would suggest that we discard our whole system of preliminary inquiries, which is a function of courts in order to establish whether or not there is a prima facie case, in preference to an in camera hearing. What star chamber justice is that? There is no justification whatsoever for an in camera inquiry or any public inquiry. What I have disclosed here—and the minister has not said that the circumstances I have placed before the committee are not accurate—indicates that the matter should be at least sent to the criminal law section of his department for their advice, certainly in preference to his decision and that of the commissioner of the R.C.M.P., as to whether or not sufficient evidence exists upon which to base an information. I feel that if such an offence had been made by anyone other than Mr. Denis, charges would have been laid so fast it would have made his head swim.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Peters: Where is Denis now?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Denis is in Montreal practising law, I am informed. Incidentally, he used to be a member of the Geoffrion firm in Montreal, which I believe was Mr. Chevrier's firm.

Mr. Favreau: What a way to put facts before the committee. For the information of the committee, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Denis is not practising law with Mr. Geoffrion—

Mr. Nielsen: I did not say he was.

Mr. Favreau: —who is Mr. Chevrier's partner; he is practising law with another very reputable firm, which is that of Blais and Associates.

Mr. Nielsen: I did not say he was practising law with Geoffrion; I said he used to.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacEwan: Take out your ear plugs.

Mr. Nielsen: I hope hon. members opposite will listen very carefully to what I am saying. If they read my remarks when they appear in *Hansard* tomorrow, they will find that is precisely what I said at the outset. I was being very careful in what I said. The preliminary inquiry, as the minister knows, decides whether or not sufficient evidence exists upon which to send an accused person for trial. As I say, the minister knows that.

He also knows that his criminal law section exists for the specific purpose of deciding whether or not, in their impartial view, there is sufficient evidence to send a matter on. That is one of the functions of the criminal law section, and they have many. Indeed, if at the detachment level the police themselves feel sufficient evidence exists, information can be laid on further reference to higher authority.

However, here is a matter which was referred to high authority and investigated. It concerned an offence in Montreal which should have been dealt with as any other case would have been dealt with by the judicial officials of this country. The minister said he would not personally order the laying of a charge by reason of the fact that he might be smearing somebody, or that he might be exercising his charitable inclinations toward anyone who deserved them. But I suggest that that is not his function. He neither orders the laying of a charge in a situation like this nor, conversely, does he suppress the laying of a charge.

Mr. Favreau: Is the theory of the hon. member for Yukon that any complaint made to the police should automatically be followed by a charge in the courts? Does he not agree that the most vicious practice in the prosecution of the criminal law is to use the system of a criminal hearing when you know that the man will not be sent to trial but that his name will be placed before the public?

Mr. Nielsen: Now the minister is saying, as I understand him, that he is not sending the matter on for a preliminary hearing before trial because he feels there is not sufficient evidence to warrant the matter going further to trial. That is what I have been suggesting to the minister is wrong about his conduct. It does not lie within his sphere of responsibility, indeed it is not his function at all, to consider this matter in a judicial way. That is precisely what he did and that is precisely what he should not have done. What he should have done was to refer the matter to the criminal law section and get their opinion.

Why was it not referred to the criminal law section? A colleague on my left has just pointed out that the minister went further than merely not ordering that informations be laid for the purpose of taking the matter before a preliminary inquiry. The minister went so far as to say that he himself had to be convinced that the offender was guilty before any such action was taken.

Mr. Favreau: I said when there was a chance of successful prosecution, and you know it.

Mr. Nielsen: That is precisely my point. The minister's function is not to decide innocence or guilt. It is not his function to decide whether or not there is sufficient evidence to warrant sending a matter to preliminary inquiry or trial. Nor is it the function of the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. to act in such fashion. This is what the minister did which I feel is wrong. He has a criminal law section set up for this specific purpose, a criminal law section which was avoided. Why?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will allow me to say so, what I have done here is the only possible defence of the Conservative party for not having laid charges against Banks.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: For six years.

Mr. Nielsen: The minister knows—

The Chairman: Order.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

I want to point out that other hon. members would like to direct questions to the Minister of Justice from time to time. For the present, the same hon. member always seems to have the floor, and, as he stated a short while ago that his time had expired, we should also like to ask the minister a few questions.

[*Text*]

The Chairman: The understanding was that the hon. member's time had elapsed but with the unanimous agreement of the committee he was allowed to continue his remarks beyond the time allocated by the rules.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, I do notice the hour and I will take my seat in a moment or two, but I have one or two more things which should be said. I will say them very quickly so that other members may put their questions to the minister.

The minister did say—the expression I have is "I double dare you to produce facts which would justify me in recommending that information be laid", or words to that effect. That is not my function. The minister knows as well as I do what are facts. He has seen the report. It is his responsibility to act on the facts that that report discloses. That is what I conceive to be his responsibility and I am sure all committee members feel the same way. The minister should have referred the matter to his criminal law section and he should have obtained their advice. Had he done so I feel he would have been advised that there was sufficient evidence to warrant proceeding at least to the stage of a preliminary inquiry. Then the minister in his portfolio as Minister of Justice, knowing that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration's executive assistant was involved, should have been even more careful to see that he personally did not intervene in this matter. He should have been ultra careful and seen to it that the matter was referred to the law officers for an independent appraisal at the official level rather than at the political level.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I intend to take further part in this debate after I have heard the minister's reply, because I have not disclosed by any means all of the facts which are in my possession.

Mr. Pickersgill: More smears.

Mr. Nielsen: If the Minister of Transport feels that I have smeared anybody in any

way let him rise and refute the circumstances I have placed before this committee.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, a challenge has been offered to me and I think I can say that I have never at any time in this house or anywhere else made general allegations that people have committed offences when those people had not previously been convicted in the courts. I say that because I have some respect for justice. And I never intend to.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What about the Fort Garry hotel?

Mr. Nielsen: There is a statement, Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

We have just seen the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) sit down of his own accord, saying to the Minister of Transport that if he had anything to say, he was to stand up and say it. I think that by so doing the hon. member for Yukon has finished his speech.

Now, others might doubtless raise questions on the same subject. That is what I am inquiring about at the present time. I have only three short questions to put to the Minister of Justice in this connection; it will not take more than three minutes.

[*Text*]

The Chairman: For the sake of order in our proceedings in committee, what we normally do is this. After a statement from the minister responsible for the estimates which are before the committee we hear a statement from representatives from different parties in opposition. I gather that although the hon. member for Yukon wishes to take part in the debate again he has concluded his preliminary statement. Perhaps we could now pass on to a representative of the following parties, and eventually we will reach the hon. member for Lapointe.

Mr. Nielsen: I just have one sentence, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Yukon had not yielded his position and, therefore, still has the floor. If he has a point to make he has the right to make it now, provided he has the unanimous consent of the committee.

An hon. Member: He already has that consent.

The Chairman: He did have the consent but it was withdrawn, so apparently he no longer has it.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask three questions.

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Douglas: I was trying to ask several questions.

Mr. Nielsen: I should just like to make one remark, if the hon. member will permit me to do so. The last remarks of the Minister of Transport, who left the committee with an innuendo or a smear, as far as I was concerned, was a remark which could only come from a master of the smear.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. Surely if the word "lie" is unparliamentary, the word "smear" is also unparliamentary.

An hon. Member: You used it.

Mr. Pickersgill: I would not think of wasting the time of the committee by asking the hon. member to withdraw a remark about a subject on which there is no greater expert in the house.

An hon. Member: Sit down.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, this matter which has arisen out of questions which were asked by the hon. member for Yukon and myself during orders of the day has taken this committee away from the general discussion now before it. I do not want to do that, as I know there are other members who wish to pose other questions. Therefore, by intervention only, I should like to ask the minister some questions about this particular case rather than about the general functions of the department.

I must say to the minister that I am far from reassured by the statements and answers he has given today. It is now quite apparent that the basic situation, as I understood it when I asked the minister a question earlier, has been completely substantiated, namely that an individual in Montreal, acting for the government of the United States in seeking to extradite an individual to the United States in connection with narcotics infringements, has claimed to have been approached by persons very close to cabinet ministers with (a) some attempt at bribery

and (b) some attempt at intimidation. It seems to be clear that these allegations have been made and that the minister has asked the R.C.M.P. to investigate them.

Mr. Favreau: On the same day.

Mr. Douglas: It seems to be clear that the Minister of Justice now has a report before him but that he has decided not to act upon this report. Those appear to be the facts. I should like the minister to tell us, if he will, since this matter came to his attention in August, when the investigation was ordered and, second, when he received a report from the R.C.M.P. I want to know also whether in that report there is an indication that the person who alleged that an attempt had been made either to bribe or intimidate him, or both, was interrogated and whether his evidence was examined closely. Were the two individuals, who are alleged to have committed these offences, interrogated, and have they involved anyone else higher up in the government?

Quite frankly I can assure the minister that I am not trying to fish in dirty waters, but I am sure the minister must realize that unless he can convince the public that this matter has been investigated frankly and fully, a suspicion will remain that these two men have not been prosecuted because of the fact they might have involved other individuals.

After I get the date the minister received the report, I should like to know what action was taken following its receipt. I took it for granted, when the minister said a short time ago that he and the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. had come to the conclusion that there was not sufficient grounds for successful prosecution, that this meant he had referred the matter to the criminal branch of the Department of Justice in order to ascertain whether there was a prima facie case so that a charge might be laid. I gathered from the minister's silence following the questions posed by the hon. member for the Yukon that this matter was not referred to the criminal branch of the Department of Justice, and I should like to know why it was not so referred.

The minister is now willing to instigate a judicial inquiry but I am curious as to why this matter was not the subject of a judicial inquiry, and why the minister and the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. decided, having received the report, that in their opinions there was not sufficient ground for laying the charge? The minister must have known that in making that decision, involving people very close to the government who may have implicated individuals even closer to the government, he was dealing with something which would be open to suspicion. I think the minister should have taken steps immediately to remove this decision from himself, by placing it in the hands of either the law officers of the crown, in the criminal investigation branch of his department, in the hands of a judge of the supreme court, or in the hands of a judge of another high court, in order that they might decide whether or not there were adequate grounds for laying a charge, even though the minister had decided no such grounds existed. I am sure the minister will acknowledge that there might be a suspicion in the minds of some people that his decision was prejudiced or biased because of the fact the individuals involved, it has been alleged, were employed in his own office or the office of one of his cabinet colleagues. Therefore I should like to know the reason for the delay following the receipt of the report; why the report was not sent to the law officials of the department, and why no action was taken with reference to a judicial inquiry.

It certainly is better to receive this information now than not at all, but I am sure the minister must realize that we feel indignant as members of parliament, who have no facilities for investigating this sort of thing, had to dig the facts out at a time when the minister, in the interests of justice and of keeping the good name of the Department of Justice, could very well have acted on his own initiative so that this matter would have been dealt with by individuals outside the Department of Justice, thus avoiding the possibility of suspicion in anyone's mind that the whole situation has been swept under the rug. That certainly is the impression one gets on an initial investigation of the facts we have at our disposal.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, I think the questions raised by the hon. member are fair questions, in that they concern directly the conduct of the minister, but do not lead to the unfair condemnation, without proof, of people who are not before the courts. I think I should suggest that the way in which this whole thing is being conducted ought to be looked into or judged in the light of the manner in which it began. I think this is the best way to draw conclusions and assess the conduct of the minister in this respect.

I must say that when the matter was referred to me very confidentially by the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. around the 15th of August—it was the 14th of August—one of

the persons involved was in Ottawa and my special assistant, Mr. Lord, was, I thought, in Quebec city. The commissioner is here so I can speak freely. After the commissioner had explained to me the seriousness of the allegation made it did not take two minutes for me to tell him that he should have the people involved interviewed that day, the one in Quebec and the other one in Ottawa. I told him he should have two of his men briefed accordingly so there would be no occasion for anybody to get in touch with anybody else. Those were my instructions. So the answer to the question, when did the minister order an inquiry or investigation after having learned about the matter, is that it was not only on the same day but in the course of the same conference with the commissioner.

Interim reports were received by the commissioner and they were discussed by me. When I say "interim reports" I mean transcripts of interviews which had been had, and a full report was made to me and discussed with the commissioner on September 18 of this year. I do not want to mislead the house and give the impression that the commissioner has made a decision. It was not up to the commissioner to decide. We discussed his views on the matter from the standpoint of police investigation and fact finding as a result of the investigation. With regard to any decision respecting the lodging of a complaint in the light of the report and that conversation, I, of course, must take responsibility because under the statute the legal adviser to the crown is the Minister of Justice, and not the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. for whose judgment, however, I have the greatest respect.

With regard to the third question, was anybody higher up in the government involved in the declaration made to the police either by the counsel who made the complaint or the person directly involved in the allegation of bribery, I must say that the allegation was violently denied by Mr. Denis, and nobody else in the government was involved by him in so far as the allegation of bribery or attempted bribery was concerned.

An hon. Member: Were members of parliament involved?

Mr. Favreau: I must say immediately that according to the evidence Mr. Lord's telephone call, of which I became aware, of course, only after the commissioner had reported the facts to me, was not at all concerned—this was agreed to by the hon. member for Yukon a few minutes ago—with any financial benefit that might have been promised to the counsel who had made the charge.

I must say that Mr. Denis has been separated or has obtained his separation from the government since and he has now obtained employment with a very reputable law firm in Montreal. I do not know whether he is a partner. Mr. Lord left, and I want to put the record clear in this respect, not as the result of any disagreement between him and me, not as the result of any lack, directly or indirectly, of confidence on my part in him. He left the department at the very time he was supposed to leave as the result of a decision which had been taken quite a long time before.

He had in fact advised Mr. Chevrier ten months or a year before I took office that he would not be with him for more than a year because he was planning to go to Oxford. This was one of the first things he advised me of when I took office as minister. At a certain time around the month of May I think it was not definite whether the conditions of access to the particular college at Oxford where he wanted to study would be obtained and he even asked me to try to make alternative representations to an American university in case he could not succeed in getting into Oxford.

That was around the month of May and early in the month of June, while his admission to Oxford had not yet been confirmed, I suggested to him the particular subject in which he would be tutored at Oxford. This is a subject with regard to which there are not many works. It is what is known in England as public corporations and in Canada as crown corporations, and this is the subject on which he is specifically working. Since that time no additional evidence has come to my knowledge or has been referred to me by the R.C.M.P. which would justify laying an information.

I must say frankly, candidly and earnestly that it had not come to my mind to launch a judicial inquiry as suggested. I have said that as far as I am concerned I would be very agreeable to one being held. Something like that will have to be done now in any event, if only to protect the reputations of those who may be involved and who have been mentioned today. I never really thought that the time had come to refer the matter to the law officers of the crown. I will do that now, of course, although I do not believe that there is really the information to do so. I say that because it must not be forgotten that

any opinions given by the officers of the crown are given under the responsibility of the Minister of Justice, who may or may not accept the opinions or may give a different opinion.

It may be that certain members will consider that I laid myself open, in acting as earnestly and as naïvely as I did, to certain possible criticism. I am ready to agree with this. However, I will never accept any insinuation that I have ever attempted to hide the truth to protect somebody from justice. As I said, I might have been acting naïvely, and the only reason I would not have acted personally was that I felt, in the light of the circumstances, it would have been unfair to lay an information against somebody when no conviction could be obtained on the evidence collected at the present stage. Those are the facts. I am telling them to the house very frankly.

It is quite true, now that the names have come out in the open and they have come out from the mouth of one person and not from the mouth of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, in all fairness to those concerned I have to consider making a decision which will bring this matter to a head in every respect.

Mr. Douglas: I have two brief questions. The first is, when did Mr. Denis leave the office of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration? Was it after August 14?

Mr. Favreau: He left on or about October 1, I believe. I would much prefer the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration would answer that himself. However, it was after the report made by the commissioner; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. Douglas: If the minister could answer the other part of my question I would be interested in knowing if he left at the request of the minister. However, only the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration can answer that.

The Minister of Justice said there was no statement made by either of the persons who were under suspicion involving any other person or persons higher up.

Mr. Nielsen: In the government.

Mr. Douglas: In the government, yes.

Mr. Peters: Who was going to pay the $20,000?

Mr. Favreau: I wonder what my hon. friend meant by "higher up in the government"?

[Mr. Favreau.]

Mr. Douglas: I had not finished my question. The minister stated there was no statement by either of these gentlemen, the two executive assistants, involving any person higher up. I wonder if the minister would tell the committee, was there anything in the statement of the counsel who was alleging attempted bribery and intimidation which involved any person other than the two persons whose names have already been mentioned?

Mr. Favreau: I shall attempt to refresh my memory by asking the commissioner. The commissioner tells me he will have to check on that, and at the resumption of the sitting at eight o'clock I undertake to answer this. My recollection is not, but I would not care to make that as a firm statement.

Mr. Douglas: I ask the minister to check it very carefully. I have reason to believe that in the allegations there are other persons, or at least one other person, named.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, there is in this respect something which strikes me. The case is still open, and, as long as the case is not closed, additional evidence may be brought up in such a matter. It is quite a point that the case should still be open.

Before I put my questions, I would like to make one or two remarks. First of all, the minister seemed to indicate a short while ago that, in his view, there was as yet no reason to lay information against certain individuals because he himself, or the R.C.M.P., were entertaining sufficient doubts. I do not believe that it is up to the minister, or the R.C.M.P., to decide whether there should—

Mr. Favreau: This is to clarify the situation. It is possible that I did talk in such a way that the hon. member for Lapointe did not understand me. I said earlier that it was obvious that the function of the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. was not to make a decision but rather that he had the right to express his views and that the responsibility of making a decision would rest on me.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, on the other hand there is just the same another principle in law according to which if a man is found not guilty of a criminal charge, he cannot be tried a second time for the same offence. That right gave the minister justification for not taking proceedings when not enough evidence has been collected and for

waiting until all evidence is available before making charges.

Now, here is the question which I should like to ask the minister. Is there in this file a prima facie evidence to refer the whole thing to a preliminary investigation or, if not, is the R.C.M.P. still conducting an investigation to complete its file and, in the alternative, once the investigation is completed, will the minister send the matter to a preliminary investigation if he entertains the slightest doubt because a preliminary investigation is not so serious since under our legal system, until proven guilty you are innocent.

Here is my fourth and last question to the minister: Now that this matter is in the open, does the minister not think that it would be in the interests of the persons involved that a preliminary investigation be carried out?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, I feel that I have pretty well answered the last question of the hon. member for Lapointe when I said that now that the names are public knowledge the lesser evil must be sought, and I shall make a decision in that regard.

Mr. Grégoire: I asked the question precisely because the minister has answered that now that everything is public knowledge he will make a decision. On the other hand, he has not told us in which sense. Might it not be preferable for the people concerned to pursue the inquiry?

Mr. Favreau: That is precisely what is intended. In all fairness, since the case is still open, I feel that I must make my instructions very clear once more and instruct the R.C.M.P. to continue its investigation in a positive fashion, for the file was never closed by the R.C.M.P.

The R.C.M.P. has never decided that it would accept no further information or that it would refuse to carry on with its investigation if it got additional leads.

The case being open, as the hon. member for Lapointe pointed out, the presentation of new evidence will obviously be the object of a more detailed investigation.

What seems clear, however, is that I will have to instruct the R.C.M.P. to complete the investigation within a given time for the benefit of both the legal advisers of the Department of Justice and the judge who will have to be appointed, if we decide to appoint one.

We will have to prepare a final report and I agree with the hon. member for Lapointe that the setting of a maximum period of time for the presentation of such a report involves the risk of taking legal action too soon.

In view of the age of the people concerned or rather of the one person involved—I still maintain that there is only one—I feel it would have been dishonest for me to order his prosecution because of his family and other responsibilities.

Naturally, it would have been easy for me to wash my hands of the whole thing as Pilate did, but I consider that I have to take my responsibilities and go further. I am confident that I acted fairly in the circumstances.

[*Text*]

Mr. Fairweather: Would the minister answer the key question which has not yet been answered. Did he refer the R.C.M.P. report made about September 18 to the criminal law section of his department or to any other officials? Does he not think these officials are motivated by the same high ideals for the protection of the innocent that he tells us motivates him? Did these people know, or was this decision taken by himself alone?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the hon. member is asking that question again. I answered it very frankly and honestly when it was posed by the hon. member for Yukon. I said it has not been referred to the law officers of my department, and the reason it has not is simply because I do not feel in the present state of the record and file there is sufficient evidence or justification for doing so.

Mr. Fairweather: Well, it is tragic.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I would be in order in not following up the discussion which has been proceeding for the past two hours. As a layman I know there is nothing I can add to the opinion of the eminent member of the bar from the Yukon and to the opinion of the eminent member of the bar who is Minister of Justice, and so far as I am concerned anything I might say in that respect would only compound confusion.

I should like to revert to the first half of the speech made by the Minister of Justice, dealing with the general question of penology. First may I say I am somewhat disappointed, as a matter of fact very disappointed, with the presentation made by the minister on this important matter. Basically I am disappointed because it is the same record I

have heard played by ministers of justice for 11 years—an expression of platitudes, of generalities and good intentions, and I feel we are entitled to receive more from the minister than the announcement of the appointment of two committees, one outside the house and one composed of members of the house. That is only putting off for too long action which can be taken now.

I do not intend to speak on the matter of the two committees, but I do want to say that as a result of my many years' interest in penology and of my contacts with the officials of the department, especially those dealing with the penitentiaries system, I am convinced that if the minister and the government really wanted to know what should be done all they have to do is ask their top officials.

From my knowledge of these men I am absolutely convinced that if the minister were to ask, let us say, the commissioner of penitentiaries and the chairman of the parole board, what should be done in the interests of modern penology, inside 48 hours they would have the answers on his desk. They know what should be done and there is only one thing holding them back from doing it, namely that they have not got the money.

If the minister was really sincere in all those wonderful speeches he made during the last six weeks across the length and breadth of Canada I suggest he ask for recommendations from these two men within the next 48 hours, and then speak to the Minister of Finance about getting the money that will be needed.

Before going on to explain some of my views, which basically I feel are those in the minds of the departmental officials, I would like to say I was bitterly disappointed that the minister was not able to take the opportunity today to announce salary increases for the employees in the penitentiaries system. The salaries which are paid to them are an absolute disgrace in view of the responsibilities of their positions, in view of what they have to know, in view of the type of men they have to handle and in view of the fact that their very lives are continually endangered every hour and every minute of their occupation.

During the past few weeks I had an opportunity to go into this matter in some detail. The officials working in the penitentiaries start at the rate of $302 a month and, after reaching their highest classification, they still receive $75 a month less than first class constables who pound a beat in our major cities. I say that is disgraceful. I also say that these men cannot live on what we pay them, as evidenced by the fact that they have to go moonlighting.

Some time ago I asked one of the branches of the civil service association to make a study of all the employees in one penitentiary, and I would like to read the information I received because I think it will startle members of the committee. However, since it is almost six o'clock may I call it six o'clock and I shall continue after the recess.

The Chairman: Order. It is my duty pursuant under provisional standing order 39A to inform the members of the committee that the questions to be raised this evening at 10 p.m. are as follows: The hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott), House of Commons, completion of redistribution before election; the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macquarrie); transport, P.E.I. causeway, inquiry as to construction start.

It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Chairman, at the time of the dinner recess I was pointing out the disgraceful situation with regard to the ridiculously low wages which are paid to the guards in our penitentiaries. I stated that they could not possibly maintain themselves and their families at any decent standard of living, with the result that there had to be a great deal of moonlighting or their wives working. In order to prove this—because it was my suspicion and contention that this was correct—I asked the New Westminster justice group of the civil service association of Canada if they would make a survey at the B.C. penitentiary for me. I would like to read the result of that survey. I have here a letter under date August 20 addressed to myself. It says:

Dear Mr. Winch:

With reference to your question during a recent meeting with members of our executive committee concerning additional income required by penitentiary officers in order to obtain a sufficient standard of living, I have been instructed to advise:

That 187 members of the staff of B.C. penitentiary have been personally contacted. The results are that 143 or 76 per cent of the members find it necessary to either moonlight, have their wives

go out to work, or take in boarders or foster children in order to have an adequate standard of living.

Most of the remaining officers on the staff, who do not have any income other than their salaries, have stated that they are in desperate financial straits.

That is signed by Mr. H. W. Darby, the secretary of this group. I believe that should be startling information to hon. members and to the government, especially when we realize that the guards in the penitentiaries spend their eight hours of work in penitentaries and are dealing with inmates of penitentiaries who are there because they have broken the laws of Canada and have been sentenced to two years imprisonment or more. Of all those in the penitentiaries at the present time, 83 per cent are recidivists; that means that 83 out of every 100 in the penitentiaries today have broken the law before and have gone to jail before. The guards have to deal with them. There is great mental pressure on the guards and there is also risk to life and limb; they can never tell when their lives are in danger.

In very recent years three guards have been killed on the job. They receive only $302 a month when they start, and when they become first class guards they still receive $75 less than a first class constable who pounds the sidewalks of our city. Moreover, a minority of these inmates who are really dangerous have only one idea; they hate society; they hate the representatives of society; they want to escape. They are very ingenious. They manufacture weapons which are absolutely startling—for use against the guards of course; because why else are they there? It is easy enough for me to say they manufacture these weapons, but that does not carry very much impact. Therefore I made a request for permission to bring to the House of Commons some of the weapons that are found when the guards frisk the inmates and examine the cells. I know that to bring dangerous weapons into the House of Commons it is necessary to receive the consent of the Speaker, so I obtained that some weeks ago. I also know that one must file these things with the Clerk of the House. I intend to do that, because I want to drive home the point that the guards must have an increase in salary. These I now have before me are just a few samples of weapons found as a result of frisks in the B.C. penitentiary. I think they will amaze the members of this house.

An hon. Member: Turn them around.

The Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member knows that it is not according to the customs of the house to use exhibits in the course of debate, either with the Speaker in the chair, or in committee.

Mr. Winch: I thought I had made it clear, Mr. Chairman, that I understood that. That is the reason why several weeks ago I went to the Speaker and received permission to do this, on condition that I filed them with the Clerk of the House, which I intend to do. I think I have completely followed the regulations of parliament. May I say, Mr. Chairman, that this stiletto which I hold in my hand, is of the type that was held at a guard's throat for 18 hours in the B.C. penitentiary.

Then, if this does not look like a real revolver, which I now hold in my hand I have never seen anything that looked more like a real revolver, for the use of somebody that was going to attempt an escape. It was made out of the holder of a spotlight. If a guard earning only $302 a month gets this rammed in his tummy, what do you think he is going to do? I am happy to bring these weapons here to show what the guards have to face. Their responsibilities are such that we as members of the House of Commons cannot allow the situation with regard to their salaries to continue any longer. That is why I express my disappointment that no mention was made of a substantial increase in the salaries of the guards or that something will be done in the immediate future, Now, sir, in conformity with what is required I will file with the Clerk of the House—

Mr. Knowles: How old is the page boy?

Mr. Winch: —all these dangerous weapons.

Mr. Grégoire: You are putting dangerous weapons in the hands of a kid.

Mr. Winch: I do not consider you, sir, a juvenile delinquent; I think you can have them in your possession. In the opening of my remarks I said I thought that if questions were asked of the commissioner of penitentiaries and of the chairman of the parole board they could give immediate answers as to the action that should be taken in regard to general penology in Canada. I maintain that the only thing holding back progress in the realm of penology is not the lack of knowledge on the part of the officials in the penitentiary service but rather the lack of money being supplied by the government. If that money was forthcoming, they could immediately proceed into action without having

to wait perhaps two years for the report of a royal commission. I believe I can prove that. On January 1, 1959, we had the establishment of the parole board as we know it today. In five years and eight months of the federal parole board's operation, 11,614 inmates in various institutions have been let out on parole. Of these 11,614 inmates on parole, only 1,137, or 9.7 per cent, returned to jail. Of those who returned to jail 585 only returned because they broke the law again. The other 552 had their paroles rescinded because they broke the parole regulations under which they were released.

Of course, when you speak of parole you cover the question of lifers. It is most interesting to note that of those who were sentenced to life imprisonment or who were sentenced to death and had the death sentence commuted to life imprisonment, only 11 have had their paroles revoked or forfeited. There are at present 183 persons on parole who received a life sentence. To the best of my information not one of the lifers ever committed another offence; they merely broke the regulations of their parole. As I have mentioned, out of some 11,614 inmates released on parole in five years and eight months only 9.7 returned.

How many parole officers have we in the federal service? We have 28 parole officers in the federal service scattered among the ten field offices across Canada. The parole officers under the control of the federal parole board which gave authority to release over 11,000 men on parole are employed in ten field offices across Canada as follows: five in Vancouver, two in Edmonton, one in Prince Albert, two in Winnipeg, four in Kingston, three in Toronto, seven in Montreal, one in Quebec, two in Moncton and one in Halifax. I ask, Mr. Chairman, how are you going not only to make the parole system work but expand it? Do not forget that it costs around $2,800 a year to keep an inmate in a penitentiary, whereas a parole officer can handle between 34 and 50 men. The ideal number is 34 or 35 but he can handle up to 50. For the price of one parole officer you can handle 35 men; and on the basis of the record of the parole board since January 1, 1959 you can save about 90 per cent of them. Do we have to wait two years for the report of a royal commission to find out we need more parole officers and that the 28 in the ten field offices across the country are not enough? No. I know for a fact that if the minister would just ask for a report, if he has not already got it from the parole board, the parole board and the chairman can tell him immediately what to do.

There may be regulations governing parole which require to be amended; perhaps a change in the act itself is required. But something should be done because the government's policy in some regards is crazy. I have in mind a young man—a young scamp, that is what he is—who comes from a very good family in Vancouver. I know his parents well. He got into trouble, serious trouble, and landed more than once in jail. On the third occasion he broke down, became a mental case, and was transferred to the insane asylum. There they did a marvellous job and brought him back to a good approach, a good attitude and to good health. And what do we do with him? We put him back in the British Columbia penitentiary.

I saw this young man two months ago in the penitentiary looking forward to going out on what is known as the SNAP program which deals with narcotic offenders. May I say that I compliment the government for this new move and for the success of the first SNAP program experiment. But this man did not make it. One month ago that boy broke down and now he is back in the mental institution once more. I received a report a few days ago and the treatment he is receiving is bringing him back mentally. When Essondale says there is nothing more they can do, that he is fine, what will happen to him? Will he be sent back to the B.C. penitentiary? If this is the case, my guess is that he will break down again and perhaps he will never come out of the mental institution to which he will be once more committed.

These are things known to your officials, Mr. Minister. They are the sort of things which should be corrected now in order to save lives and the taxpayers' money. These are some of the matters we are asking you to think about and to do something about now, instead of waiting two years for a royal commission report. There are other things which can also be done. Speak to your commissioner of penitentiaries who has had years of experience. He knows the wardens and he knows the penitentiaries, and he knows the psychiatrists in those penitentiaries. Is the minister going to wait and perpetuate the situation presently existing, which is the most stupid and asinine policy I know of? Psychiatrists are employed on a part time basis. There are around 800 to 850 men in the B.C. penitentiary. There is a medium security prison at William Head and a minimum security prison at Agassiz. What can one psychi-

atrist employed half time do for 1,000 men? The majority of these men he is never able to see. Those he does see he sees for only a few minutes, and psychiatric treatment, Mr. Chairman, requires more than a few minutes. I would ask the minister to talk to those psychiatrists, as we who are interested in this matter do. Talk to Dr. MacDonald in the British Columbia penitentiary. He told me three months ago that there were many sex offenders there requiring attention. There should be full time psychiatrists at that penitentiary, in which case 55 per cent of those in jail for sex offences would never come back again. He said they need three or four psychiatrists in every penitentiary and if that were the case over 55 per cent of the sex offenders and the mentally unbalanced would not be anti-social any more. But no, we would rather spend $2,800 a year to keep a prisoner in the penitentiary than give the parole board a few more parole officers or employ psychiatrists full time. Admittedly we might have to pay $25,000 or $30,000 a year for a psychiatrist, but if 55 per cent of the sex offenders did not come back to prison you would not only save lives but you would save the money of the taxpayers.

These things are known to the minister's officials; and I know they believe in what I am saying. Why did we only get generalities, platitudes and promises for the future from the minister when he spoke at the introduction of his estimates this afternoon? We are asking him for action now, not for some vision for the future. As I said this afternoon, I could have closed my eyes and thought to myself "My golly, that is the same speech I have been hearing now from ministers of justice for the 11 years I have been in this House of Commons, on the subject of penology". Now is the time for action, and we did hope we would get it from the present Minister of Justice.

I see my time is running on, Mr. Chairman, and very soon it will run out, so although this is a subject very dear to my heart I am not going to carry on, as I could, for hours, if I had the opportunity, to speak about narcotics and the need for forensic clinics. But I would mention what is said to me by every psychiatrist I have spoken to who is interested in penology, and that is that money and lives can be saved if there is segregation between the young and the old, the new offenders and the old offenders, the narcotics and the sex psychopaths.

I should like to conclude by using the minister's words. I have been interested in all these wonderful speeches which the minister has been making over the past two months across the country. I am very grateful that he has been so kind as to send me a copy of these speeches. I have always wondered why it is that only in the last two months he has grasped the need to do something, the need for a new approach. I could ask him why it was he did not learn about that during the years he was a deputy minister and do something about it then. However, I always believe the best of people; I am not like some others in this House of Commons.

I should like to read from a speech made by the Minister of Justice on November 5, 1964 at Montreal to the Canadian club as follows:

> If I were to reproach those who today condemn our prisons, I would tax them with restricting their censure to merely a small part of our correctional system. You, who in your various professions, form a virtual parliament of Canadian corrections, can measure this failing better than anyone; you know that at stake is the entire treatment of delinquents, their entire treatment right from the prevention of juvenile delinquency to after-care, not to mention sentencing, probation, imprisonment, rehabilitation and parole. For in spite of considerable recent progress, our correctional régime remains in many ways disorderly, reactionary and inhuman.

Those are the words of the minister on November 5, this year. He also said this:

> But it must be observed that, in the long run, punishment promises society no real security. The only lasting way to prevent offenders from falling back into crime—unless we imprison them all for life—is to change their anti-social attitude.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude by drawing the minister's own words to his attention, particularly where he says that our correctional regime is disorderly, reactionary and inhuman, and that the object is directed toward rehabilitation and parole. In view of his remarks to the Canadian club at Montreal, I remind him that it is not enough to appoint a parliamentary committee to study the existing penitentiary situation. Nor is it enough to appoint a royal commission to study the situation and report two months, three months, six months or even three years from now. If he meant what he said, he has members on his staff with knowledge and experience in this field so that he can take some definitive steps to correct the existing situation.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I suppose one should say the nice things at the beginning. I was very pleased to hear the Minister of Justice confirm the plans to build a penitentiary at or near Drumheller, and that it is going to be built in 1965. Without being critical

I should like to state that it was my hope that this penitentiary would be proceeded with in 1964 as was promised. However, I do appreciate that the preparation of plans, tendering for contracts and so on take up a good deal of time.

Since I have been a member of this House of Commons I have enjoyed listening to the hon. member for Vancouver East speak about penitentiaries and correctional systems generally in this country. That hon. member has been recognized many times in the past as an expert in reform practices. I remind the minister again, as did the hon. member for Vancouver East, that there are a great number of infants confined to our penitentiaries which are supposed to be institutions of rehabilitation and correction. I should like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Minister of Public Works the fact that this project is of tremendous importance and should be proceeded with as quickly as possible.

It is very pleasing to me today to have the opportunity of saying a few words in regard to a matter which has been in the forefront of public attention for some time. I was shocked and surprised to hear the minister's remarks in his reference to the Denis case. I think he should have kept the circumstances and treatment of this case in mind when considering the whole trend of Canadian justice and the rules of law as manifested by the Banks case. We are faced with the fact that an individual was able, by the posting of a few thousand dollars bail, to escape this country and avoid the penalties imposed by our courts. I appreciate that there were difficulties involved in this particular case, but as far as the average member of the public is concerned, it appears as though there has been some special application of the laws, for some unknown reason, in this respect.

The Minister of Justice will undoubtedly blame the inadequacies on the chief justice of Quebec, as far as the Banks case is concerned; but the chief justice of Quebec happens to be a friend of mine, and I am convinced that he acted in good faith but without, perhaps, definitive evidence. If that court had been presented with available and complete evidence as to the actions of Mr. Banks, Mr. Banks would never have been afforded the opportunity to avoid the inevitable judgment of the court.

When one analyses what has taken place he must come to the conclusion that Mr. Banks was treated liberally by the Liberal party. The situation was summed up very well by the Toronto *Daily Star* when it reported that Mr. Pearson had admitted the possibility that the S.I.U. had provided some financial assistance to Liberal candidates in an election campaign. This fact has been the subject of cover-up within the past several weeks. I suggest if there was nothing to hide the Liberal government should have been quite honest and open in releasing the facts of the case. I am sure that a great many Canadians feel that Mr. Banks has had the sympathy of the Liberal party, and has been, through devious means, given the opportunity of avoiding Canadian justice. Perhaps this same attitude has been taken in respect to the Denis case, and the same freedom purchased by Banks was purchased in that respect.

There is a suspicion in the minds of the public that Mr. Banks purchased Liberal freedom as a result of the fact that certain individuals knew that they might be found out if Mr. Banks were given any reason to produce the evidence. That certainly has been the attitude of the Minister of Justice in answering questions posed by the hon. member for Yukon in respect of the Denis case. Why did not the minister disclose the facts before the House of Commons? Why did he not say this afternoon, if there were some suspicious circumstances surrounding this situation, that the department was suspicious about the facts and intended to look into the situation? Why did the minister not give some indication, if there is suspicion, that he would look into the situation personally? I suggest that the good reputation of the Department of Justice, particularly its administrative side, is deserving of a complete exposition of the circumstances surrounding the Hal C. Banks matter. It is much better for us to remain on this side of the house than it is to be in a position of having ill-gained power as a result of suspicious dealings with individuals such as Mr. Banks.

The government in reference to this whole matter has failed to make any full disclosure. We can only feel, as has been expressed by the hon. member for Yukon, that certain circumstances are such that they must be withheld from parliament and from the public. The hon. member for the Yukon did not make a personal attack upon the Minister of Justice, nor has anyone made such an attack on this side of the house. However, the hon. member for the Yukon has suggested this afternoon that there was a misadministration of justice in the Banks case. Mr. Banks gained his freedom by putting up several thousand dollars bail. Banks apparently has been a Liberal

scrip. Apparently he has been the Liberals' cheque book. Apparently Mr. Banks has been the exemplification of new Liberal justice. Perhaps Mr. Banks has been the new Liberal national bank. Perhaps Mr. Banks has been behind the whole Liberal campaign, and this government, just for a pot of gold, has allowed Mr. Banks to buy his freedom. Just for a pot of gold the Liberals have given him freedom. Just for a pot of gold the Liberals have purchased power, but they now shuffle about and fear they might be found out.

I suggest again that you can keep your ill-gotten gold on that side of the house. I hope you enjoy your temporary power, but it is better that we sit on this side with our principles. It honours us to be members of the opposition under these circumstances. Better is it to be a member of the opposition than a member of the present Liberal government, debauched, derogated, bedraggled and, above all, a desperate government whose emolument is power derived with the aid of corruption, and whose hands and speech are now feared.

The government because of this matter is now full of exercitations with no answers. Our arguments will withstand all attacks because they are irrefutable and irrefrangible. I should like to ask the Minister of Justice at this stage why Banks should enjoy immunity from the hands of justice while others must suffer punitive action both outside and under the rules of law.

What is to be the rule of law? Are we now to have rule of law by prime minister, or by the minister of justice? Are we to be subjected to a rule of law by the Liberal cabinet? Have these rules of law replaced the accepted rule of law, and have these rules of law tempered and shaped government reasoning because of the fear that Banks may talk?

Let us now take a look at the Pierre Berton program and find out what the Prime Minister has said. Mr. Berton asked this question:

Let me ask you another contentious question—

Some of them were not contentious questions. Perhaps I should repeat the beginning of the question:

Let me ask you another contentious question, about Hal Banks and the S.I.U.

Surely such a question would be contentious. He then said:

It is true that Canadian corporations and unions and other organizations contribute campaign funds to political parties. Is there anything unusual in the fact that Mr. Banks and his S.I.U. appear to have contributed only to the Liberal party?

The Prime Minister said:

But who says they contributed only to the Liberal party?

Mr. Berton said:

Well, the newspapers, which are pretty good at unearthing things—

I am going to have something to say about what they have unearthed.

—have only been able to discover that they contributed to the Liberal party. Are you suggesting that they contributed to the Conservatives?

Nobody has ever suggested that. The Prime Minister replied:

Well, I am suggesting that you should not say they contributed only to the Liberal party because that may or may not be the case—

He does not know.

—but there seems to be evidence—

This is an amazing admission to be made over television.

—that individual members of this union or the union itself have contributed to individual members of parliament in Montreal where the S.I.U. has its headquarters.

I think we are entitled to know who got these contributions. I say this to the Minister of Justice: If the S.I.U. has made contributions to the Liberal party or to the New Democratic party or some other party that may not have much weight with anybody in this house, but if they have made contributions to members of parliament, to members of the government, members of the cabinet, in past elections including the last election, then the language I used was far from strong when I said that Banks bought his freedom just for a pot of gold. You gave him his freedom just for a pot of gold.

Mr. Favreau: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Favreau: —I do not know why any matter concerning the contribution of political funds would be discussed on the occasion of the consideration of my estimates—

Mr. Skoreyko: There are a lot of things you do not know.

An hon. Member: You would like to appear naïve.

Mr. Favreau: —unless whoever intends to discuss the matter of funds is ready to assert in this house that to his knowledge or even in his opinion, and stating why, the receipt by anybody of funds from one particular source has had any bearing on the decisions which I made in relation to the Banks case.

Mr. Woolliams: Be honest, be true. That is the old song.

Mr. Favreau: It is all very well to smear reputations by innuendo, by insinuation.

Mr. Nugent: Just facts.

Mr. Pickersgill: Give us facts instead of smears.

Mr. MacEwan: Get back to your own seat and say that.

Mr. Favreau: It is something else to say and to have the courage to say that there is a relationship. This is a point of order because this is the only way in which this matter could possibly be tied up with my estimates, that there is a relationship between the receipt of funds from this particular person and that particular person because the Minister of Justice has thereby been convinced to deal with his functions in a fashion which ought not to have been expected. If the hon. member is ready to say this and to state that this is the point he wants to make and that he has the facts to establish it, then I say this is related to my estimates but otherwise it is not.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

[*Text*]

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that was a point of order but I should like to answer it in this manner.

The Chairman: Order, please. A point of order was raised by the Minister of Justice, to which the hon. member for Lapointe would like to address himself.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order raised by the Minister of Justice.

In my opinion the minister is shifting the matter somewhat. He says that if we want to talk about that matter we should bring up some fact or evidence or express an opinion that would be related to it.

The estimates of the Department of Justice are not examined to give the opposition an opportunity to express opinions or make assertions but rather to get the truth from the Minister of Justice.

Personally, I must say—and I take responsibility for that statement—that if Hal Banks contributed to the campaign chest of Liberal candidates or members of the House of Commons, his action was not entirely disinterested; he surely hoped to get something in return from the Liberal party. And what was that? We know what happened recently.

Now, I claim that we have the right to know. But the truth is hidden from us.

The Chairman: Order. It seems to me that the hon. member is now discussing the matter rather than giving an opinion on the point of order raised by the Minister of Justice.

I should like now to hear the hon. member for Bow River.

[*Text*]

Mr. Woolliams: The minister said if I could bring one scrap of evidence he would be happy. The best evidence I can bring is that—

Mr. Favreau: You will not take the responsibility.

Mr. Woolliams: —"Pearson admits S.I.U. aided some Liberals". I do not know where you could get better evidence than that. If the Prime Minister, the leader of the Liberals, admits they got money, surely Banks was not just helping the campaign for nonsense. Banks was a lobbyist, Banks believed in influence. Banks believed that his bank roll was his greatest influence and he worked it to the limit as far as the Liberals were concerned.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: The old character assassin.

Mr. Woolliams: The minister talked this afternoon about the charges made by the hon. member for Yukon and the charges made by myself. I would remind him of what Rousseau said: "Man is born free, but everywhere you find him in chains". But under the kind of law we have now, under Liberal law, Banks, the lobbyist with the bank roll, enjoys impunity and immunity although his violence and terrorism are well known throughout the land, while all within his jurisdiction and touch tremble in fear of their lives, particularly those members of his own gang. I say to the minister, and he knows this, that Banks has been violent before and he will be violent again. Banks has been silent before and Banks will speak again. That is what they are afraid of.

What has gone on so far as the administration of justice is concerned? A radio commentator has been threatened not only by Banks' men but by those men of government influence whose decency and principles have been eroded by fear. If the truth is known, the power of these men with eroded principles shall fall and smash just as if the clock fell out of the peace tower.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Monteith: Trained seals over there.

The Chairman: Order, please. It is difficult for the Chair, as I am sure it is for other members, to hear the remarks now being made by the hon. member for Bow River, and I would ask the co-operation of members in listening quietly.

Mr. Woolliams: I am not going to get into any argument and I appreciate that we should have some decorum in the house. Surely the hon. member who is so fond of royalty that he will not even stand when God Save the Queen is being sung should have enough courtesy and decency to listen to an argument. I say to him that if I am silenced tonight in the 30 minutes allotted to me you can rest assured that the estimates of justice will never pass until I have had my say so far as the Banks case is concerned, and so far as the other case is concerned. If this be a new kind of closure, the kind of closure where you are howled down, then I intend to stand in my place and talk until I have made my point.

The Chairman: Order, please. Perhaps at this time the hon. member for Bow River might return to the consideration of the estimates.

Mr. Woolliams: I say that the law in Canada in its majestic equality means equality for all, not for some good friends of the government. It means equality for every Canadian as he runs, equality for every Canadian as he walks, equality for every Canadian as he sleeps, equality for every Canadian who obeys the law, and equality for every Canadian who disobeys the law. It means equality for all foreigners who visit Canada as if they were Canadians and even equality for those people who were admitted to Canada by special privilege, and maybe illegally. The administration implements inequality so far as their pet Banks is concerned.

Let us have a look at that case for a few moments. For months, we on this side of the house asked that Mr. Banks be charged. At one stage, he was charged but not arrested. Then, he was convicted but not imprisoned. Then, he stood in contempt of the Supreme Court of Canada with no imprisonment. The Minister of Justice has said that the Conservatives are not irreproachable so far as the Banks case is concerned because we did not prosecute him. I want to answer that charge right now. The minister wants people to believe we were irresolute at a time when witnesses feared for their lives. They were being terrorized until after the Norris commission. In other words, the minister knows quite well, I think that witnesses were afraid to come forward before the Norris commission, and that is well known because of the position he held when Hon. Davie Fulton was minister of justice. At that time he held the position of assistant deputy minister of justice of this country. Anything could be done to silence witnesses, and they were afraid to come forward.

What happened in that regard? I would remind him when he challenges some of us to silence, when he challenges us on this point—

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of privilege.

An hon. Member: Again?

Mr. Favreau: Yes, again. We must function with the truth, at least in part. The hon. gentleman for Bow River implies that I have been consulted during the term of office of the Conservative minister of justice, that is between 1958 and 1960 when I left the Department of Justice, with respect to the Banks affair. I must state, and this can be checked easily by the whole of the Conservative party, that I have never been consulted directly or indirectly with respect to the Banks affair, in relation to which none of the reports was ever sent to the legal officers of the crown.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: Well, there is one thing he will admit, Mr. Chairman, I do bring life to the house. I would say this to the minister: I was rather surprised at that answer in view of the position he held and the oath he took when he became assistant deputy minister of justice. I am surprised he has made the kind of disclosure he has today. I am surprised he can be so critical of the Conservatives because when he is critical so far as Banks is concerned he is criticizing Davie Fulton and criticizing the Department of Justice of that time.

Let us take a look at it. The minister asks, why did we not prosecute? There are two simple answers to that. Until we had a royal commission, until the witnesses came forward voluntarily before the Norris commission, it was impossible to get the evidence. The minister is a good lawyer. This afternoon he said that you cannot prosecute without the evidence.

Now, what happened? Only one man came forward until the beginning of the Norris commission hearings.

Mr. Pickersgill: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. Woolliams: No, I have not much time.

Mr. Pickersgill: Is the hon. gentleman afraid of a question?

Some hon. Members: Sit down; you know the rules.

Mr. Pickersgill: Is the hon. gentleman afraid to hear the question?

The Chairman: Order; the hon. member for Bow River has the floor.

Mr. Woolliams: I hope, Mr. Chairman, you will grant me the appropriate amount of time in order to finish my remarks. I was saying that the minister knows the reign of terror which existed on the great lakes and the seaway when it was all a man's life was worth to oppose Banks. Does anybody deny that it was all a man's life was worth to oppose Banks? Of course they would not. One man came forward. I see the Minister of Transport is listening, and he knows what I say is correct.

Mr. Pickersgill: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Woolliams: One man did come forward in 1954 and he has not been heard of since.

Mr. Pickersgill: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman has asserted that I knew something.

Some hon. Members: Oh, no.

Mr. Woolliams: I would never do that; obviously I was in error.

Mr. Pickersgill: He asserted that I knew that only one man would come forward. I do not know how many men would come forward. I know one man who did not come forward and did not take the Banks case into the courts and that was the minister of justice under the previous administration of the right hon. gentleman who complains about what we did.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that you calm down the hon. gentleman because his state of excitement is dangerous to his health.

Mr. Pickersgill: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I assert that the regime headed by the right hon. gentleman opposite did not have the courage to prosecute Banks and they hid behind a royal commission for six years so they would not have to do it.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

The Chairman: Perhaps I could suggest to hon. members that there did not appear to be a prima facie case of privilege. I recognize the hon. member for Bow River.

Mr. Woolliams: If I may just continue with the point I was mentioning before the Minister of Transport got up on a point of privilege and tried to prove to the house that he knew something, I should like to apologize to him for ever suggesting that he knew anything. I would say if he does not know I would remind him that only one did come forward before the commission and his name was Droeger. This man came forward back in 1954 and then disappeared. This is an example of the kind of terrorism, the kind of conduct of the hoodlums that were running things then.

An hon. Member: Why didn't you clean them up?

Mr. Woolliams: If you will give me just a little silence here I will tell you why we did not clean them up. There was only one man came forward until 1961 and then two men came forward. Who were those men? Let us put it on the record. They were Michael Sheehan and John Wood. Until they came forward it was impossible to convict Mr. Banks. They had that evidence and the report was filed when the Liberals were in office. They laid their charge and he was convicted and sentenced to a five year term. Then, they failed to instruct their counsel so far as the courts were concerned and this man is now a fugitive from justice.

I ask this question. Why is he a fugitive from justice? I ask the press this question tonight, why is there all this uproar when I dare to raise my voice in connection with this matter? It is because the Liberals are frightened. The Liberals know they have a skeleton in their closet just as they have in connection with the Denis case. They know, Mr. Chairman, that if the full truth were found out and the press printed the truth tonight, the Canadian people would know there is a mess in the Department of Justice so far as many matters are concerned, and so far as the erosion of the rule of law is concerned.

What has happened to the Department of Justice in 15 or 16 months? We heard the Minister of Transport tonight say something about Davie Fulton. It is only a week ago that he got up in his pious way, as only Pickersgill can do, and said that Davie Fulton was a great fellow; he was honest and he was everything. As soon as the heat of debate

is on, he will throw his friends over very quickly, especially if they happen to be Conservative friends.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that until we get some inquiry on this matter, until we find out why Banks was allowed to break the law, until we find out why, though he was charged, he was not arrested, until we find out the facts with regard to the application for bail, we will always believe there is a skeleton in the closet. This is why I say there should be an inquiry, a royal commission to look into the whole mess so far as this matter is concerned.

Mr. Favreau: Will the hon. member permit a question? Will the hon. member take the word of the chief justice of Quebec when he said that he knew none of the offences for which he put Banks on bail were extraditable offences?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, you concealed the fact.

Mr. Woolliams: So far as I am concerned there should be an inquiry into these questions, and such an inquiry might answer them. The reasons for it are, what part did the former minister, Milton Gregg, play so far as Banks is concerned? Maybe this famous tape recording which we have heard about, if it were brought before an inquiry, would disclose what part he played.

Then what about this famous landing permit firm, Harris and Pickersgill incorporated, that brought this man in illegally? I would like to get behind the answer to that. They said it was in order to clean up communists. Well, if it was, the cure was worse than the evil. Did members of the Liberal party receive money from Banks and the S.I.U.? Maybe that tape recording would tell that.

Did the Liberal party, its organizers or even its American advisers organize the S.I.U. to help break up a Conservative meeting, Mr. Diefenbaker's meeting, in Vancouver in 1962? The same S.I.U. members, 60 of them, helped to keep order so far as Mr. Pearson's meeting was concerned. Those are things we want to know and until we get those facts we on this side of the chamber do not intend to stop talking. We are going to find out what scandal is here, where the skeletons are, and the whole facts of this sordid mess.

Many people believe that the Banks affair is a dead issue, but Banks today is stretching out into the S.I.U. I predict that McLaughlin will be the next president of the S.I.U. He is the close friend and henchman of Banks, and if that happens Banks will be still running the S.I.U. The Liberals have done nothing to clean up the mess except allow their friend to return from whence he came. They are the ones who brought him into the country illegally, yet they dare challenge us so far as the administration of justice is concerned.

Today we heard the hon. member for Yukon talking about the Denis case, and all the Minister of Justice said was that you must not charge innocent people. Why did he not refer this matter to the officials of his department? It was because he knew some of his Liberal friends were mixed up in the whole sordid mess, the same as Banks. That is the reason he did not refer it to the law officers. Now he says there is going to be a judicial inquiry but nobody is going to be allowed to know the results. What kind of inquiry is that going to be? Is it going to be held in camera so that no one will ever hear the bad news and be able to look into the cupboards and see the skeletons.

So long as we have affairs like the Banks case and like what the hon. member for Yukon brought up this afternoon, the rule of law will be eroded until we have a rule of hoodlums in this country. I say to the minister: Clean up the department; clean up the administration of justice and then good Canadians will be able to look once again with pride on the kind of administration of justice that we had under the former Conservative government.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Chairman, I thought I might take just a few quiet moments of the committee's time to speak about the subject that has been raised by the hon. member for Bow River and which we have heard many times in this chamber during the past months, and the past year or two.

I am quite surprised at the manner in which the hon. member for Bow River states his case regarding Hal Banks. The excitement that characterized the latter portion of his speech tonight reminded me immediately that in the west the hon. gentleman had a reputation of being an outstanding jury lawyer. I am sure many members of the committee are familiar with the fact that a good jury lawyer talks the loudest when his case is the weakest, and that he waves his arms the most and gets worked up to a frenzy when his case is hopeless.

First of all I would like to say that I feel what has been attempted this evening is a gratuitous smear upon the reputation of the Minister of Justice, and I am very upset that the hon. member for Bow River would do such a thing. He is suggesting very strongly that the Minister of Justice personally was responsible, or wanted the courts to act easy

in the case of Banks, and wanted Banks to escape from the country, a type of charge which he would not dare repeat outside the house but which he takes advantage of his parliamentary immunity to repeat, and give it widespread circulation.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member said I would not dare say outside the house what I said tonight. If he had listened to a certain T.V. program he would know I repeated the exact same thing over a Canadian network. Further, I will repeat it outside the house. I say there are some skeletons in the cupboard and the Liberals had better clean this up. I will repeat outside the house any time what I have said in the house.

Mr. Regan: Quite on the contrary, instead of the Liberal administration and the present Minister of Justice—

Mr. Nugent: What about that false charge you made?

Mr. Regan: Mr. Chairman, I have to talk quite loudly to be heard over the parrots and trained seals on the other side of the chamber.

Mr. Nugent: Withdraw that charge.

Mr. Regan: Quite on the contrary to the remarks made by the hon. member for Bow River, may I pass very quickly over the years the Conservatives were in power, six long years which the Canadian people will not quickly forget. During that parade of procrastination the administration of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition did absolutely nothing about the question of Hal Banks. Results are what count. Even my hon. friend would agree that one of the results of the Liberal administration is that Hal Banks sulks in Brooklyn harbour. Under a Conservative government he swaggered in a Montreal penthouse.

Under a Liberal government we have law and order on the great lakes. Under the former Conservative government outlaw tactics and gangsterism were the order of the day on the great lakes. Under this Liberal government Hal C. Banks faced prosecution and judgment, but under a Conservative government he lived here in immunity.

What is more important from the point of view of the interests of the Canadian people is that under a Liberal government the S.I.U. has been brought back to the control of its members. The board of trustees was established and once again it is a lawful union. Under the Conservative government the outlaw S.I.U., under Banks, spread its tentacles into every part of Canada.

It was a Liberal government which brought back law and order to trade unionism in Canada, and which established once and for all that there is no room in Canada for any James Hoffas, for any Hal Banks. We want law and order.

Mr. Winkler: Would the hon. member permit a question—just one little question, one small question?

Mr. Regan: When I am finished I shall be glad to deal with the hon. member's question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Halifax has the floor.

Mr. Winkler: Just one question?

Mr. Regan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At the conclusion of my very brief remarks I will be very happy to deal with any questions.

Mr. MacInnis: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Tardif: Oh, not again.

Mr. MacEwan: Well, look at Charlotte's buddy over there.

The Chairman: Order. May we please have order in the committee. The hon. member for Cape Breton South is rising on a question of privilege.

An hon. Member: Again?

Mr. MacInnis: If you do not mind, Mr. Chairman, I will wait until laughing boy finishes.

Mr. Regan: I presume I may continue my remarks, Mr. Chairman, because I hear nothing from the other side of the chamber.

The Chairman: May I ask the assistance and co-operation of all members of the committee. There is a question of privilege being raised by the hon. member, and he should be given an opportunity to submit it.

Mr. MacInnis: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Halifax challenged the hon. member for Bow River to make a statement outside the house about interference. I have made that statement outside the house, and I will set out—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Chairman: Order, please. Obviously this is not a question of privilege; it is a matter of debate.

Mr. Grégoire: Those Pickersgill ones were not questions of privilege either.

The Chairman: Order, please. The suggestion has been made that the questions of privilege raised by other hon. members were not questions of privilege, and they were not—

Mr. Grégoire: And you allowed them.

The Chairman: —any more than the one that is now being raised by the hon. member for Cape Breton South. It seems to me the point he is making now is really a matter of debate, which he will have the opportunity to make by participating in the debate. I would invite again the assistance of hon. members to let the hon. gentleman who now has the floor continue with and complete his remarks.

Mr. MacInnis: With regard to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, I maintain that I have a question of privilege in that the member for Halifax threw out a challenge to members on this side of the chamber, and unless that challenge is taken up immediately or at the first opportunity—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. MacInnis: —his challenge will go unanswered.

The Chairman: Order. This is not a question of privilege, and that is the ruling of the Chair. The hon. member for Halifax.

Mr. Regan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, of course, that is not what I said, at any rate; but I am not going to interrupt my remarks to deal with challenges thrown out by every obscure backbencher on the other side of the house.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: They have been backbenchers much longer than you.

Mr. Regan: Since the subject of backbenchers has come up, however, I want to talk about one other thing that happened with reference to Hal Banks during the six years the Conservatives were in power under the now right hon. Leader of the Opposition. I notice that quite a number of the backbenchers on the Conservative side are very talkative in this parliament and that they talked very briefly when they were in power.

Mr. Winkler: You aren't doing badly.

Mr. Regan: That is right; thank you. I am talking now, despite the fact that I am on the government side of the house. But I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that the trained seals opposite had nothing to say during those six years on this subject; not one backbencher had anything to say about Hal Banks.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Chairman, I do now have a question of privilege with regard to the remarks made by the hon. member representing Halifax.

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Cape Breton South.

Mr. MacInnis: I do now have a question of privilege with regard to the remarks made by the member representing Halifax.

Mr. Simpson: The junior member.

Mr. MacInnis: My question of privilege arises from a remark he has now made that is far removed from the truth. He does not know what he is talking about, because I and other members of this side of the house, along with the hon. member for Kootenay East—

Some hon. Members: "West".

Mr. MacInnis: —brought this very question up. I would not only point out the question of privilege but I would ask that the member representing Halifax withdraw his remark.

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Halifax has the floor.

Mr. Regan: I am very pleased to know that I have the floor, Mr. Chairman, and I will now complete what I was saying with reference to the backbenchers opposite during the years of the Conservative administration.

Mr. MacInnis: On a question of privilege—

The Chairman: Order. If the hon. member wants me to rule on the question of privilege, I rule that it is not a question of privilege. The hon. member can disagree with what another hon. member says; he can disbelieve what he has said—but that does not make the matter a question of privilege.

Mr. MacInnis: The hon. member—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. MacInnis: If the hon. member makes an assertion that is false, and that includes myself, the member for Kootenay West and many other hon. members on this side of the house, then I feel I do have a question of

personal privilege and one on which the hon. member should withdraw his remarks.

The Chairman: Perhaps the hon. member would like to quote an authority for that statement. Certainly it is contrary to what the Chair believes to be the rules of this house. The hon. member for Halifax.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Chairman, I certainly would not want to cause anyone to misunderstand what I have been saying, or offend anyone's feelings in the house; therefore I should be very careful and exact in what I am saying. I am saying that during the years the Conservative administration was in office—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. We are now discussing certain estimates for fiscal year 1964-65, and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) refers to six years previously. My point of order, and it is also a question of privilege, is this. The opposition has agreed that the discussion of the estimates would be concluded by next Friday. But if the Liberal members keep talking out of order, we will not be able to discuss the estimates which are before us, and thus the members on the government side will prevent us from examining the estimates for fiscal year 1964-65.

I would therefore ask the hon. member for Halifax to restrict his comments to this year's estimates, and not revert to six years previous; otherwise, the agreement we have entered into to limit the debate to six or seven days will not be carried out, because this obstruction from the government members will prevent us from knowing the truth respecting the estimates for the current year.

The hon. member for Halifax should limit his remarks to the estimates now before us.

[*Text*]

Some hon. Members: Carried.

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Moreau: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: No. Perhaps to simplify things I would mention that in the opinion of the Chair the point raised by the hon. member for Lapointe is well taken. Certainly the matter before the committee now is the estimates of the Department of Justice for the year 1964-65. There is one particular item, which is vote No. 1, concerning administration, including the office of the superintendent of bankruptcy, etc., for one specific year; and this has nothing to do with the year 1960 or previous years. I must say, in justice to the hon. member who has the floor, that the previous speaker did go beyond the limitations of this vote and I would ask for the hon. member's co-operation in restricting his remarks to the vote now before the committee.

Mr. Regan: I would certainly be very happy to co-operate with the Chair in this matter, and I would assure my hon. friend for Lapointe that at no time did I have any intention of taking anything but a very few moments of the time of the committee, but unfortunately there have been so many interruptions from the Conservative benches, who do not want to hear the truth, that it makes it very difficult for me to complete my remarks.

Mr. Nugent: Give us some hope of that, will you?

Mr. Regan: I will conclude by pointing out that if the remarks of the hon. member for Bow River were in order, then surely a brief comment on what he has said, pointing out the inaccuracies, is proper debate at this time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Regan: What I was saying was that the backbenchers on the other side of the house during the six years a Conservative government was in power did nothing about Hal Banks, said nothing that was constructive and produced results.

The Chairman: Order, please. I suggest that remark was out of order.

Mr. Winkler: Is the hon. member ready for my question?

Mr. Regan: Let me say, then, Mr. Chairman, one word about contributions.

Mr. Jorgenson: That will be the first one you have made.

Mr. Regan: Under our system of government as it works in this country at the present time, as I understand it contributions to political parties come from individuals, companies and trade unions. For the hon. member to suggest—

The Chairman: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member again but it seems to me that what he is trying to do now is to discuss the general question of contributions to political parties, which to my mind is not germane to the item before the committee.

Mr. McIlraith: Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, that you are ruling that the question of contributions is not relevant to the discussion?

The Chairman: I might point out that I did not hear the whole argument proposed by the hon. member but I took it upon myself to surmise that when he referred to the word "contributions" he was going to go into a consideration of contributions to political parties; and to my mind, in the opinion of the Chair, contributions by unions or by the S.I.U. to a political party are beyond the terms of the item before us.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Chairman, if it is to be the ruling of the Chair that no other hon. member can speak on this subject of contributions made by the S.I.U., I would be very happy—I seem to hear a noise from the back.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

The hon member for Halifax wants to know if your ruling applies to all election contributions.

In my opinion. election contributions made by Hal Banks, those particular ones, must be dealt with when considering the estimates of the Department of Justice because we assert that there might be a link between those contributions to Liberal members elected thanks to Hal Banks' money and the fact that he escaped Canadian justice.

[*Text*]

The Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Halifax has the floor.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Regan: I presume I have the floor.

Mr. Aiken: I am rising on a point of order.

The Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka on a point of order.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, I want to be clear about the ruling you have just made. If an hon. member directs his remarks to the Department of Justice, am I correct in saying that the mere fact that contributions are involved would rule such debate out of order? I want to be sure that your ruling is not a broad ruling which would exclude anything directed at the Department of Justice which I feel would be relevant.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka knows that the Chair cannot rule in anticipation. The ruling which was made applies particularly to what the hon. member who now has the floor is saying at this time.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether we could have an understanding on this point. The hon. member for Bow River was allowed to rant and rave for hours, and now when my hon. friend for Halifax attempts to reply within the same scope a point of order is raised—and I am not objecting to the point of order. If it is clearly understood that anything that happened before 1964 is excluded from our consideration then we on this side of the house have no objection as long as that ruling is applied uniformly to all members. But we would object if the kind of latitude taken by the hon. member for Bow River is not allowed to apply to an hon. member on this side of the house who has introduced no new matter but is specifically replying to the hon. member's specious and really—well, I will leave it at specious—arguments.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, I am certain most of us found your ruling a little surprising, although I realize that perhaps when we refer to these ancient matters the house can get a little riled. However, I am sure all of us are willing and anxious to hear the hon. member for Halifax make some defence of the government's position in years past. In particular, we do not want to see any debate excluded touching the actions of the government at the time Hal Banks was brought in and allowed to remain in this country so mysteriously. I hope that that will not be your ruling.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. Members: Oh no.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Chairman, further to the point of order, the Minister of Transport rose and objected to the way the procedure has developed and said that because the hon. member who represents Halifax was answering the hon. member for Bow River a point of order was raised. I would point out to you, sir, that no point of order was raised on this side of the house. We are only too anxious to let the hon. member continue. The point of order was not one as such but was really a ruling made by the chairman himself which the Minister of Transport is now criticising.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Chairman, if I might continue my few remarks on this matter, with specific reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Bow River concerning contributions and with specific application to what

he said and that alone, I want to point out that when he suggests that the S.I.U. or some other individual member may have contributed some money to several Liberal candidates for office I am sure the hon. member would realize that under our system of western democracy at the present time political parties receive, to finance their campaigns and enable them to carry on their work, contributions from individuals, from companies and from trade unions. If one adopts the reasoning used by the hon. member for Bow River, then whatever companies or individuals made contributions to his campaign—perhaps they were misadvised, but whoever they were —are in the position that they could control him, and therefore he would do exactly what they wanted. I do not believe that of the hon. member for Bow River for a moment. I think that all of us in this house and the people in the country know that the same situation applies to the Liberal party, and the Minister of Justice. He acts independently and in good faith regardless of any other consideration.

Mr. MacInnis: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Regan: When I finish; you have interrupted me enough.

Let me conclude by saying this, Mr. Chairman. At least today if Hal Chamberlain Banks comes into Canada, if he ever shows his face in this country, he will be locked up in jail for five years. But as long as the Conservatives were in power he swaggered around in his penthouse in Montreal, caused laws to be broken across the country, and lived in immunity because the former prime minister did not have the courage or willingness to take action, or for some reason did not take any action, against Mr. Banks. Year after year passed and Banks continued to put his tentacles further out into the—

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Into the Liberal party.

Mr. Regan: —into the shipping unions of Canada. Well, the Conservatives were in office, at a time when the hon. member opposite who is now making so much noise was in the House of Commons to object to Banks' tactics. There is no doubt that it has only been since the government changed that these people have found their voices. I am glad to say that this parliament has brought forward on the Liberal side a new type of backbencher, one willing to contribute and be prepared to state his position on a matter, and not act like a trained seal. Since the days of sweetheart contracts and Hal Banks' protection by the government in office we have come a long, long way; to the point where the S.I.U. is again a lawful union; to the day when we once more have peace, law and order on the great lakes and in the unions of Canada; to the day when Hal Banks can no longer enter this country but must sulk in Brooklyn harbour wishing that the Conservative government were still in office so that this immunity would be restored.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, the junior member for Halifax has invited questions, and I should like to ask him one.

The Chairman: Order, please. Does the hon. member intend to ask a question?

Mr. Winkler: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the hon. member a question.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Chairman, I should be very pleased to deal with any question asked by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I must preface my question, but I shall do so briefly. My question relates to the suggestion made by the hon. member during the course of his heated remarks in reference to the lack of desire on this side of the house for the facts. He said that if Mr. Banks ever came into the country again he would go to jail for five years. Is the hon. member aware of the method by which Mr. Banks was allowed into the country? Is he aware of the article which appeared in the Toronto *Star* a few weeks ago in relation to the former minister of citizenship and immigration, Hon. Walter Harris, in reference to the countermanding of his deportation order?

An hon. Member: What is your question?

Mr. Winkler: Just one moment. Is the hon. member aware of the countermanding of the order of the former minister of citizenship and immigration of June 1954 by his cabinet colleagues, some of whom now enjoy the front benches on the government side of this house?

Mr. Regan: Mr. Chairman, I should like to answer the hon. member for Grey-Bruce who, with his usual courtesy, has directed this question to me tonight, in this way. He is a member for whom I have great respect. I have read, as have other members, about the conditions under which Mr. Hal Banks came into this country, and feel that if there was impropriety in the manner in which he came to Canada, and remained during the years the Liberals were in power, I am sure the Conservative government during its years in power would have taken some action because

of that impropriety. They did not do so, which indicates to me that perhaps there was no impropriety, or they compounded it because they wanted him to stay here for their own particular reasons.

Mr. Winkler: I have one further question.

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Winkler: Do you know who appointed the Norris commission?

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I may be allowed to exercise my rights under the rules.

Mr. Nugent: What rights, and what rules?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on a point of order.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: Has the minister been recognized as a speaker? I should like to know what rule gives him the right to speak now. Has he been recognized?

Mr. Pickersgill: It is a rule of this house, sir, that if an hon. member makes a misstatement another member can speak to a question of privilege, if not at the time then when the member has completed his remarks.

Mr. Knowles: Where do you find that rule?

Mr. Pickersgill: You will find it in the rules Mr. Chairman, and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is well aware of it.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, I have risen on a point of order, and I should like to know on what ground the hon. member is attempting—

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Pickersgill: In any event, Mr. Chairman, I happen also to be a member of this committee and should be allowed to speak.

The Chairman: Order, please. I am wondering whether the hon. member has reference to the rule which would allow him to speak a second time to correct a previous statement that has been misinterpreted. In any event, that rule does not allow him necessarily to speak immediately. He may rise a second time later on to correct a misinterpretation.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Halifax indicated that he would accept questions.

The Chairman: Order. My suggestion is that in view of the fact we have already entertained several questions—

Mr. Regan: Mr. Chairman, I am quite prepared to deal with all questions.

The Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member may be prepared, and is probably anxious to answer all questions, but I would remind him that other members of this committee wish to take part in the debate and should be given an opportunity to do so.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I think that there would be no point for my Conservative colleagues to put questions to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) because he will keep on repeating the same story and giving the same answer, namely: What did the Conservatives do during six years? That is what he said again and again during his speech and no other valid argument came out of his contribution to the discussion tonight. It was simply a meaningless continuous repetition.

We are discussing a very serious case; the case of an individual found guilty by our Canadian courts and who managed to escape the arm of our Canadian law with an unequalled easiness and facility.

This is connected also with the fact—and I am not afraid to assert it—that considerable pressure must have been brought to bear upon the Department of Justice to make it that easy for Hal Banks to get out of Canada.

Recently, we heard that Liberal members, particularly on Montreal island, benefited from $1,000 election subscriptions or contributions during the last general election.

We should like to know the names of those Liberal members sitting in this house who received $1,000 contributions from the S.I.U. or from Hal Banks.

Second, I should like the Minister of Justice —this concerns his department and I hope he will listen to what I am asking him now— to make a review of the statements made under oath by all hon. members after the election concerning the sources of their election funds, and I should like him to check whether hon. members who received $1,000 from Hal Banks or from the S.I.U. did state in their affidavit that they had received $1,000 from the S.I.U. or from Hal Banks.

I think this comes under the Department of Justice and that it is up to the minister to investigate the matter.

The statements tabled in the house by hon. members, after the last election, concerning their expenses and the sources of their campaign funds, are forms duly signed by them and sent to the chief electoral officer 30 days or six months after their election, I believe. Now, the Prime Minister stated that he would table documents showing the names of those who received such contributions.

Whether those documents are in the hands of the Minister of Justice, the Norris commission or the S.I.U. board of trustees, after they have been tabled, it will be the duty of the Minister of Justice to compare them with the statements submitted by the hon. members concerning the sources of their campaign funds to determine whether such contributions were reported in the statements under the signature of hon. members or that of their campaign managers. That is most important since it will enable us to find out whether Liberal members of parliament accepted contributions from Hal Banks and were shy of admitting it. If they did, they could benefit from such contributions and, after the election, use their influence on behalf of their contributor.

Mr. Choquette: Would the hon. member allow a question?

Mr. Grégoire: No. I am quite familiar with that kind of question.

Mr. Choquette: Does the hon. member feel that it is a more serious matter to accept contributions from the S.I.U. than to work for Jos. Bégin who is a notorious criminal and who has been charged before the courts?

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I will say to the hon. member that he clearly and royally lied. It is clear. If he can prove that, he should do it outside the house instead of relying on his parliamentary immunity. The hon. member for Lotbinière is brave here, but he is not so brave when he hides behind his parliamentary immunity. I am not afraid of telling him that he lied.

The Liberals always succeeded in being elected by lying during the electoral campaigns, and by accepting money from gangsters like Hal Banks and from big capitalists and financiers. And once elected, they protect their interests, they crawl on all fours before these gangsters who were convicted, and before these financiers. This is not the first time the Liberal members have acted this way, and the electors of Lotbinière know it very well.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Justice asked this afternoon if we could prove that there existed a connection between the escape of Hal Banks and the electoral subscriptions. Is there a relation between the two? After all, it is the responsibility of the Minister of Justice to give us the details, the information and the names we are requesting. Then we may ask the R.C.M.P. to investigate into this matter.

Would this not be a bribery attempt? When a certain amount is offered to six members and at the same time another amount is offered another political party—it cannot be claimed that Hal Banks gave $6,000 or $7,000 to the Liberal party and that at the same time he gave a certain amount of money to the New Democratic party because he supports both parties. He certainly does not belong to both parties. All the same, one thing is evident: he wanted to get a favour. Everyone knows that most of the subscribers are doing it to obtain favours in return. Once more the same thing occurs in that case as in many others.

What are the names of those who have received money? That is an important question.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I maintain, with regard to Hal Banks, that the Minister of Justice would be able to take the necessary steps to obtain his extradiction to Canada, if he chose to do so. I am convinced that if the minister takes the action we already suggested to him in this house, he will be able to obtain that extradition.

We have discussed that before and I suggested to him a procedure taken from a legal text. Any individual who is a director, trustee or holder of money or funds belonging to a union, a bank, a trust company, a finance company and who plays with the funds of that union, that trust company—I am convinced that he played with the funds of that union, everyone knows that—is liable to deportation under the law. Well, in his report Mr. Justice Norris blames Banks directly and categorically for having played with the funds of his union. Mr. Justice Norris admitted categorically and plainly that Banks played with the funds of the seafarers' international union. If he did that—and that was reported by Mr. Justice Norris—then it is a crime or simply a charge made against Banks for having done that. That is something which makes him liable to extradition. That is a striking, concluding reason why the minister, if he really wanted to, might

ask the American government to send Hal Banks back to Canada. Hal Banks is liable to extradition.

But the government does nothing, they do not ask the American government. The Minister of Justice did say, one day, that the R.C.M.P. was looking for Hal Banks and had not found him; yet, a mere newspaperman found him in two hours. The Canadian government would be in a position to ask for his extradition under the charges mentioned previously; but the Minister of Justice does nothing; he takes no action. That is what seems strange to us and gives rise to our suspicions.

I always had confidence in the honesty and sincerity of the Minister of Justice, but when the time comes to act, he takes no action. I have been suggesting this means of obtaining Hal Banks' extradition for two months, and he never acted. I ask him to read the Norris report where he will find the charges against Hal Banks under which he can obtain his extradition. When I asked him whether such a search has been made, he answered: Nothing was found. He did not look far, for he would have found out.

Why does the Minister of Justice not act? Why does the Department of Justice not act? Why in the case of Hal Banks is the same justice not applied as for anybody else?

With all the hesitations, delays and roundabout ways of the Liberals, I rather feel that there is more than that, that the Liberal party is afraid to have Hal Banks come back to Canada, afraid of his statements, which might perhaps compromise members who now sit in this house.

Is that the right way to have the law enforced in Canada? When we make accusations, we are told: Look at what the Conservatives did for six years. But that is not an argument, Mr. Chairman. If others did wrong, that is no reason to continue along the same lines. Instead of blaming others for their lack of action, why not take the means to correct the present situation?

Mr. Chairman, there are means to force the extradition of Hal Banks. It is possible to find means, but the Minister of Justice does not do so. Then, since we get no answers to our questions, since the minister does not give straight and direct answers and does not tell us that he is ready to apply the means suggested to him, since he cannot give us the names of those who received those $6,000, the opposition must—

Mr. Favreau: Am I to understand that in all fairness the hon. member for Lapointe has asked a question in order to know whether I tried to get an opinion respecting the fraudulent use of funds of the seafarers' union?

Mr. Grégoire: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, on March 6, 1964, counsel appointed to advise the government on the charges that had been laid, gave us the following opinion. I quote from the letter that was sent to us by Mr. John J. Robinette on March 6, 1964:

[*Text*]

We have also considered whether there is sufficient evidence to justify prosecution against Banks arising out of the alleged misuse by him of union funds. As stated in our letter of September 27, 1963, it is our opinion that, although there were irregularities, we do not think that the evidence is sufficient to justify a criminal charge of theft or embezzlement, principally because Banks had a colour of right arising out of approval of his financial dealings by committees of the union.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, this is not all—

[*Text*]

Mr. Nielsen: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Favreau: Ah, you do not like this.

Mr. Nielsen: —now that the minister has read from this document I believe that by the rules of the house he is required to table it and I would request that he do so now.

Mr. Pickersgill: He has not finished reading from it.

Mr. Nielsen: The Minister of Transport interjects that the Minister of Justice has not finished reading from the document. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that if the minister quotes in part from the document he must table the document itself. He has obviously quoted at length from it, and I suggest to you he is now required by the rules to table the whole of it.

Mr. Moreau: May I ask the hon. member for Bow River to table the Fulton memorandum?

Mr. Favreau: I have been quoting from that part of the opinion which referred to the matter raised by the hon. member for Lapointe.

Mr. Nugent: On the point of order concerning the tabling of the document, could we have a ruling from the Chair when the minister has completed his quotation? Is it not according to the rule that he must table the whole document?

The Deputy Chairman: I am quite sure the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona realizes that documents cannot be tabled in committee. They have to be tabled when the Speaker is in the chair if they are to be tabled.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the matter was carried further, and following the remarks made by the hon. member, I recall having asked for the opinions given by counsel and, of course, the answers can be found in the two documents I have here.

I have just quoted from the one dated March 6, 1964 having to do with the opinion of September 27, 1964, where this was said:

[*Text*]

Mr. Nugent: Again on a point of order, I say let us have a ruling from the Chair.

An hon. Member: There was a ruling.

Mr. Nugent: The Chair has said that a document can only be tabled when the Speaker is in the chair. Am I wrong in my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the chairman of committees will not allow anybody to read from a document unless he is willing to table the whole of it? It can be tabled while the Speaker is in the chair. If he indicates his willingness to table the whole document, then of course we have no argument.

Mr. Favreau: I am merely asserting—

Mr. Nugent: Before he reads, I want a ruling.

Mr. Favreau: I am merely asserting that twice an opinion has been asked and given on this particular matter. I am satisfied, after reading the opinion of counsel that the point raised by the hon. member for Lapointe, although it is one which is quite interesting, would be legally achieved for the purpose he seeks if the opinion were in the affirmative.

Mr. Nugent: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Justice is speaking to the point of order or is going to recognize the point of order as being correct, then he will not pretend he is reading from the document and I can resume my seat. I should like to have a ruling from the Chair as to whether he can pretend to this committee to be quoting from a document which he is now unwilling to table. He certainly has a duty to this house to make his position clear. Is he purporting to give the committee his idea that he says is backed up by the document he will not table, or does he wish to read from it and indicate his willingness to table it later? I certainly think before the minister goes any farther he should tell us which is the case. If he wants to read from this document he has, then he has to tell us he is willing to table it when the Speaker is in the chair.

[The Deputy Chairman.]

Mr. Favreau: This is one matter we shall attend to when the Speaker is in the chair.

Mr. Nugent: On the contrary, the minister has already read from one of the documents and he now must table it when the Speaker is in the chair. If he attempts to read further, then before he receives the Chair's permission to read further, he should indicate he will abide by the rules and will subsequently be tabling the document. I certainly believe that he cannot now slough it off by saying that when the Speaker is in the chair we shall talk about it further. The rule is the rule, and I ask you, Mr. Chairman, now to give us your ruling.

The Deputy Chairman: Order; I should like to refer the members of the committee to Beauchesne's fourth edition, citation 159, paragraph (3), which reads as follows:

> It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the table of the house, if it can be done without injury to the public interest. The same rule, however, cannot be held to apply to private letters or memoranda.

This is the point which I believe has to be decided, whether or not it is a public document. If it is to be tabled it has to be tabled not in the committee but in the house when the Speaker is in the chair.

Mr. Nugent: I am not quite clear about your ruling. The document has been cited. I am not criticizing the Chair for not stopping him reading from it immediately, but I am sure the rule is that if he is going to quote from a document he must be willing to table it. If he is not willing to table it, then he cannot read from it. If the minister is going to say it is not in the public interest to table this document, he should tell us. Otherwise, he should now assure us that having read from it he is willing to table it.

The Deputy Chairman: The rule which the hon. member has cited applies to public documents. I am sure the member is not going to expect the chairman to decide whether or not this is a public document.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Justice—

The Deputy Chairman: Order please. It is possible there is machinery in the house for the hon. member to obtain the information, and I am sure he knows what that machinery is. It is not the business of the chairman to decide whether a document is public or is not. If it is a public document and it is

quoted, then the general rule is that it has to be tabled.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman—

The Deputy Chairman: I will hear the hon. member for Yukon.

Mr. Nielsen: May I respectfully draw your attention to paragraph (4) of citation 159 which also has a bearing on the point of order raised? I should like particularly to draw your attention to paragraph (5) of citation 159 which is directly on the point of order and reads as follows:

> The point of order, that a member should lay on the table a document which he quotes, should be taken when reference is made to the document.

The point of order has been taken here according to the ruling under paragraph (5) of citation 159, at the proper time. I am sure the minister can clear up all the difficulties. I am assuming this is a public document from which he is speaking, since it is an opinion from which he is quoting. The minister could clear up all the difficulties very quickly by agreeing to table it when the Speaker is back in the chair.

Mr. Martineau: In the same vein, Mr. Chairman, paragraph (2) of citation 159 is completely on the point:

> A minister of the crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a dispatch or other state paper not before the house, unless he is prepared to lay it upon the table.

The citation goes on to say that this principle is so self-evident it has never been challenged. I think the minister, by quoting the document has made it a public document and therefore he is in duty bound to at least indicate he will table it when the Speaker is in the chair.

Mr. Macdonald: I should like to speak to the point of order, Mr. Chairman. The question is really not so much what appears in citation 159 but whether or not this particular document is a dispatch or a state paper. In other words, is this a public document? I suggest, Mr. Chairman, it may be well for the Speaker to take this matter under advisement and to refer to the debate which occurred in this house during the twenty fifth parliament when hon. gentlemen opposite were strenuously opposing the tabling of a particular legal opinion. I would say that legal opinion in this case is on the same basis and that the arguments raised by hon. gentlemen at that time would apply with equal force to this particular opinion. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, furthermore, that this question be put over for consideration so that it may be determined whether it is in fact a public document, and therefore whether it is capable of being tabled under the rules.

Mr. Nugent: Obviously the parliamentary secretary misunderstood the arguments because the rule just quoted by the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue did not make any reference to a public document. The minister cannot quote from anything unless he is prepared to table it. He has already quoted from this document, and to suggest now it is a public document and that one rule cancels out the other is just nonsense.

If he purports to have a document in support of his argument and has the effrontery to quote from it, then this is what the rule of the house is designed for, to protect the house so that we cannot be given little quotations out of something, by a minister or someone else saying, "I have here a document which supports me and I will give you a little bit of it."

Mr. Favreau: On a point of privilege—

Mr. Nugent: He must table the whole document.

Mr. Favreau: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, this is distorting the facts, as no one but certain people on the other side can. The hon. member for Lapointe will remember that the question which he asked me was whether I had considered—

Mr. Nugent: Is the minister alleging I distorted the facts?

Mr. Favreau: I said that this must be read in relation with the question which I was asked, and the question was whether or not the matter of embezzlement of public funds had been considered. I replied yes, because I had had an opinion on it; and the fact that I read part of a letter of opinion was only in support of the fact that I had been asked for an opinion on it and had considered it. I was not depositing the document or referring to the document as a statement of the law on the matter.

Mr. Martineau: If the minister were in a court of law and his opponent were to quote from a document would he insist on that document being produced? Would that not be his right?

Mr. Macdonald: I would like to make an explanatory statement with reference to what the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona said. I pointed out the documents which are specifically referred to under citation 159

in Beauchesne, and it specifically refers to a dispatch or a state document. The question which should be put for the Chair's consideration is whether or not a legal opinion of this nature is a state paper or dispatch. As to the observations of the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue, it is all very well for him to refer to the rules in a court of law, but we are covered by the rules of the house, and in particular by the rule set out in citation 159.

Mr. Martineau: Just to answer the parliamentary secretary about whether there is any pertinence between what is done here and in a court of law, I again cite from Beauchesne:

> This restraint is similar to the rule of evidence in courts of law, which prevent counsel from citing documents which have not been produced in evidence. The principle is so reasonable that it has not been contested; and when the objection has been made in time, it has been generally acquiesced in.

I think that is final and comes within the exact authority that the parliamentary secretary has cited. Therefore he should advise his minister to produce the document.

Mr. Macdonald: I just point out again that the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue has missed the point. The rule may well apply in the case of a dispatch or state document but it does not apply to anything which is not a state document.

Mr. Nugent: To any document.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman—

The Deputy Chairman: Order, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, before we go any further with this point I think members should stop trying to rely on the words "public document," "dispatch," "state paper" and so on. The citation which you yourself read simply says this:

> It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the table of the house if it can be done without injury to the public interest.

Now there is nothing—

Mr. Pickersgill: Read the rest.

Mr. Knowles: I will, don't worry. There is nothing in that sentence which refers to state documents or official documents. And immediately in the next sentence, which hon. members want me to read there is the one exception:

> The same rule, however, cannot be held to apply to private letters or memoranda.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

If the minister can somehow allege that the item from which he is reading is a private letter or memorandum, then of course it comes under this exception; but if it is not, then it seems to me it is covered by the first sentence in citation 159(3). May I also point out that 159(4) goes on to say, and is very precise:

> Official papers quoted during a debate should be laid on the table of the house.

The whole basis of that ruling is given. It is a Canadian decision with the ruling at the end "That the point of order was well taken, and that the paper cited . . . should be placed in the possession of the house."

What the minister is quoting from is either a private letter or a private memorandum which is of no value to the debate, or it is a document that concerns the debate, and if it is cited as such, then clearly the rule states that it has to be produced or the minister has to desist from making reference to it.

Mr. Macdonald: I would just refer in return to citation 159(3) and to the fact that there is no limitation with respect to a memorandum of law, such as this one, indicating whether it is private or public. I would point out specifically that in the following sentence there is a reference to legal documents tabled in the British house of commons, and in that case it was ruled by the speaker that they should not have been tabled.

Mr. Nugent: Was that when the documents had been read from?

Mr. McIlraith: Might I ask the indulgence of the committee, Mr. Chairman, to ask you not to see the clock for, say, another hour if that would be agreeable?

Mr. Nugent: Nonsense.

Mr. Douglas: I would like to point out that the minister promised to answer some questions which I asked him, at eight o'clock, and he did not. Since we may not be continuing with the estimates of the Department of Justice tomorrow I want to know if he is prepared to answer these questions now?

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I think I had the floor and I was interrupted by the Minister of Justice himself. Now that he has quoted from a document I think we should first have your ruling as to whether or not he should deposit the document from which he was quoting. That is the first thing that should be done tonight because I can see by the reaction of the parliamentary secretary that they

are afraid to produce that document and are afraid to shed light on what is taking place. It is when somebody is afraid, that we want to know more about why they are afraid. Is that document condemning you? If it is, just say so and keep it.

Mr. Macdonald: With respect to the point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre—

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The general rule adopted by the house is that if a paper is an official paper and is quoted from in the house, then it should be tabled. If it is an ordinary letter or memorandum it is not usual to table it.

Mr. Nugent: It should not be quoted.

The Deputy Chairman: Yes, it can be quoted but not tabled. When the committee demands a ruling from the chairman in this regard it is asking the Chair to decide whether or not this document is an official document, which is not within the knowledge of the chairman. If the committee want the minister to table this document, they can request that he do so. If he refuses to do so, then of course there is machinery in the hands of the house to still have the document tabled.

Mr. Fisher: What is he hiding?

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I maintain that this document has now become an official one. It might remain a private document as long as it remains in the hands of the minister or his departmental officials; but I saw the minister show the document to the Minister of Transport and it is not a private document any more.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Grégoire: It is not a Department of Justice private document; it has become a public document because the minister has shown it to the Minister of Transport—and I saw the Minister of Transport's reaction. Moreover, since the Minister of Justice started to read one line of this document, the whole document has become an official one. It is now a public document because the minister has given the public notice that such a document exists, and started to read from it. Therefore it has now become an official document and I maintain it should be tabled when the Speaker is in the chair.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I have a question of privilege in regard to this matter, since the hon. gentleman made certain—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Pickersgill: Surely hon. gentlemen will not mind listening. The hon. gentleman—

Mr. Woolliams: We do not want phony ones.

Mr. Pickersgill: —made a statement that I had done such and such things after I had been shown this document. I did not do what the hon. gentleman suggested at all. Moreover, I, like my colleague the Minister of Justice, have taken the privy councillor's oath, and the fact that I read a document does not make it a public document; or the fact that any minister—

An hon. Member: This is no question of privilege.

Mr. Pickersgill: There were certain allegations made.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Douglas: Surely, Mr. Chairman, this is not a question of privilege. May I ask the minister one simple question. Was the legal opinion from which he quoted tonight paid for out of the public treasury?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, I had risen before the hon. member—

Mr. Douglas: I want an answer to that. This would decide whether or not it is a public document.

Mr. Favreau: I had risen before—

Mr. Douglas: Answer the question.

Mr. Grégoire: Answer.

Mr. Douglas: That will determine whether or not it is a private document or a public document.

Mr. Peters: What are you hiding?

An hon. Member: The minister of injustice.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The Chair recognizes the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam.

Mr. Douglas: I asked a simple question, Mr. Chairman, namely was the legal opinion from which the Minister of Justice quoted paid for out of the public treasury? If it was paid for out of the public treasury, then it is an official document in the possession of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Woolliams: Right.

Mr. Douglas: That does not mean, of course, that the house has the right to ask for it—it is a privileged document—unless the minister himself quotes from it. But the moment the minister quotes from it, he himself makes it a document that is no longer

privileged, because he has no right to quote from a document and therefore place a certain interpretation on a given sentence or paragraph unless those whom he is addressing have the opportunity to see the rest of the document to ascertain whether or not the statement is out of context. Therefore, having quoted from this document, which I presume was paid for out of the public treasury, it seems to me the minister has no alternative but as soon as the Speaker is in the chair to table that legal opinion.

Mr. Martineau: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Favreau: No, please. I want to repeat, in due deference to you, Mr. Chairman, because you had not noticed that I had risen and I do agree on your calling on the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, that I had risen at least at the same time as the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam to speak on this point. I have waited for some time listening to the discussion which has taken place here. It is precisely the type of remark from members on the other side that makes for destroying reputations by innuendoes and insinuations.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: Nonsense.

Mr. Macdonald: You can't take it.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, on a question of privilege—

Mr. Martineau: Mr. Chairman—

The Deputy Chairman: Order.

Mr. Favreau: What do they have to hide?

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Favreau: Whether the letter be a public document or not I shall table the letter.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I think the regulations are addressed to you as well as all members of the house. There is an article in this book which says that as soon as somebody raises a question of privilege you must recognize him before going any further. I stood up to raise a question of privilege. You heard me because I speak loudly but you did not recognize me. I think you should stand by the rules first if you want the rest of the house to stand by them.

My question of privilege is that the minister made some remarks concerning some people on this side of the house which he might very well have addressed to those on the other side of the house who interrupted to make the same sort of insinuations he talked about.

Mr. Byrne: Don't be so touchy.

Mr. Douglas: I take it the minister is tabling the memorandum, so that matter is closed. I would ask the minister whether he would be kind enough, as he promised, to answer the questions I asked him earlier today, the one on orders of the day and the one I asked later which he said he would answer at eight o'clock.

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I think I have the floor. I would like to remind you that I started at about 25 minutes after nine and was interrupted by the Minister of Justice at 20 to ten, so I have only had 15 minutes. I did not even hear the whole answer given by the minister concerning the suggestions we had made to him. So perhaps the first matter would be to receive an explanation from the Minister of Justice, an explanation which he had just started to give me.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, as I said the deposition is a very considerable one and I wish to make a statement tomorrow on the question that has been put to me by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam. I think he will agree that in view of the type of statement involved this would be much fairer to both the minister and to himself as well as to all hon. members. If that is agreeable, whether or not my estimates are called tomorrow I undertake to make a statement.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask the minister, if the estimates are not called, whether he will make the statement either on orders of the day or on motions?

Mr. Favreau: Yes.

Mr. Douglas: I take it the questions the minister will answer are the two main questions I asked having to do with—

Mr. Favreau: Well, I have asked for the blues so I can check the exact questions which have been put, and I will make a statement tomorrow. If my estimates are not called for complete discussion we can either call them for that purpose or I can make a statement on motions, or orders of the day.

Mr. Douglas: Perhaps the minister would do it on orders of the day if the estimates are not called. May I remind him that there

is not only the question I asked him in committee here. I refer to the question which I asked on orders of the day in reference to the whereabouts of Mr. Leo Rivard and the others arrested on April 29. Are they still in jail, are they out of jail, or have they been extradited?

Mr. Favreau: I tried to reply to the last question when the hon. member for Yukon was speaking, but he thought I was out of order and would not allow me to do so. Perhaps I was out of order at that time.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, the answer to the question is that they are presently in jail at Bordeaux awaiting deportation. However, they have launched proceedings by way of habeas corpus, which at the moment has brought about a stay of proceedings.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I see that the Minister of Justice does not intend to pursue the explanation he started to give concerning the suggestion I made to him about the document from which he was quoting, or at least part of the answer he gave. He stated that a memorandum or an opinion had been isued by his department to the effect that there was insufficient evidence of theft or misuse of union funds by Hal Banks, but that there were irregularities, and the minister went no further.

Therefore, I wonder, before going on with what I was saying when the minister himself interrupted me, whether the minister would prefer to continue with his answer.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, I was saying that the legal counsel of the department, after considering all the facts, even if he came to the conclusion that there were some irregularities in the handling of union funds by Hal Banks, did consider all the evidence, taking these irregularities into account, and came to the conclusion that, considering the whole evidence, a charge could not be laid successfully against Hal Banks on the allegation of misuse of funds.

But I say, Mr. Chairman, that in spite of the remarks which may have been made—normally I should ask myself whether this is a simple memorandum or an official document—I have no objection whatsoever, quite the contrary, to tabling this opinion which confirms exactly what I said tonight.

Therefore, if it is in order that I table a copy of the opinion to which I have referred, that of March 6, 1964, signed by Mr. John Robinette, I will gladly do so. But a ruling was made that I could not do this. However, if the house agrees to overrule that decision and allow me to table this document, I will table it immediately.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Order. The Chair can suggest to the committee—

[*Text*]

The suggestion made by the chairman is that when the committee rises the hon. member table the document. Is that agreeable?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, after hearing the answer just given by the Minister of Justice, I can only come to the conclusion, once again, that the minister, his department and his advisers have really no desire to proceed with that investigation concerning Hal Banks and to take the necessary steps to obtain his extradition.

Here is what the minister said. He stated that there may not have been any thefts but that there were irregularities, that according to the report, there was a manipulation of union funds, but that on the whole evidence concerning such manipulation, the proceedings could not be instituted with success.

Now, let us take a look at the facts. Let us suppose that the Minister of Justice does lay a complaint—before getting to that point, let us mention that it is also the minister, as he explained this afternoon, in the case of the young people referred to by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), who decides himself whether or not there is sufficient evidence for a preliminary investigation, while the minister should leave it to the judge who will preside over the preliminary investigation to decide whether or not there is enough evidence for trial.

This is the second time today that the minister and his officials have assumed judicial capacities. The first time was in the case indicated by the hon. member for Yukon and now, he assumes once again judicial capacities and decides whether or not there should be proceedings against Hal Banks for dishonest manipulation of funds, since the investigation by Mr. Justice Norris had unearthed irregularities on that matter.

The Minister of Justice, therefore, is playing a part which he is not entitled to play. He is assuming the rights and privileges of a judge.

Now, please note what will happen. Suppose the Minister of Justice takes proceedings against Hal Banks. Should Banks decide to remain in the United States, he would lose his trial by default. He would not be there to appear before the court and plead his case, so he would lose his trial by default. Then, he would be found guilty by default and his extradition could be obtained. And if he comes to Canada to defend himself, all you have to do is grab hold of him and throw him in jail for five years.

That is all there is to it. But the Minister of Justice is not taking any action. Why not bring at least a charge of embezzlement of union funds against Hal Banks? Then, you could see whether Banks comes to Canada and, if so, you could put him in jail the moment he sets foot in this country. If he does not appear, what plea can he put forward? He would then be sentenced in absentia.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a word concerning the remarks just made by the hon. member for Lapointe. I know that he is not an expert in criminal law any more than I am with regard to some other legal aspects. But I think that he will agree with me that proceedings in absentia exist neither in Canada nor in any British country. In criminal law, it is impossible to have somebody sentenced or even tried in his absence, except in minor cases by summary proceedings.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Justice will also admit that it is sometimes possible to obtain extradition, more particularly with regard to manipulation of funds, not only when the man has already been convicted, but as soon as prosecution has started against him.

Therefore, the simple fact of starting proceedings in a case like that would make Hal Banks' extradition possible.

In my opinion, the minister should carry out a more detailed investigation in that field.

But the way some Liberals interject and the way the minister talks about Banks, keep bringing back to our minds the following question: Have the thousands of dollars the Liberal members received for their election campaign managed to influence the decisions taken in the Hal Banks case? That money was received from Hal Banks and the S.I.U. by some Liberal members.

The right hon. Prime Minister said this afternoon that he would table the documents as soon as possible; but they have not been tabled and we do not have the names yet.

Truth about the matter is kept from us; we are kept in the dark.

Obviously, the minister does not take the necessary means. Why? This raises some doubts about the reasons which make him act in this way. Maybe they are influenced by election contributions which prevent them from prosecuting Hal Banks fully because they are afraid of the statements he might make once in Canada.

Mr. Chairman, an understanding was agreed upon between the different parties. We have accepted it openly and honestly, in the belief that during the discussion of the estimates of the various departments, we would be given at least the necessary information as well as the required documents, so that we could vote conscientiously on the estimates before us.

We have but a few days to discuss them; and now the Liberals, in turn, take advantage of this to delay the debate by refusing either to provide us with the requested documents or to answer our questions. In short, they are refusing to answer such a simple question as this: give us the names and the documents showing that some Liberal members received money from Hal Banks for their election funds.

We have only a few days to study the estimates. In fact, their study will be terminated Friday evening, and members on the government side are taking advantage of the fact that we made an agreement, in good faith, believing sincerely it would be respected, to attempt to hide, not only the documents we are requesting, but also the truth about certain questions we are asking.

Mr. Chairman, I have often agreed to limit the debate at house leaders meetings, but this time I feel that I was probably hoodwinked, as well as the members of my party, for the time spent on the estimates will have been limited strictly to hiding the truth. In the future we will be more circumspect, and we will attempt to have all the time required to discuss the estimates in order that we might ask him and demand that the minister produce the documents requested, to which we are entitled.

If the minister is able to produce them, if he does not fear to tell the truth, let him produce the documents establishing who are the people who were financed by Mr. Hal Banks, during the last electoral campaign, those who have repeated all kinds of things and deceived the Canadian people, with a

propaganda which had never been seen before in the province of Quebec. Thousands of dollars were spent in advertisements in the newspapers and over the radio, and today, people know where the money originated, know who paid for this propaganda. We wish to have that information, and the population will know it was deceived with electoral funds which were supplied by Mr. Hal Banks and other individuals of the same category.

Mr. Chairman, I see that this hurts several members on the other side of the house, but we are entitled to know those names. The population will then be in a position to establish the connection, not only with the present debate, but also with the position taken by the minister as regards Hal Banks. Such position is not clear in my mind—it is even fuzzy—but when the names are known, we may even request an inquiry, and above all check the electoral expenses appearing in the statements made and signed by some Liberal members.

It may also be possible to inquire of the chief electoral officer, who has in hand the statement of expenses forms, in order to decide whether such donations or subscriptions from Mr. Banks were entered. Some Liberal members may be caught at fault, especially those who declared only half the amounts of money they spent for electoral purposes.

We therefore request these documents and hope that the Minister of Justice will tell us—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, you may see that this hurts to some extent certain Liberal members, and I understand that.

Some hon. Members: Especially those from Montreal.

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, since today was spent on the estimates of the Department of Justice, I feel that the minister should give us those documents and tell us the names of those who received money.

[*Text*]

Mr. Pilon: May I call it ten o'clock. Mr. Chairman?

The Chairman: Shall I rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again?

Progress reported.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, with the unanimous consent of the house, could I be allowed to table a document dated March 6, 1964 which is a legal opinion addressed to the Department of Justice and signed by Mr. John J. Robinette?

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house agree to the tabling of the document referred to by the Minister of Justice?

Mr. Bell: May we have the minister's assurance, and I ask this merely for the record, that that is the entire legal opinion given by Mr. Robinette in this case?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house agree?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: May I ask the Minister of Justice if he intends to table the documents containing the names of those who received $1,000?

[*Text*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McIlraith: Tomorrow we propose to call the estimates of the department of secretary of state, forestry, the Indian affairs branch, and if those three are finished, trade and commerce or finance, but not necessarily in that order.

Mr. Peters: What happens to justice, now?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being after ten o'clock—

Mr. Peters: May I ask what happens to the Department of Justice?

Mr. McIlraith: The arrangement was that certain departments would be called on certain days. That involved external affairs on Thursday of last week and the justice department today, with the other two departments I indicated for tomorrow. This is as far as I can go at the moment.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

TRANSPORT—P.E.I. CAUSEWAY—INQUIRY AS TO CONSTRUCTION START

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I regret that it is so late. I know that maritime unions are important, but so are maritime provinces.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Public Works today was with regard to

the construction of the Prince Edward Island causeway, a matter upon which there is confusion and uncertainty resulting from diverse and differing statements from ministers of the crown.

According to *Time* magazine of October 9 the Solicitor General (Mr. MacNaught) said that it—

> —is certain that construction will start by 1966. There's nothing in the reports to indicate any delay or any discouragement. We have a schedule and I am completely confident it will be met.

One has to read the papers regularly to hear progress of this undertaking, since one finds little on the records of parliament. On November 21 the Charlottetown *Guardian* had a headline "Causeway Construction Slated for 1965 Start?" The story is more interesting, if less revealing, than the headline. It is an account of a Liberal meeting in Kings county where the guest speaker was the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill). I quote from the newspaper account:

> Mr. Pickersgill did not make a long reference to the causeway. He said there was absolutely no question now about the causeway being built. He said he hoped to see the project actually under way next year.

Mr. Pickersgill: Don't you?

Mr. Macquarrie: I hope so; my colleague hopes so; a hundred thousand islanders hope so. But we would like a little more than hopes.

It is significant that the minister who has departmental responsibility, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Deschatelets) has not said 1965, like the Minister of Transport, or 1966 like the Solicitor General. He has made a consistent and sustained contribution of silence to this vital question.

Throughout the years when our party was in power the present Minister of Transport was frequent and constant in his interrogation of the government. He used to rise and ask about the feasibility report, and when it was going to be tabled. Frequently he would ask if the causeway was under construction. He was fortunate that he was never asked to put these questions on the order paper, like I have been. But now, after being 19 months a member of the government I would have thought that more than hope would have been voiced by him. I would have thought a definite statement, not of hope but of policy and of plans would have been made—a firm announcement; the kind of statement the former prime minister made in the house when he rose and pledged his government to build the causeway.

Mr. Pickersgill: What happened to that?

Mr. Macquarrie: I hope the minister will contain himself. I have listened to many things from him for many years and I was able to restrain myself from interruptions, which were very easily prompted.

The former government was often criticized for not producing reports fast enough. Now we have a situation where this report has been available for months, but it is not being revealed. It is not being released, nor is the government indicating what plans it has, based upon the information which it admits it has had for a long time. We have had no information as to what type of work will be done and when it will begin. There is nothing about the interesting suggestions of a very reputable organization headed by Mr. Margison. There is nothing about the possible effect upon rail travel.

Except for newspaper releases and short statements at political meetings, all is silence on this great subject, one of the greatest things as far as the maritime economy in the region is concerned. With regard to a place where transportation problems have always been of the most compelling urgency we find a dreadful lack of official assurance, of official statements from the government by the minister who has the responsibility for this vast project, about which so much was done by the preceding government. I invite the minister to lift tonight a little of the veil of secrecy and state in this house officially where the project stands.

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to make a statement on the Northumberland causeway project on my estimates, but since the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macquarrie) has raised this matter, may I be permitted to say this. The first phase of preliminary studies has been completed; a detailed report has been turned in, and also two sets of designs have been submitted by the consultant engineers. This report establishes without any shadow of a doubt the feasibility of this project both as regards the engineering and economic aspects. This report and the designs are now before the government. I have said several times, and I repeat tonight, that this project is under very active consideration by the government. Having said that, I do not want to comment any further on the matter except to say that I have read the statement of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) as re-

ported on Saturday in the Charlottetown *Guardian,* where he said, and I quote, that he hoped to see the project actually under way next year—meaning, of course, in 1965. I think all hon. members will agree that the Minister of Transport is not only a great thinker but is also a great prophet. Let us hope that, as usual, he will be right.

Mr. Macquarrie: Another hope.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, November 24, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. ROULEAU—RESIGNATION AS PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO PRIME MINISTER

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Rouleau (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

In view of the statements made in the house yesterday, and in view of the fact that I have already made a voluntary statement to the R.C.M.P., I wish to state as follows:

1. It was as a member of parliament that I made representations in the case of one Mr. Rivard. In the course of those representations I am convinced that I did not exercise or attempt to exercise any undue influence, nor did I do anything reprehensible;

2. In view of that statement given to the R.C.M.P., I am sure that my name is mentioned in the report of the R.C.M.P.

If a judicial inquiry is held in this matter, as was inferred yesterday, I request that I be granted every opportunity of appearing before the investigating commissioner;

3. I wish to state and insist upon the fact that, right or wrong, I never thought that I should inform the Prime Minister about this matter, and it was only this morning that I told him about it;

4. Until an inquiry has established the whole truth about this matter, and until a decision is rendered, I am asking the Prime Minister to relieve me of my duties as parliamentary secretary.

[*Text*]

PENSIONS

CONCURRENCE IN FIRST REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON CANADA PLAN

Mr. A. J. P. Cameron (High Park) presented the first report of the special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on the Canada pension plan, and moved that the report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ESTABLISHMENT OF JUDICIAL INQUIRY

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in the house last evening, I now intend to make the statement which I undertook to make today.

The government on my recommendation has decided to accept the suggestion made by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam that a judicial inquiry should be held. The commissioner will be asked to deal with the following questions:

1. Whether, on the basis of the reports submitted to the Minister of Justice by the R.C.M. Police, and the evidence laid before him in connection therewith, it was a reasonable decision on the part of the minister that there was not sufficient evidence to support a successful prosecution.

2. Whether any further evidence that may be laid before the commissioner, taken in conjunction with the evidence that was before the minister, would justify prosecution.

To deal specifically with the question raised by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, I may say that apart from the persons mentioned by the member for Yukon, the only other person besides myself associated with the government and referred to in the report is the hon. member for Dollard (Mr. Rouleau).

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the statement made by the minister that a judicial inquiry will take place in connection with the matters raised by the hon. member for Yukon will naturally be accepted provided it is made clear that the suggestion of the minister yesterday that such a commission should meet in secret—

Mr. Favreau: No, Mr. Speaker; I am sorry, but the contrary is clear. It will be an open inquiry.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is welcome. That indicates there has been a great change overnight in the attitude of the government.

Mr. Woolliams: And the minister.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It bears out what has been said in description of oppositions, that

oppositions cleanse and purify those in office and that we in the opposition are in fact the "detergents of democracy."

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am glad to see the reception given those words by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who ridicules them—

Mr. Sharp: I am not ridiculing them. I am just thinking of how they might apply to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Diefenbaker:—as does the Minister of Transport, but I am quoting the present leader of the Liberal party when he spoke in Washington in 1960. I am very happy to find there is the same division among members of the cabinet today as has been so apparent in the last few days.

Canadians will not be satisfied by anything short of a complete investigation into this matter. The questions that have been suggested as the basis for the examination by the judge are too limited. There should be a general provision so the judge will be able to make the fullest and most careful examination of this matter, and so that no hidden recess will remain concealed from the searchlight of full examination and scrutiny.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: They laugh, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday they ridiculed the hon. member for Yukon when he brought this matter before the house. I want to say, too, that there are apparently other matters that will come up when the estimates of the Department of Justice are again considered by the house, and we in Her Majesty's loyal opposition do not intend that we shall be curtailed in any way in bringing before the house additional matters over and above those that were dealt with yesterday regardless of whether or not a commission is set up.

I would have thought that the minister would have immediately given the house certain information which the Canadian people have the right to know. Was Mr. Denis dismissed from office? If so, for what reason? Did he admit any wrongdoing? If so, why was that wrongdoing so carefully concealed until brought forth in the house by the hon. member for Yukon? What statements were made by Mr. Lord? Did he admit that he had indulged in any way in threats? Did Denis admit that he had indulged in attempted bribery? The minister could have told the house, without in any way interfering with the course of justice, whether the counsel for the United States gave to the Department of Justice any information regarding alleged bribes or threats. We have not any of this at all.

It is a strange thing that before the commission is set up the minister has not seen fit to clear up these questions. Today there has been another step. I am not going to refer to the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister or the statement he made as a question of privilege, but certainly that statement on his part today indicates that in the last 24 hours there has been a lot of soul searching across the way.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I do not see how the government could have done other than it has done, namely to offer a judicial inquiry into this matter which was raised in the house yesterday. The surprising thing to me is that it should have been necessary to bring this to the attention of the house before the government decided to initiate the inquiry.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion the terms of reference which the minister has suggested are far too limited. As I took them down in rather scratchy notes, the minister said there would be two items in the terms of reference, namely whether or not there was sufficient information available to the minister when he received the R.C.M.P. report to warrant the laying of a criminal charge; and second, whether there is any further evidence at the time of the judicial inquiry which would warrant a prosecution.

It seems to me there is a much wider aspect of this case which ought to be looked into now, and that is the whole procedure which was followed by the minister and the government in dealing with this matter. Here was a minister of justice who, if I remember the dates he mentioned yesterday, around August 14 was told by the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. that a counsel had been faced, in one instance personally and in another case by telephone, by two executive assistants to two cabinet ministers. In the one case he was offered a bribe and in the second he had been subjected to intimidation in order to go easy on an application for bail by two men who were subject to extradition proceedings on behalf of the United States in connection with a narcotics charge. Now it is also apparent from the statement that has been made today that this allegation by a prominent counsel of

the city of Montreal involved a member of this house, the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister.

When the minister received the report on September 18 he had all this information before him. The minister decided, on his own, that there was not sufficient evidence to warrant prosecution. I say, Mr. Speaker, being as charitable as it is possible to be, that here was an allegation by a highly respected lawyer, a member of a reputable legal firm in the city of Montreal who had nothing to gain by making this allegation and, on the contrary, was only doing so to safeguard his own good name, and who must have known that in making this allegation he would be dragged through an investigation. Certainly there was every reason to believe that his allegations were true.

From the minister's statement yesterday it is perfectly clear that this matter was not referred either to the law officers of the crown in his department or to the crown attorney of the area to see whether they thought there were grounds for prosecution. Instead the matter was dropped, and would not have been raised again if it had not been raised in the house yesterday.

I think we are entitled to some explanations, and certainly a judicial inquiry ought to bring out some of the facts. For instance, the secretary or executive assistant to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration left the employ of the minister around October 1, two weeks after this report was given to the Minister of Justice. Was he fired? If he was fired and if there were sufficient grounds for firing him, surely there were sufficient grounds for prosecuting him.

Yesterday the minister did not give us any further information, although we pressed him, regarding whether or not there was any person higher up involved. Now it it admitted that the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister was involved in this investigation. Surely the house has a right to know, and the country will want to know, whether the Minister of Justice transmitted the contents of the report he received from the R.C.M.P. on September 18 to the Prime Minister. If the Prime Minister knew, and has known since September 18, that the parliamentary secretary was involved in this investigation, why is it that only today, on November 24—

Mr. Favreau: On a point of order.

Mr. Douglas: —is the hon. member submitting his resignation?

Mr. Favreau: On a point of order—

Some hon. Members: Resign.

Mr. Favreau: —the Prime Minister was not apprised until yesterday.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why not?

Mr. Douglas: I am sorry; I could not hear the minister.

Mr. Favreau: I said the Prime Minister had not been advised.

Mr. Monteith: Well, he should have been.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Why wasn't he?

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice says the Prime Minister was not informed of the contents of this report which he, the minister, received on the 18th day of September. Of course that is a matter for the Prime Minister to deal with, but I want to say that I would think any prime minister would take a dim view of an R.C.M.P. report lying on the desk of his Minister of Justice, involving his own parliamentary secretary, not being transmitted to him.

It seems to me this is a very serious matter indeed. I would therefore hope, Mr. Speaker, that if the judicial investigation is to be ordered its terms of inquiry will be expanded to deal not only with whether there is now sufficient evidence to warrant a prosecution against those concerning whom allegations have been made, but I would think the judicial inquiry should also include an examination of all the procedures that were followed, in order that the Canadian people may know whether the Minister of Justice, and other ministers who were involved, carried out their responsibilities properly, or whether there was an attempt to conceal this matter and sweep it under the rug in order to prevent the facts from becoming known.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that since the Prime Minister must accept the major responsibility for any actions of the government, he would insist that the terms of reference be widened to look into the propriety of the manner in which this whole question has been handled by the Department of Justice.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, in view of all that has taken place I think we can only regret that it is difficult to find complete honesty in politics.

I think that the announcement made by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) of his decision to hold an inquiry in that matter is certainly a sound one. I can only urge the

minister to carry out a complete inquiry into that matter so that no doubt can subsist in the minds of the members of the House of Commons and of the whole Canadian people as to the implications that could spring from the allegation made yesterday by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen).

It seems to me, after listening to the discussion yesterday, that there is definitely grounds for an inquiry, and a very serious inquiry, since confidence in politics is involved and since that confidence has been quite seriously shaken by the policy followed by this government since they came to office. I think we could have done without this new ordeal. Since the facts are already before us, it is imperative to throw some light on that matter so that all facts will be known by each and every one. And if someone is guilty, let him be punished.

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, following the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) I must state that we are far from being satisfied with the terms of reference of this inquiry.

The inquiry will be, especially under the terms of reference announced by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau), entirely contrary to the principles of impartial justice.

The minister states that the purpose of the inquiry will be to determine whether the department was right or not in not lodging a complaint when the report from the R.C.M.P. was received.

The inquiry will hence determine the action of the minister on receipt of that report from the R.C.M.P. Now, on receiving the report the minister decided not to lodge a complaint immediately. What happens to the role of the Minister of Justice? His efforts will tend to prove that he was right in not lodging a complaint and that there is not sufficient evidence. By the same token, it can be seen that apart from this role he will have another more serious part to play, which will be to try and justify the innocence of those against whom charges were laid, so that his own role, which was not to take action, will be justified.

In that inquiry the minister will attempt to justify his refusal to prosecute or lay charges against those presumed responsible.

Obviously the role of the Minister of Justice will be then quite contrary to that he usually assumes in the normal discharge of his duties. The duty of the Minister of Justice is to set up inquiries, to lay charges against those presumed guilty, but in that inquiry, if the Minister of Justice wants to justify his action not to prosecute those individuals, he will definitely have to try to prove their innocence. Under the terms of reference the minister did set out himself, his duty and his role will be to prove that two individuals are innocent which is not his role but rather an opposite role to that he has to play.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the terms of reference of the judicial commission whose establishment has just been announced is nothing but a smokescreen set up by the Minister of Justice who is trying to hide the facts and play a role which is not his, that is to exonerate the accused.

The matter raised by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) is a serious one; in fact, it is much more serious than it would seem on the face of it. As the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) pointed out, two executive secretaries to ministers are involved. One of the parliamentary secretaries to the Prime Minister even felt compelled to resign. We do not ask for that much, since he is presumed innocent until proven guilty. However, he felt he had to resign and it is reported today that one of the two executive secretaries has been fired. The minister announced an investigation on the actions of those individuals, but not on the question of whether he was right in not bringing the matter before the court.

So, that is what I think of the announcement made by the Minister of Justice. The terms of reference that he formulated are absolutely contrary to the impartial application of justice. In my opinion the minister should ask instead for a complete investigation on everything that took place in this matter, including the telephone calls as well as the threats and the amounts of money involved. That is what he is there for, in any case, as he just stated.

[*Text*]

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, with reference to the announcement made a moment ago regarding the setting up of a judicial commission, we in the opposition might want the opportunity of discussing further ramifications in connection with this matter which I am informed will be brought before the house. Therefore I ask the Prime Minister whether he is in agreement that no objection

would be raised on the part of the government, should the commission be appointed, to having further discussion of the matter in the house when the estimates of the Department of Justice come back to the committee of supply. To that end I suggest to the Prime Minister that they be called again tomorrow and that the order in council, if it has not already been issued, be held back so as to permit further disclosures to be made. The hon. member for Yukon has additional matters that the house and the country should have, and in the interests of the Canadian people I ask the Prime Minister whether he will accede to this request.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Yukon made certain charges, allegations and statements in the house yesterday and had, of course, ample opportunity to do so and he had the right to that opportunity. As soon as those statements and allegations were made the government acted to set up an inquiry as was requested, quite reasonably. That inquiry has terms of reference to deal with what was stated yesterday. I am quite certain that the terms will be wide enough that all relevant factors and the statements and allegations made will be covered by the inquiry.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): What are you afraid of?

Mr. Diefenbaker: I would ask the Prime Minister, has the order in council been passed yet?

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, not yet.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Then I would ask the Prime Minister to hold it and bring back the estimates, because there are other matters, which might cause further interest even than those already revealed, to be brought before the house in connection with this matter.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are other matters which will be revealed. Perhaps there are further matters to be revealed on this side, too; but we were asked to institute an inquiry with respect to those matters, and we have done so in terms which will permit the widest possible inquiry into them.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Apparently the terms were so worded that I suggest to the Prime Minister that it could not be anything other than a whitewash proceeding. Will he put a general term in the reference so the whole field in this connection may be looked into; because there are other matters in which the Prime Minister may be interested. He was not informed what his parliamentary secretary was doing. There may be other matters that the Minister of Justice did not inform him about.

Mr. Pearson: If there are other matters, those matters can be dealt with when the charges are made.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The House of Commons is the place.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Justice whether he got advice from the law officers of the crown in the preparation of the terms of reference for the judicial inquiry, or were they drafted on his own initiative? Because we have had examples of his initiative before.

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, as usual the opposition feels that the civil service ought to be dragged into this matter—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Favreau: —but I have to assert now that I have had advice from the law officers of the crown.

Mr. Churchill: With regard to what?

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question of the Prime Minister. He spoke of the terms of reference having the widest possible application. I cannot reconcile this with the statement made by the Minister of Justice, which revealed two very narrow terms of reference. May I ask the Prime Minister if he is prepared to see that in the order in council containing the terms of reference there is provision for an investigation into the propriety of the procedure followed by the Department of Justice following the reception of the R.C.M.P. report on September 18.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the terms of reference were not, in my view, as narrow as my hon. friend suggests. The evidence that has been referred to will be before the commissioner. Any other evidence bearing on what was mentioned and alleged yesterday will be before the commissioner. I am perfectly certain that the commissioner will undoubtedly, in considering the evidence, inquire into the propriety of any action which has been taken.

Judicial Inquiry Established

Mr. Douglas: A further supplementary question. It is not what I say about the terms of reference; I am simply stating what the Minister of Justice said they were. He referred to only two items; 1, whether or not there had been sufficient evidence to warrant prosecution; and 2, whether in the meantime other evidence had arisen. If these are the two items in the terms of reference they are not wide enough to give the commission the latitude which is required to look into the propriety of the whole procedure which has been followed by the Department of Justice. I ask the Prime Minister whether such a clause will be inserted.

Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe the terms of reference are wide enough to deal with the matter referred to by my hon. friend, but of course there is no desire on the part of the government to hold back anything from this inquiry. We want to make this inquiry both full and fair, and I will look at the terms of reference with that in mind.

Mr. Douglas: One further supplementary question which I would like to direct to the Minister of Labour. Can he indicate whether in preparing his material for submission to this commission, providing he has in his possession the documents and exhibits of the Norris commission, as I believe he does, he will undertake to have those documents searched to see whether there was a voucher presented by Mr. Harold C. Banks for the payment of a sum of money—I believe some $1,500, but the amount is not important—to one Raymond Denis? Will the minister undertake to see whether this voucher is among the exhibits and documents of the Norris commission and, if it is, to have it submitted to the commission?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Prime Minister a supplementary question which is closely related to those which were asked by the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the New Democratic party.

Yesterday the Prime Minister intimated that he would reveal, as soon as he was in a position to do so, the names of the Liberal members or organizers for the city of Montreal who received $1,000 gifts from the organization of Mr. Hal C. Banks.

Knowing that the Prime Minister is perfectly aware of what happened in Montreal at the time of the last election, is he in a position to give us the names of the federal Liberal members who received $1,000 each from the organization of Mr. Hal C. Banks?

[*Text*]

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, there is a motion for the production of papers on the order paper dealing with this matter.

An hon. Member: It has been passed.

Mr. Pearson: That motion has been passed and the information is being produced as quickly as possible. This will take a little time, because the motion related not only to government departments—that information could have been produced at once—but also to other agencies under government control. To provide the information in that respect will require making contact with a great many agencies throughout Canada, and that is being done.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of what the Prime Minister has said about his intention in respect of the terms of reference, will he undertake before the order in council is passed to come before this house again and disclose whether he then intends to widen the terms of reference?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I have already said that I am satisfied the terms are wide enough for an investigation. I have also said, I believe, that the question of widening them will be considered.

Mr. Woolliams: Will you disclose the circumstances to the house before passing the order in council? That is my supplementary question.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister in order to clear up what appears to me to be an ambiguity, as I am sure it appears to other hon. members, consequent upon some of the answers given to questions today. Was the Prime Minister informed by the Minister of Justice of any of the circumstances of this case, which is now going to be investigated, prior to those circumstances being brought out in this house yesterday?

Mr. Pearson: I think the Minister of Justice has dealt with this matter, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, the reason I asked the question is that it appeared from questions and answers that the Prime Minister had not been informed about his parliamentary secretary. It was not clear whether he had been informed about any of the other circumstances, and my question is this. Was he informed by the Minister of Justice in regard to any of the other circumstances of this case prior to those circumstances being brought to the attention of this house yesterday?

Mr. Pearson: I was informed by the Minister of Justice of some of the circumstances shortly before his estimates came before the house. He told me this matter would be before the house during the consideration of his estimates. He told me the facts of the matter. My parliamentary secretary, who has just resigned, has already indicated in his statement that he had not informed me of this matter until this morning.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's answer touched upon the ambiguity I mentioned, which was the reason for my question. When the Prime Minister said he was informed before the minister's estimates were put before the house, does he mean he was informed yesterday or a week ago? When was he informed?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I think I was informed on the day before his estimates were brought before the house.

Mr. Eric Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I have one further supplementary question in this regard for the Prime Minister. Before the completion of the order in council, will the Prime Minister give serious consideration to the suggestion that these terms of reference be broadened; or will he perhaps appoint some other body, such as a royal commission, to investigate not only the matters referred to by the Minister of Justice but other matters specifically related to the possibility of international crime organizations having infiltrated other offices of cabinet ministers of the government?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, that is a very different matter, which is far reaching and would involve a great deal of consideration and discussion. If there is any evidence to support the very serious statement made by my hon. friend perhaps he will produce that evidence, and the necessary steps will be taken.

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration whether he will inform the house today why Mr. Raymond Denis was released from employment in his office.

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Raymond Denis submitted his resignation in writing and I accepted it immediately.

[*Text*]

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question I should like to direct to the Prime Minister. Will the Prime Minister include in the terms of reference of this judicial inquiry, authority for the judge or commissioner to thoroughly examine the affairs of the Department of Citizenship and Immition during the employment of Mr. Raymond Denis, in view of the fact that Mr. Denis served in that office for a rather lengthy period of time?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, there is now a commissioner inquiring into certain aspects of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration; I refer to Mr. Sedgwick. The particular man in question who worked in the department of immigration most certainly will be under investigation by the commissioner.

Mr. Woolliams: I have a further supplementary question for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Did the executive assistant give reasons for resigning his position and, if so, what reasons did he give for that resignation?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, if I remember rightly, Mr. Denis wanted to take up other activities than those of the government.

[*Text*]

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Woolliams: I have a further supplementary question. Is the new field which he wanted to go into the same field he was in while he was employed in the minister's office.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

When did Mr. Denis hand in his resignation? The minister told us that this official had taken up other activities he preferred, but when he resigned, he surely gave reasons for so doing. Can the minister tell the house if those reasons are somewhat similar to those which induced Mr. Hal Banks to leave Canada and flee to the United States?

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I would be ready to give all this information to the house, but I believe that the investigating commissioner will be quite glad to obtain all those details. I will also be very glad to supply him with all the information required to clear up this situation.

[*Text*]

Mr. MacInnis: I have a supplementary question.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It does seem to me that we are going rather far afield.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. There is such a thing as common, ordinary, plain honest justice and I do not believe that—

An hon. Member: Yes, there is, but where is it? That is what we are looking for.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If any hon. member has a charge to make, surely the right procedure is for him to stand up and make the charge, rather than doing so by indirection. A commission has been set up to investigate this matter.

Mr. Diefenbaker: No, it has not.

Mr. Speaker: A commission is in the process of being set up to investigate this matter, and it does seem to me we are going a little far afield from the grounds of common justice to individuals who may or may not be concerned in this matter.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs about Mr. Lord, who went to the United Kingdom. Has Mr. Lord been on the payroll of the Canadian government, and in particular since being abroad has he been temporarily on the payroll of the high commissioner's office in London?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, if he is I am not aware of it. I will make some inquiries.

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration this question arising out of his answer. Having regard to the charges made yesterday by the hon. member for Yukon, was the minister aware of the matter in which his executive assistant was involved at the time he accepted his resignation, and did he discuss it with his executive assistant before accepting his resignation?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat what I said a while ago: I will be glad to make all depositions and give all necessary information to the investigating commissioner, when that inquiry is held. But I do not believe that this is the right time and place to give those details.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister this. Is he defying the House of Commons and refusing to answer the question? Is it or is it not true that he fully discussed this matter with his executive assistant prior to the resignation? Why not answer that? Is it because he is afraid?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Denis sent me his resignation he informed me of the charges that had been laid against him.

[*Text*]

Mr. J. H. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Did he inform the Prime Minister of the facts concerning the resignation of his executive assistant when the executive assistant resigned; and if he did not inform the Prime Minister, why not?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I have already explained this. Mr. Raymond Denis sent me his resignation after having advised me of the charges laid against him. He has always denied those charges. I did accept his resignation. However, I did not feel that I had to advise the Prime Minister that my assistant had decided to resign and leave my office.

[*Text*]

Mr. Horner (Acadia): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Why did the minister not inform the Prime Minister at that time?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Surely the minister is able to reach his own decisions.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTING CLOSING OF LIMOILOU SHOPS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lucien Plourde (Quebec West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport.

Could he tell us whether he has looked into a resolution from the Quebec city council and what steps he intends to take so as to cope with the decision of the Canadian National Railways?

This question refers to the one I asked yesterday.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Surely this is a question for the order paper. There is not that pressing urgency.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, to be fair to the hon. gentleman I would point out that he asked the question yesterday and I undertook to make some reply today. My parliamentary secretary is ready to do so.

Mr. Grafftey: That does not make the question in order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, we received representations from Quebec city this morning, and we are now in touch with the management of the Canadian National Railways. The hon. member will be informed of the answer as soon as it has been received from the Canadian National Railways.

[*Text*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CONGO—INQUIRY AS TO SITUATION RESPECTING HOSTAGES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Is the minister in a position to inform the house as to the safety of the Canadian missionaries and others in that very troubled section of the Congo?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as of two o'clock the latest information we had was that some 65 of these hostages were believed to have been killed and some 55 wounded. Whether there are any Canadians involved I cannot say. There were some conflicting reports, and I would not want to comment on those for fear of creating concern where it may not be warranted.

Mr. Nesbitt: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. How many of the hostages have been taken to safety so far? Is the minister in a position to tell us that?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No, Mr. Speaker, we do not know.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Have the Belgian troops which were prepared to go into Stanleyville actually landed there, and are they now in a position to prevent further slaughter of these hostages?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, we have been advised that with the prior agreement of the government at Leopoldville, a Belgian paratroop unit of 500 parachuted on Stanleyville this morning, the purpose being to rescue the foreign hostages about whom we have been so much concerned during the past few weeks. The Belgian government has clearly indicated that the landing of these paratroops was not a military operation, but was designed and limited solely to providing for the security and obtaining the freedom of the hostages. The foreign minister of Belgium, Mr. Spaak, indicated at eleven o'clock this morning that he hoped that before the end of the day the operation would be successful; but we are not in a position, as I just told the hon. member, to say to what extent and in what numbers the hostages have been able to obtain their freedom and to escape the terrible situation confronting them.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

INQUIRY AS TO STEPS TO DEAL WITH UNEMPLOYMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. In view of the release by the dominion bureau of statistics last Friday indicating an increase in unemployment by 40,000 between September and October and a decline of 50,000 in employment, both figures being larger than seasonal, what steps is the government taking to meet this alarming situation?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I regret I did not hear the hon. member's question fully. I will be glad to read it in *Hansard* and reply tomorrow.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, may I enlighten the minister by referring to the dominion bureau of statistics release indicating that unemployment in Canada increased by 40,000 between September and October and employment declined by 50,000, both figures being larger than seasonal. What steps is the government taking to meet this alarming situation?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I will answer the question tomorrow.

EFFECT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION ON ATLANTIC PROVINCES SHIPPING

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Labour of which I have given him notice. Can the minister assure the house that the crews of C.N.R. operated ferries will not suffer a reduction in take home pay due to the operation of the terms of Bill No. C-126, if enacted in its present form? I am thinking chiefly of the C.N.R. ferries in the maritimes and of ships operating to Newfoundland.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, much as I would like to accommodate my hon. friend by giving him a reply to this question, I have already stated that in view of the fact that the bill is in committee stage and listed for consideration later by the house, it would be improper for me to answer such questions; but I am sure the question he has raised is important and will be dealt with by the committee.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): As a supplementary question, may I ask the minister if he has received representations from the crews of these vessels, as many of us have, in which they point out that in general they welcome the eight hour day, as it will improve their working conditions, but as one man says,

—if I have to lose wages I would rather continue working the ten hours.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I have seen a great number of representations. I shall investigate this particular set of representations and give them every possible consideration.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

RECONSIDERATION OF DISBANDMENT OF IRISH REGIMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. In view of the large volume of protests indicating activity on the part of the Irish, and in view of the recommendation of the Suttie report, will the minister say whether the decision to disband the Irish regiments in Toronto and Vancouver has been reconsidered?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the hon. member for giving me notice of his intention to ask this question. As hon. members are aware, similar questions have already been asked, and in reply I have said that representations have been received from many sources, including hon. members from both sides of the house. I have also said that I was keenly aware of the pride felt by those making representations on behalf of great regiments, and that I regretted that the decisions taken with respect to the transfer to the supplementary order of battle of these historic units, including the Irish regiment, must stand.

A suggestion has been put forward, however, which will permit the decisions taken to be implemented and at the same time enable us to perpetuate the great Irish tradition within the active militia. We have already announced the formation of an infantry battalion in Sudbury to replace the 58th field artillery regiment now located there. It has been proposed that this unit be named the 2nd battalion, the Irish Regiment of Canada, (Sudbury).

I am informed that this solution carries the judgment of a representative group of responsible people, and I am pleased to concur in the hope that the action will receive general support. In this way the name and glorious tradition of this great regiment, the Irish Regiment of Canada, will be actively maintained.

Mr. Brewin: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister feel that this solution will be at all satisfactory to those who have been active members of the Irish regiments in Toronto and Vancouver; and does he think it wise to pick a fight with the Irish?

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the second half of the question is in the negative. In respect to the first part of the question, I certainly hope this solution will meet with general approval. The representations I have had were to the effect that the Irish tradition should be preserved in the active militia, and that in particular the Irish Regiment of Canada history should be maintained. This solution is a happy one which will permit that to go forward.

POSSIBLE POLICY CHANGE RESPECTING NUCLEAR WEAPONS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Is it a fact that the government is considering an about turn in its long term nuclear policy, opting for a continuing nuclear role for Canada in an effort to break the deadlock between France and the United States over the nuclear deterrent?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the government's position with respect to atomic weapons was very clearly set out in the white paper on defence. That will remain the policy of the government until some announcement is made to the contrary.

TRADE

WHEAT—SUBSIDY ON EXPORTS BY UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. It concerns a major policy matter which I raised last Friday, namely the drop in Durum prices from 11 cents to 16 cents. Did the minister receive notification from the Canadian wheat board before this price change was put into effect?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I am happy the hon. gentleman has asked me this question because it enables me to answer a charge he made the last time he asked a question on this matter. I should like to say that so far as we can determine the United States has not broken any international agreement by the action it took with respect to the pricing of Durum wheat.

The Canadian wheat board was made aware of the action of the United States government shortly before the United States took that action. I was informed immediately, and by the time I was informed, or shortly thereafter, the price reduction had been made in order to sell the wheat. An order for something around two million bushels was filled, and that was the occasion for the increase in the subsidy and the reduction in price.

Mr. Hamilton: My supplementary question bears on the first part of the minister's statement. Is the minister aware that the same sort of thing happened in the fall of 1962? The United States put on the subsidy on a Friday and took if off at nine o'clock on a Wednesday morning because of representations from the minister.

Mr. Sharp: I am a great admirer of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. I say this quite sincerely. I think the hon. gentleman did a very good job when he was minister of agriculture. My only regret is that he always reminds us about it.

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): May I ask a supplementary question. Does the Minister of Trade and Commerce not think the reduction in the price of two million bushels of Durum wheat will seriously affect the final price at which we will have to sell our spring wheat under the international wheat agreement?

Mr. Sharp: I should like to add to the answer I gave the other day, and this bears directly on the question which has just been asked. I have been in communication with the department of agriculture of the United States. Unfortunately the secretary of agriculture was absent when I called and I spoke to the under secretary. As I said in the house the other day, I made strong representations concerning this reduction in the price of Durum wheat. I said to the under secretary that I understood the circumstances surrounding Durum wheat and I did not question the right of the United States to set its own prices, any more than the United States questioned our right to set our prices for our wheat.

However, I did say I hoped this did not foreshadow any alteration in United States policy with respect to spring wheat, and that I hoped the United States shared our general desire to maintain as much stability in price as possible. On both these points he gave me his assurance.

Mr. Eric A Winkler (Grey-Bruce): I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce a supplementary question related to the answer he has just given. Is he aware of the reduction in income of those engaged in eastern agriculture, which would give rise to the repeated wish for a return to the state of affairs when the hon. member for Qu'Appelle was minister of agriculture?

Mr. Sharp: I hope I shall be permitted to reply in kind to this sort of question. I would say to my hon. friend that when we took office, as he well knows, there was a great deal of dissatisfaction in eastern Canada with respect to the condition of agriculture.

An hon. Member: And there still is.

Mr. Hamilton: My supplementary question of the minister is this. Does he consider that the federal government of the United States, by subsidizing the movement of grain to eastern ports, is not subsidizing grain for export into commercial markets?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I agree entirely with the hon. gentleman. It is most undesirable that the United States should subsidize export grain. He has protested and I have protested. When he was in office the United States exported subsidized grain. He is well aware of this. We both have been fighting this same problem, and I think I have fought it with at least as much success.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): May I ask a supplementary question. Did the minister protest to the United States government regarding the recent drop in their export price on Durum wheat? If so, to whom were the representations made? What was the nature of the representations, and approximately the time?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. gentleman was absent when I was answering the question of the hon. member who sits behind him. I made these representations to the under secretary of agriculture, Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Rosthern.

Mr. Nasserden: My supplementary question has been asked.

FINANCE

INCREASE IN CANADIAN, U.S. AND U.K. INTEREST RATES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Finance.

Can he comment on the recent decision taken by the governments of Great Britain and the United States to increase the rate of interest or discount in those countries? Can he also comment on what measures he expects will be taken to prevent Canadians from investing Canadian capital in those countries, in view of the fact that the rate of discount was increased yesterday or the day before?

[*Text*]

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I had rather expected a question on this very important matter today and I wonder if I might be permitted to answer it rather fully. The chancellor of the exchequer of the United Kingdom made the following announcement in the British parliament yesterday morning:

> As the house is aware, the Bank of England has today, with my approval, raised the bank rate from 5 per cent to 7 per cent.
>
> The purpose of this move is to place beyond any doubt the government's determination to maintain sterling at its present parity, and thus to bring to an end the outflow of funds which has been taking place. The Bank of England has been in close touch with other central banks, with the object of maintaining co-operation designed to counter speculative movements.
>
> The government expect a progressive improvement in the balance of payments as some of the factors adversely affecting both the current and the capital account in 1964 lose their force, and the measures already taken by the government make their impact. The exceptional step of raising the bank rate by two points will reinforce these measures and will give time for them to operate.
>
> The long term improvement in the balance of payments will come from a reshaping of the economy through the measures outlined in the government's statement of October 26.
>
> These will lead to the necessary expansion of exports and the curtailment of imports. Prominent among these measures is the working out with both sides of industry of an effective policy for prices and incomes. Discussions on this subject have already made good progress and are being pursued urgently.
>
> In taking the decision to raise the bank rate, the government have weighed most carefully their responsibility as custodian of one of the world's two reserve currencies with their commitment to promote a healthy and steadily expanding economy at home. They are determined to carry out both these tasks.

That was the statement made by the chancellor of the exchequer in the British parliament yesterday.

The United States, which is also conscious of its own balance of payments problem, immediately considered what action it would require, and the federal reserve system made the following announcement yesterday afternoon immediately following the close of their markets. I think if I read part of this it will suffice:

> The federal reserve system took action today on two fronts to maintain the international strength of the dollar.
>
> The board of governors in Washington approved actions by the directors of the federal reserve banks of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago and St. Louis increasing the discount rates of those banks from 3½ per cent to 4 per cent effective tomorrow.

That is today.

> The change was the first since July 1963 when the federal reserve discount rates were increased from 3 to 3½ per cent.

The board of governors also increased the maximum rates that member banks are permitted to pay on savings and time deposits—

I shall not read the remainder of the release.

It was recognized, of course, that these moves in London and the United States would call for a careful consideration of the Canadian situation, and there was evidence that Canadian financial markets were in some doubt as to what would happen here. The governor and deputy governor of the Bank of Canada consulted with me several times about the situation created by the British and United States action, and late yesterday evening the bank reached a decision on the matter and made the following announcement:

The Bank of Canada announced tonight that the bank rate, which had been 4 per cent since August 1963, has been increased to 4¼ per cent effective immediately.

In announcing the change, the governor, Mr. Louis Rasminsky, said the bank wished to eliminate uncertainty in Canadian financial markets following changes in bank rates in the United Kingdom and the United States and described the new rate as one which was appropriate to the needs of the domestic Canadian economy and Canada's international financial position.

I think these various announcements speak for themselves. I do not anticipate any important outflow of capital from Canada, which was the subject of my hon. friend's question, and I think perhaps the matter should be left at that.

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): As a supplementary question, was the move taken yesterday by the Bank of Canada to increase the bank rate designed to increase the inflow of United States capital to this country?

Mr. Gordon: No, Mr. Speaker, it was done in the context of the changes to which I have been referring.

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): As a supplementary question, in view of this situation in the international monetary market, in view of the fact that the Canadian dollar is, as the minister will agree, in an entirely different position from the U.S. dollar and sterling, have the minister and his advisers considered the possibility of releasing the Canadian dollar from the pegged rate and adopting either the free floating rate or a wider range of possible fluctuation?

Mr. Gordon: No, Mr. Speaker. The government's policy on this matter is well known, and there has been and will be no change in it.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): As a further supplementary question, does the minister consider this policy will be maintained even if the upward pressure on the Canadian dollar, which has been evinced in the U.S. market, continues?

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Speaker, this question was, of course, taken into account when the decision was taken to increase the Canadian bank rate by one quarter of one per cent, despite the fact that the rate in the United States had been increased by one half of one per cent.

PRIVILEGE

MR. CHOQUETTE—CLARIFICATION OF REMARKS IN DEBATE

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege. Yesterday, as reported on page 10410 of *Hansard,* I put the following question to the hon. member for Lapointe:

Does the hon. member feel that it is a more serious matter to accept contributions from the S.I.U. than to work for Jos. Bégin who is a notorious criminal and who has been charged before the courts?

I recognize that I have expressed myself more strongly than I intended to because Mr. Jos. Bégin is not a notorious criminal. What I intended to say is that criminal charges have been laid against him, that they are before the courts and that the hon. member for Lapointe worked for this man for $50 a week.

[*Text*]

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

1. Grant in respect of the net operating amount required to discharge the responsibilities of the national broadcasting service, $85,900,000.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, mindful of the fact that we have many departmental estimates to pass in a short number of days my few remarks will be fewer than usual. I am sorry my colleague from Digby-Annapolis-Kings is not able to be here, though I do not suggest I am continuing his remarks. He has enough problems to deal with without bearing the responsibility for anything I might say.

The impressive statement of the minister on Friday, November 13, indicating it is not such an unlucky day as some may think, was

full and interesting, and I was impressed at the emphasis he put upon what he chose to call the spiritual side of our Canadian life. We should remind ourselves that for a nation, as for an individual, life is more than meat, and the body more than raiment. While we all know that in our time life is becoming easier, it is our responsibility to give leadership in fields other than material. He said our cultural life was anaemic. Perhaps it is; but I am optimistic enough to believe that it is viable, that after an assiduous search for our identity we have found one. Now it is up to us to nurture and nourish our cultural development.

Much of what the minister said the other day was not new. Much was a recapitulation of plans and projects which have been under consideration or in progress for years. A good deal of it was of a very general nature. Despite this, however, his statement was important, useful and on the whole encouraging, and I congratulate him upon it.

I should like to make a few brief comments on one or two of the subjects he dealt with. I do not intend to spend any time on the affairs of the C.B.C., because on interim supply many of us made our comments with regard to that important body. Had the estimates come before us earlier we would have made them in connection with those estimates. I do hope that at another session of this parliament, if there is one, we may all have an opportunity to deal with this vital subject in a period of time commensurate with its interest and importance.

In the first place, I think putting all the cultural agencies under one roof, as the minister describes it, constitutes a good and useful step. I should like to advocate strongly the establishment of a standing committee on cultural matters. I believe much would come from the establishment of such a body. Third, I believe, and I hope the minister believes, that we Canadians must devote far more of our budget to cultural matters. The minister, with all these agencies under his umbrella, has a tremendous opportunity and an immense responsibility. Fourth, I believe far more use could and should be made of the queen's printer, or perhaps of the queen's publisher, to popularize the cultural activities and aims of our nation.

I believe too that larger budgets and greater programming autonomy should be provided for agencies such as the archives and the others the hon. gentleman mentioned in the latter part of his statement. I only wish I had more time in which to discuss the public archives, which is the institution I know so very well, but I can pay a tribute here to the wonderful effort which has been made in recent years in encouraging historical research and revitalizing our interest in our past. Sixth, I should like to endorse the intention to proceed with consideration of the establishment of a national research centre for the humanities and the social sciences. I believe this is a most commendable and worth-while field of study. We have the national research council as a splendid example of what the government can do in this area of science. Surely in the social science realm the need is even greater.

With my seventh point my sermonette is at an end. In the words of a great man whose death we mourned and recalled just the other day, a nation is judged not only by the men it produces but by the men it honours. This brings me to a subject I have often raised in this parliament; the failure of Canadians and, I believe, of this government to give proper attention to our history and to the great men of our past. We are heading toward the sesqui-centennial of the birth of our greatest founding father, Sir John A. Macdonald. This event takes place on January 11. We are looking forward to celebrating the centenary of confederation in 1967. Let us take the first step in 1965 by celebrating in a full and fitting way the birth of the leading figure in the confederation movement whose centennial we will soon be marking.

I invite the minister to stimulate the interdepartmental committee which he said the other day has been established. In the process he might get somebody to provide an answer to the very simple question I placed on the order paper on August 18, namely whether the government had any plans—whether it was consulting with the government of Ontario, the city of Kingston, and so on—for participation in ceremonies honouring the anniversary of the birth of our first prime minister. Perhaps he could approach his colleague the Postmaster General about the issue of a commemorative stamp, the first of a series, it may be hoped, by means of which we could honour many men, including George Brown, D'Arcy McGee and others for whom appropriate celebration dates will be arising soon.

As far as I know nothing has been arranged except a dinner at Kingston to honour the birthday of Sir John A. Macdonald. I think the centennial committee is playing some part in that celebration. Perhaps the minister, if

he cannot get me an answer to my question, might get me a ticket to the dinner. This is something on which I would commend him most heartily; but surely the government, this parliament, which itself in such an impressive way commemorates Sir John A. Macdonald, should be giving a lead. Part of our trouble is that we are always so reluctant to enthuse or emote about the things which have made this Canada a good and worthy country.

Regretting that I have not time to say a great deal more, I wish the minister well in his efforts. I think he is a good minister. I hope I will be able to say this with greater enthusiasm as he produces more. In this connection I would urge him to keep in mind this need to pay tribute to our great men and honour our national founders. Let him give leadership in this regard. I shall be interested in what happens on January 11, and I shall expect to see his hand there in celebrations worthy of the man and worthy of our country.

Mr. Fisher: Many hon. members have taken advantage of this opportunity to comment on the affairs of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I intend to devote most of my remarks to the activities of the national film board.

First of all, though, I should like to say a word about the minister himself. I had intended to congratulate him on being the man from the Pearson team chosen to drag the wagon of culture. Someone behind the curtain remarked that we should be no longer speaking of "the Pearson team" but of "the Pearson gang". I do not know how the hon. gentleman would fit in with the gang.

I am pleased that he has this job and I hope he will be able to move quickly beyond the statement of policy he presented when the estimates were first brought before the committee. I notice that most people seem to think this statement was a good start, but there have been suggestions that it represented a hazy start. One of the drawbacks is the great hesitancy on the part of the people of Canada to consider a minister of culture. It seems too highfallutin', too fancy, too eggheadish, too corny, even, for Canadians. Nevertheless, in effect that is what the minister is, and the sooner the government sets out to give weight to the whole concept the better it will be.

The C.B.C. has been much in the news lately, largely because of programming. There has been a great deal of discussion in this house about the relationship between parliament and the corporation. We are waiting, as we usually are for some reason or other in connection with the C.B.C. and broadcasting matters generally, for a report, in this case the Fowler committee report. One of the gaps in our thinking as politicians is our inability to come to grips with the whole question of the grey areas of the relationship between the crown corporations and the government. I was reading J. K. Galbraith's analysis the other day of what a public corporation should be and his whole point was that it had to be completely clear of intervention and interference so far as its administration is concerned. But the important thing was to have the objectives of a public corporation open for discussion and perfectly clear, and it seems to me that this is the predicament of the C.B.C. at the present time.

The objectives of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation are no longer clear, and it seems to me they have been changed partly because of a hardening of the arteries within the C.B.C., which is now a middle aged and rather frumpy institution which has lost a great deal of its zest. Also private industry and the opportunity of watching United States programs has pretty well changed its objectives and indicates one of the main theses supporting the tremendous amount of money which is given to the C.B.C.

The whole concept of the C.B.C. has been that it provided the main bones of the broadcasting service in Canada. The plain fact of the matter is that it now no longer does this. It shares it with the private stations in both radio and television and it shares it also with the 60 to 75 per cent of the people of this country who are able to watch United States programs on television. This it seems to me, has really been the cause of the questions raised in many minds about the scale of financial support which the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation gets.

This support has increased tremendously. If you go back to about 1945 or 1946 I believe it had a budget of $5 million or so. Now the budget is more than 20 times that, and the scale of contributions from general revenue is up over the $70 million mark. The situation has changed and the C.B.C. is no longer the main agency through which the majority of people get their radio and television. As a matter of fact radio is now a very minor element, not a major element, in terms of listening hours put in by Canadians. Television seems to get its major audience in most places where the audience is split or the program competes for an audience, or

shares an audience with United States or other Canadian stations. I do want to suggest that this means that we should consider drastically altering our policy with regard to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, but it seems to me it is because of these changes that people are expressing increasing doubt about the scale of the moneys provided the C.B.C. and the kind of programming it does.

Dr. Stewart of the board of broadcast governors has expressed a view about future broadcasting policy which suggests we have two competing systems in this country, particularly as far as television is concerned, the C.B.C. and private television. He sees them in a sense side by side and offering an alternative, something like that the C.P.R. and the C.N.R. offer in transportation. I suggest it would be very much like the C.N. and the C.P.R. in the sense that they are multipurpose, grab bag transportation systems, with no real difference except that one is promoted and supported in the main by the public treasury and the other is supported by normal revenue.

It seems to me that the question with which we should concern ourselves is whether this distinction is enough. We have all heard the blandness of Mr. Ouimet and Mr. Fraser before our committee in connection with mixed programming and balanced programming. But I think it is here that we need to take a really close look. Is it proper that sums on the scale of $70 million a year should be devoted to seeing that we have one national system and one national type of programming that includes the whole range, offering from soup to nuts to junk, if you want, through to the very best things which the C.B.C. does, it seems to me, incomparably better than any other broadcasting unit in the world? I think we should consider this point in defining any new objectives.

I must express some very serious doubt about the opinions expressed by private broadcasters. I spent most of last night trying to wade through that long report of Don Jamieson, head of the private broadcasters, which runs to 70 pages odd, and I could come to no other conclusion than that the private broadcasters were completely selfish. It seems to me that no consideration is being given to future policy. I assume it will be funnelled to the government and will then be out in the open, but I think the government should be very sceptical of any ideals which are preached by these people. I was especially drawn to this conclusion because repeatedly, I would say 60 times throughout that paper, Mr. Jamieson exalts parliament—that parliament should decide, that parliament should express its opinion, that parliament should be the agency here. This is a misconception or is a wrong idea of parliament. I know Mr. Jamieson is not a fool, and I can only feel that in a sense this was an appeal to a sort of higher authority. We all know parliament is not a unit; but in developing any new policy as far as broadcasting is concerned, whatever those of us in the opposition contribute to broadcasting, the initiative in setting out the goals of broadcasting in this country must come from the government. There is no way out of that, and it seems to me that in this sense the private broadcasting interest, through Mr. Jamieson, were appealing in general to parliament, which in some ways is the wrong place altogether. Perhaps they should appeal to the party leaders or to the parties themselves in developing their programs.

This may seem like a "picky" point but if we are not sure where the C.B.C. is going or what kind of broadcasting policy we should have I do not think we improve the situation by general debates here which tend to zero in and concentrate on the C.B.C. and not nearly enough on broadcasting as a whole, on what I consider drastic failures of the B.B.G. and of the private television industry, particularly in living up to all the promises they made to the public and to the B.B.G. in obtaining their licences.

One point raised by Mr. Jamieson which it seems to me should be looked at at once is the question of Canadian content. He makes the point better than anyone else that this is too loose a classification, that if you want Canadian content you had better get some kind of incentive formula in your policy to distinguish between the fact that it costs a great deal more money and takes more talent to put on a live drama production than it takes to put on a bunch of western singers, and so on. I think he had the best argument I have ever heard on this question. If we are going to have a Canadian content requirement, which seems to me does serve a purpose in a minor way, then our programming should be readjusted very quickly.

I suppose the minister might say that this is a matter for the B.B.G. Many of us have felt that the B.B.G. has developed over a much longer period of time something similar to that developed by the board of transport commissioners. The B.B.G. were given immense powers initially but have gradually

drifted on, in the turn of events, to being a very cloistered, narrow, regulatory agency concerned with safety, with reviewing the regulations and taking very little initiative in the field of promoting and developing the policies and concepts we want in broadcasting.

Turning now to the national film board, Mr. Chairman, about two months ago I sent a letter in these words to the minister:

This letter is a request that the national film board come before a committee of the House of Commons, the committee to have terms of reference which would enable it to examine the policy of the board, the way it is being carried out, and the possibility of developing or altering the present policy in order to clarify what the objectives of the board should be.

What right have I to make this request? Aside from my responsibility as a member of parliament I am much concerned at the nature of the present work of the board. I have other contacts which are not directly related to my work as a member. My argument which follows is not based on any wish to embarrass or to harass or to destroy the board.

I have been both a librarian and teacher and through this work I know many people who are active in the distribution and showing of films in small towns and cities in Ontario. I have made much use of national film board films myself since I tour my constituency with a projector and films at least twice a year giving showings to classes in schools and to adult groups such as unions and co-ops. Last winter I began to get irritated over the dearth of good, recent documentaries for showing to such groups so I began to inquire among my librarian friends. There is no question that the backbone of distribution and showing of national film board films in Canada is provided by film councils and public libraries. Let me quote from a statement in the November bulletin of last year, put out by the Ontario association of film councils.

"Film councils did not appear by spontaneous generation. They grew from seeds sown by thoughtful and farsighted people in the national film board. They became part of a phenomenon in communications and adult education that attracted the attention of people in this field throughout the world. This happened over a space of 15 years. But those years are past. Are film councils obsolescent?

"In the beginning, many councils offered a service which could not or would not be offered by the public library, the logical agency. This has changed. In most places, the public library has shouldered this responsibility. In addition, the spread of television has altered the pattern of needs.

"Many film councils have withered and disappeared. Others suffer hardening of the arteries. Some councils continue on momentum picked up long ago. Often, the people who were the backbone of the film councils are still active, but lonely.

"Momentum, too, seems to describe the current policy of the national film board towards community distribution. Six or seven years ago there was a ferment of national film board activity—research into effective utilization, missionary work to spread the word, visits of distribution executives from Montreal to assess the needs at the grass roots. What is there now?—a quiet routine of issues, promotion sheets, loans, and sales. Are the remaining rural circuits getting top issues? We think not.

"Polite voices will doubtless arise to reassure us that our intuitions stray, that the shadow is but a mote in our eye. Do not imagine that we question the dedication of many national film board field reps, executives and production men who see the non-theatrical field as the number one of national film board. We know these people are still with national film board and still with us, but they are living in a different climate.

"The national film board quite rightly exploits more than one way of reaching Canadians, through t.v., theatres and exhibits at the Canadian national exhibition. If the policy makers of the board have concluded that this is where stress should be placed, then the volunteers in film councils should be given some inkling. We realize it is impossibly awkward for a government agency to come out and say 'Thanks for your help in the past, but we don't need you any more', but the gradual ebb of interest in community distribution is disappointing to volunteers and must be frustrating to national film board employees who have the responsibility for dealing with we volunteers, a demanding exercise in diplomacy. Without imaginative initiative from the national film board, the film council and the whooping crane will shortly share the same niche in the Canadian scene".

This is rather indirect criticism but I read it from my inquiries, as a charge that a concentration on theatrical and television and experimental film has left in last place the kind of films which made the national film board's reputation and give it the status in the country on which it rests at present.

Teachers and librarians and program chairmen for organizations in the adult education field tell me that fewer and fewer documentaries which handle social and economic problems are being produced. Since we are now at a stage where a new policy on feature films has been enunciated, shortly after a year in which the national film board has gotten into the feature film field, I think we need a review of the national film board policy and a clarification of it. The urgency of this is enhanced in my mind by the stories that come to me of the widening split amongst the board people in Montreal between the French and English sections. When I see remarks in the press where the head of the board waxes lyrical on his great friendship with the minister responsible for the board or statements by a national film board director such as Don Owen (Montreal *Star*, August 11, 1964) that his original assignment to a short documentary "Just grew. I was away from the film board (which has headquarters in Montreal) and they couldn't touch me." ... "They didn't know about it until it was all shot."

Then I am led to wonder what is going on with the national film board.

I think the following questions need to be examined:

1. How much of the board's funds and creative workers are producing documentaries for non-theatrical and non-t.v. distribution?

2. What sort of "mix" in work variety is necessary to keep directors and producers happy and zealous?

3. Is there anything to the contention I and others make that any concentration of resources on making films for t.v. does produce the kind

of film with topical and ephemeral characteristics which makes it less valuable for ordinary non-theatrical showing?

4. What is the "entertainment" concept of national film board policy? Is it primary? If not, is there a trend in film making that way which is overlooking or forgetting the production of films whose subject matter has content that is significant, relevant to important topics, and full of information? Has the glamour of cinema and t.v. been too attractive to national film board directors?

5. Has the board's experience with the "Drylanders" and "Nobody Waved Goodbye" been indicative of anything in what not to do in producing feature films?

6. What is the board's policy towards the field of education in the broadest sense? Perhaps "public service" should be substituted for "education"?

7. Has the board any research activity to enable them to know what the film needs are in the field of adult education?

8. What is the recruitment policy and program of the board? Does it get personnel by a regular canvass or exploitation of university graduating classes? What is the present composition of the board's creative people in terms of age, experience and training?

9. How is the production staff assigned work?

10. Has the move to Montreal led to the virtual isolation from each other of the English and French personnel of the board?

11. What duties and interests other than the national film board have been put on or accepted by the head of the board?

I sent that letter to the minister requesting the establishment of a committee. I gather that he felt it best to get the requested information from the head of the national film board, and he forwarded that letter. He did not reply to me in terms indicating that he took my request with any seriousness on his part as the minister. He did send me a reply which was prepared by Mr. Roberge.

I have discussed this personally with the minister and I do not intend to quarrel with him here, but one of my main disappointments is that when someone presents a request, with an analysis, he should reply in something other than the form of an answer from the head of a particular agency. The reason I might have expected a reply from the head of the agency is just that such would be normal; but surely if the minister is in charge of the over-all policy and its operations it is his responsibility to examine the questions put to him and make some comment.

I have heard that the head of the national film board and the minister are very close friends. Perhaps there is such a relationship between them that they speak with one voice, but I suggest to the minister that if he wants to be fair to opposition politicians he should speak or make some comment about the suggestions made.

[Mr. Fisher.]

In any event, Mr. Roberge was kind enough to send me copy of a memorandum to the Secretary of State with respect to a letter from me. This is the answer:

I regret that owing to circumstances beyond my control I have been unable to let you have earlier my comments on Mr. Fisher's letter to you dated September 10, and I trust that both the member for Port Arthur and you will not have been inconvenienced by this delay.

Then he states:

While it is not for me to say whether or not a parliamentary committee should be constituted to look into national film board matters, I do feel that a meeting with the member for Port Arthur could provide him more rapidly with the information necessary to reach a conclusion on the various points he raised, more particularly on page 4 of his letter to you. I would be quite prepared, with my colleagues in the management of the board, to go into these questions at Mr. Fisher's convenience, if he could spare a day or so for that purpose.

This invitation is all very nice, but one of the things I have learned as a politician and opposition member is that the best thing you can do is to keep away from the formal apparatus of a civil service or a department or an agency unless you are dealing with it either in a parliamentary committee or with the minister or the senior political official responsible present. By "political" I mean an elected person. I appreciate the invitation but I am not particularly interested. As a matter of fact, I have received most of the information I present as a critique from members or people who work for the national film board or have a very close relationship with it, and I would not raise these questions if I did not feel they should be considered seriously by the government, not just by the head of the national film board. But Mr. Roberge goes on:

I appreciate Mr. Fisher's interest in what we are doing and how we are going about it. We are not indifferent, I may assure you, to the concern expressed by Mr. Fisher with respect to our community operations in Canada as distinct from our other activities at home in the theatrical and television areas and our operations abroad.

Here is a lovely sentence of gobbledegook:

Considering all the factors affecting our role here and abroad, and resources are one of those factors, I sincerely believe that we have, over the years, maintained a reasonable balance.

Shades of Alphonse Ouimet. That is what Al always comes up with, this reasonable balance thing. How do you argue with it? He goes on to say:

On all fronts, the demands have been, and still are, greater than our resources.

They certainly are. If you have got a director who starts with a short and turns it into a feature film because he is away from

home base, you really have got demands on your resources. There is no question about that. He continues:

> In terms of effort and funds, community films and their distribution as a distinctive sector have not and are not receiving the "poor relation" treatment. I would say that on the production program for this current year, more than 20 new films in English and more than 10 new films in French are, in our opinion, particularly suited for community use—and this does not take into account other new films which are released first on television or in the cinemas and which then are placed in community distribution. An analysis of the current productions and of our releases in the last years would indicate that films "which handle social and economic problems" are not the exception in the board's program.

I am not going to accuse Mr. Roberge of lying because I do not think he thinks he is lying, but he is not giving a true statement of the situation as I see it. I do not know whether the minister has looked at the catalogue of films listed as available for distribution by the national film board in 1963, but I would challenge him to take a look at it, run through it and see just how old many of the basic series are. For example, the ages of the child series is seven years old, the adolescence series is seven years old, the mental mechanism series is 14 years old, the accidents do not happen series is nine years old.

And so it goes. In other words, much of the very best that has been produced by the national film board in the functional documentary area has become out of date, and anyone who has shown films eight, nine or ten years old, particularly in a field such as safety, knows just how out of date these things can become. Furthermore if they are in areas where there has been a fairly keen distribution you need a fairly large stock as well as having the older series brought up to date.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Francis): Order. The Chair does not wish to interrupt the hon. member but I understand the item before us is the vote for the C.B.C., not the national film board.

Mr. Fisher: The minister will explain.

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, when I made my general statement more than a week ago I covered the eight cultural agencies and at that time invited members of the committee to make any comments they might want to make on this so-called first item. Therefore I think the hon. member is quite in order.

Mr. Fisher: I want the minister to examine and go through the catalogue with Mr. Roberge and reassure himself with regard to whether I am wrong, because I do not believe I am. I cannot find better evidence of the national film board's feeling with regard to the production of serious, functional documentaries than the fact that so many of these films in their major series are out of date, and on top of that so comparatively few new ones are being produced.

I have here the quarterly reports of the national film board on the production of films and other visual materials for the periods ended March 31, 1964, and September 30, 1964. I have gone through these and again it is a most discouraging record if you are interested in having the kind of material you can take to groups of various kinds out in the communities, who want something serious and substantial.

I was reminded of that national film board production a couple of weeks ago, which all television reviewers thought was so beautiful, about the unmarried young lady who becomes pregnant. It is all done very delicately and the acting is very good with all the latest technique. But the only message seemed to come at the end when in a great tizzy she grabbed the telephone, called her boy friend and said, "I am going to have a baby", and then slammed down the phone. Having seen the problems of showing films to teenagers and youth groups such as the girl guides out in the communities, I can just imagine how useful this particular national film board production, with its I am going to have a baby, drop the telephone kick, is going to be when it is distributed. Yet here was a production that made use of excellent directing talent, contained some wonderful acting and I am sure involved substantial expense. It is a perfect illustration of the kind of fetish in programming that has become an obsession with many people in the national film board and with, I think, bad effect upon its primary purpose. I continue with Mr. Roberge's letter:

> We are conscious that the need is to take into account the ways in which films are actually used today and to supply films for those types of uses—films with substantial content and on subject matter of contemporary interest and value. In fact we are working along those lines—

That is good to know.

> —and, to that end, are seeking the best assistance we can find. For instance, on September 16, 17 and 18 a small conference on films was held in Saskatoon, convened by the film board and attended by senior people from the extension departments of the Universities of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

I just want to make one comment in that regard. The way Mr. Roberge puts it you would think that the film board had taken

the initiative. That is not true. That meeting was called because the extension departments of most of the universities in western Canada were fed up with the national film board and its lack of touch and lack of liaison. But the way this is put it suggests that the national film board took the initiative. Mr. Roberge goes on to say:

I am now considering proposing to the members of the board that a national committee of some kind be set up to advise us on matters pertaining to adult education. As you know, a considerable expansion is taking place in adult education and a decisive role appears to be played there by university extension. Between 1957 and 1962, enrolment in extension has almost doubled.

This is what people have been telling the national film board for a number of years, and finally it has got through. At this late date Mr. Roberge has decided that he should now consider a national committee of some kind. I should like to point out that this is typical of the fact that the national film board has been proceeding along lines that have been taking away from its primary purpose. He goes on:

For several years, a Canadian education association-national film board committee has advised us with respect to films specially intended for school use. We have followed the same pattern on the French side; a joint committee has been set up with l'association Canadienne des éducateurs de langue française.

My information on this point is that over several years this so-called committee has met no more than twice, and I have the information from one person who took part in one of the meetings that it really did not get anywhere, and it certainly has had nothing of substance to put forward.

The Chairman: May I bring to the attention of the hon. member the fact that his time has expired, unless he has leave to carry on.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Fisher: I ask for about 10 or 15 minutes. I would appreciate it very much if I were given that time. I should like to continue with Mr. Roberge's letter:

There is a greatly increased potential in community and educational films. There lies the board's traditional strength. While not detracting from our other duties, I am sure my colleagues and myself wish to emphasize and strengthen our work in these areas.

Well, where are the films? Where are these productions? There is a paragraph here concerning my local area which I will skip. I thought it a little bit of effrontery to tell me that the circulation of films is increasing there. I certainly hope it will, and there is no reason why it should go down when there is a very devoted national film board man there pushing them.

Then, he goes on:

Mr. Fisher refers to film councils and to public libraries. In that respect, I would like to state in general terms that there is throughout the country an increase in film activities conducted through public libraries. Without implying that there exists a direct relationship between them, I would also like to say that while the number of film councils has remained quite constant, we have noticed that in the changing milieu and because of changes in the audio-visual and community fields their role is being modified. In my opinon, the film councils' role will, in coming years, find in many instances a different level. However, this is a matter under review and I am not prepared to say anything too precise about it at this time.

Well again, Mr. Roberge is not very precise or he is considering something. The facts, as I understand them, are that public libraries, particularly in Ontario and the western provinces, have built up a framework that is almost fundamental for the distribution of film. The cry at the moment is not so much for a different distribution system as it is for films. They want more functional, documentary films; films with a purpose; didactic films; films that explain some of the problems of our times.

I will just finish off Mr. Roberge's letter. He says:

Before closing, I would like to put the record straight on Don Owen's statement that his film "Nobody Waved Goodbye" just grew into a feature film production without our knowing about it.

This is really entertaining.

This is the ebullient statement of a young director who did not, I can assure you, operate with the complete independence his statement quoted by Mr. Fisher does suggest. The fact that the subject of his film grew was apparent to both hs producer and management. It was a management decision to produce the film at a longer length than that first contemplated.

I am not going to ask for a committee of inquiry into something that is within this area, the running wild of a film. However, Mr. Roberge is not kidding me, and I do not think he is kidding anybody when he says that the subject of the film grew and was apparent to both his producer and management. I do not believe you get a young man making the kind of statements Mr. Owen did, not to one reporter but to several at different times, indicating that he just went to Toronto with a bunch of film, on his own, and the first thing they knew he had a feature length film without his bosses knowing. I quite appreciate Mr. Roberge feels that he has

to cover up, but I am not accepting that answer at all.

I continue to quote from the letter:

Mr. Fisher points out too "the stories that come to him of the increasing split among the board's people in Montreal between the French and English sections". In the board, as almost everywhere in Canada, this is a delicate matter.

Well, it certainly is a delicate matter.

If, in this respect, the board were to be considered the "microcosm" of Canada, I venture to say that the whole Canadian situation would, at this time, appear to be quite sound and reasonable.

Well, I agree that they are still operating in the same building and that, I suppose, is an achievement. So far as I know, that is about it, in terms of the situation with regard to language.

I should like to add that I had some anxieties last year, but considerable improvement has taken place and, if left alone, the present equilibrium will be conducive to good results and relative happiness.

That is all I am going to read from Mr. Roberge's letter. This last point, the fact that there is a split between the French and English wings of the film board in Montreal is something I am not prepared to put forward any evidence upon. All I know is that it has come to me repeatedly, and the indications are that this split is not only a language split. It is a split between producer attitudes in terms of the fact that French Canadian producers are working as a result of the stimulus of their own city and the new techniques, and have gone much farther in this new, avant garde kind of film making. It is very easy to appreciate the excitement that they are generating amongst themselves. However, I think it has tended to divorce them in their purpose from the traditional, the functional kind of production that gave the film board a name in this work.

Mr. Lamontagne: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think that in order to complete the record the hon. member should put the last short paragraph of the letter on the record.

Mr. Fisher: I will certainly do that.

Should you wish me to report in detail on all the points alluded to by Mr. Fisher, I shall endeavour to do so. Should you require further information, do not hesitate to let me know.

I did not deliberately leave it out. It was just to shorten things. I happen to feel that Mr. Roberge is a competent administrator, in his way, of the national film board. If I am pillorying him here it is only because I believe that he is befogging the purpose, what I consider to be the central purpose of the national film board, which is to produce good, functional documentaries that have a distribution out in the country beyond the theatrical and television circuits.

Mr. Simpson: Is there anything to say why they should have any place beyond television?

Mr. Fisher: The hon. member asks if there is anything to say why they should have any place beyond television. I would assume that in his own area he knows that all kinds of groups cannot get around a television set.

Mr. Simpson: No, why should there be any area beyond television?

Mr. Fisher: Now you are on a very good point. I wanted to make these points that are put together by someone who has a relationship with the national film board, but in language which I have adopted or paraphrased.

There is a distinct danger of the national film board becoming oriented predominantly to the will expressed by some of its film makers rather than to the needs of its audience. I suspect that this is revealed by the great tendency in our films for manner to prevail over matter. Reversing the healthy relationship between these elements, the preferences are for subject matters to be increasingly dictated by the purpose of the film maker to provide film adventures rather than by the demands to maintain a story relationship. Consequently the policies currently being advocated, although presented without drama and in part legitimate slogans of aesthetic national idealism are essentially offering an environment of licence for film makers.

Performance and organization: by projecting discussion of internal national film board policies into the national arena and turning them into public dialogue, is both improper and dangerous. The national film board itself is increasingly coming to be influenced by the reflections of a narrow circle of critics, cine club critics, aesthetics and process film makers rather than those average viewers who seek a film more consistent with his problems of living than with the creation of an aesthetic division that assembles around the assumption that prestige in the film world amounts automatically to widespread public approval. The national film board has been living increasingly on past capital and good will in so far as a very large section of the Canadian public are concerned. The only prestige which counts in the long run is a prestige that is inevitably Canadian and associated with a creation in

which the national film board has an important role to play. The steady distortion of the purpose by the alteration of this role could reduce the N.F.B. from its significant place in a Canadian society to that of an art factory concerned largely with its own prestige in a narrow film world, and this at a time when the real world faces us with most critical and complex problems. Already the national film board has begun to lose ground in an audience area where formerly it was successful.

Those points it seems to me, contain the guts of the criticism I have made and want to make of the national film board. I say that despite all the praise paid to the 25th anniversary of the national film board, the board is in serious difficulty in terms of its purpose, its allocation of resources and its direction.

If I had more time I would like to read other contributions. For example, I have a translation here put forward by the French association professionale de cinema which I think is very germane to the points I have raised. I know the minister has a copy and I assume he has looked at it, and later on in this debate I want to come back to this topic of the national film board.

There is a quotation from Jacques Maritain I want to read. Perhaps it is a little too arty to slip in here, but he made the point in one of his studies of philosophy that man is confronted by two separate concepts, that of artistic value which relates to his own work, and that of moral values which relate to his being a man. He says, about these two autonomous worlds, art and morality, that each is sovereign in its own field. The problem arises from the fact that these two worlds cannot ignore and disregard each other, for man belongs in them both as an intellectual maker and a moral agent. Therefore since an artist is a man before being an artist and is not an abstract impersonation of art coming down from an Appollonian separate heaven, the autonomous world of reality is superior to the autonomous world of art. "There is no law against the law on which the destiny of man depends."

That may seem somewhat remote but the point I want to make is that art for art's sake which has seized the new avante garde, the new wave dominating the national film board, has lost sight of the great morale and purpose which the national film board had with Grierson. I say that the statistics of production, the catalogues of the national film board prove it is falling behind in its original, major purpose and so far as I am concerned as a member of parliament that is the purpose I want the national film board to keep in mind and in focus, rather than feeling it is becoming a centre for producing such artistic, lovely things, like that half hour which it produced for the C.B.C. a few weeks ago in which the only message I could see was that if you are unmarried and you are going to have a baby you ought to tell your boy friend.

That does not seem to be the proper sort of message for the national film board. It may be very suitable for the C.B.C., but my point is that the national film board using art can do moral work and contribute to education, and should not be using art just for art's sake.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the estimates of the Secretary of State, I think that we can discuss to a certain extent the estimates of the C.B.C.

The other day, we raised questions about which the minister told us: "When my estimates are discussed, you will have the opportunity to call my attention to those questions and deal with the C.B.C. estimates".

Mr. Chairman, I have been for some time the target of rather vicious attacks on the part of some people in the C.B.C. because I stated in this house and called the attention of the minister to the fact that there were in the C.B.C. people with a socialist and communist tendency who forced certain programs upon us. I said that we ought to be given the names of those responsible for those programs, but we never could obtain anything from the Secretary of State because, we are told, it is not in the public interest to reveal the names of a particular producer or organizer, of a particular man or woman in charge of particular programs.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, it is necessary to have in the C.B.C. competent and experienced directors, people who are knowledgeable as far as radio and television are concerned, people who know where they are going and also what programs are likely to inform the public and improve the national culture in the French field.

I feel that this crown corporation lacks a general philosophy, a specific objective. They do not really know where they are going, but they ask us nevertheless to approve estimates to the amount of $85,900,000, an increase of $8 million over last year.

There has been practically no improvement in the programming and we still get rehash and programs which are not likely to raise the level of French Canadian culture.

I gave as an example of recent discrimination in the C.B.C. an editorial by Lorenzo Paré, editor in chief of the Quebec city newspaper *L'Action* which the Secretary of State knows perfectly well. Entitled "In the cauldron of the witch of duty", the article read as follows:

On the occasion of the Queen's visit to Canada, *L'Action* published an editorial stating the reasons why we felt the Queen deserved a warm welcome in Quebec. The local officials of the C.B.C.—

Those in Quebec city.

—asked us if we were willing to repeat the same opinions on the national television network. It was necessary to get the approval of the Montreal office, which refused that plea for the Queen, saying that the C.B.C. avoided "controversial matters".

I asked the minister then to tell us who was responsible for that explanation given by the Montreal office of the C.B.C. to Lorenzo Paré who had been duly invited by the C.B.C. officials in Quebec city.

Now, in that same telephone conversation, turning down comments on the forthcoming visit of the Queen, the C.B.C. offered us, from Montreal—

—not from Quebec city this time, but from Montreal—

—to participate in a televised interview of Mr. Jacques Berque—

—which I quoted to the house the other day—

—who advocates Quebec separatism as a "preliminary step" to the success, in our province, of marxist revolution.

For a small C.B.C. gang in Montreal, the visit of the Queen to Quebec city was "too much a controversial subject"; however, the separatist and communist revolution was not. Mr. Berque's interview was taped at the Palais Montcalm last October 2nd.

A little over a month ago, Mr. Paré gives us the pedigree of Mr. Berque:

Who is Jacques Berque? A strange individual from France. He came here on three separate occasions in less than two years; on one of those occasions he stayed one month. A "decolonization" expert, he comes over here to "sell" the blood and bomb Algerian recipe to French Canadians. He is the one who wrote, in between two trips to Montreal, that "Quebec will shortly become a gigantic Cuba".

So that was not a controversial subject in the eyes of the C.B.C. in Montreal.

In passing, who in Montreal decided to invite Jacques Berque? Are those in charge of the C.B.C. in Montreal competent or incompetent, experienced or inexperienced? They are the ones who must shoulder the responsibility.

And I continue to quote:

The high priest whose dictums appear almost word for word in the communist manifesto of *Parti Pris* and the speaker provided to address the students of Montreal University.

This same Jacques Berque, who was invited by the C.B.C. and highly lauded in *Le Devoir*, in an article signed by Jean-Marc Léger, another one who has communistic tendencies, wrote the following concerning the rebels in Quebec:

The political independence would only be a preamble—

—A preamble, that is exactly what we are saying—

Economic structure, social justice alone can support it. Whatever conflict in a free Quebec may oppose the partisans of unbelief to the believers, capitalism to revolution, this conflict, and therefore its declaration, rely upon independence.

At least, that is what has happened in the rest of the world.

Recently, I dealt with those problems in Quebec city, the old city of Champlain, where some 20 or 30 separatists yelled in favour of a free Quebec.

The free Quebec, the free Canada or the free province which we are offered consists in preventing others from holding different opinions than ours.

That is the way they operate or attempt to operate in the province of Quebec. Those are the people who have priority within the C.B.C.

Why is it, for instance, that during Her Majesty's visit, the C.B.C., in its national news broadcast, gave more importance to the incidents which occurred in front of the Quebec city hall than to the person of the Queen or to the parade of the 22nd Regiment?

Mr. Chairman, I was called a monarchist in Quebec city. I am not a monarchist, but there is a difference between a monarchist and a rascal. One may be polite, even in the province of Quebec, and if we are a civilized nation, if we sincerely believe that we are civilized, we did not show it by the way we acted in the city of Quebec a short time ago.

But the C.B.C. is greatly responsible for this conduct, because for many months it gave priority or granted a capital importance to those actions or to the terrorism which occurred for a while in the province of Quebec. The C.B.C. went out of its way to give publicity to Quebec separatist extremists, to the French lay movement and to communists.

As I said the other day, as soon as Michel Chartrand came back from Cuba where he had spent a month with some 30 or 40 students, the corporation asked him to give his impressions of that country.

That is how we heard Mr. Chartrand state on the national television network that Cuba has become a paradise since Castro took over and that the only thing missing there, since the advent of communism, is American soap and toilet paper.

That is the kind of program we get from the crown corporation which costs the Canadian people $86 million a year, at least this year.

The day after I made those statements in the house, the C.B.C. asked me to participate in Mrs. Michèle Tisseyre's program "Aujourd'hui". I was to have a discussion with Mrs. Jean Desprez, a commentator who writes a certain lonely hearts column and who can handle the heart problems of others much better than her own.

Consequently, I went to the C.B.C. studios to hear an employee or rather a person who has been doing free-lance work for the corporation for the past 27 or 28 years, that is since the C.B.C. was set up.

The next day or the day after, the lady took it upon herself to haul me over the coals on the pretext that I did not permit her to answer or express her opinion.

Here, on two pages, in a letter in two parts published in a Montreal newspaper, she repeats about exactly what she said on the C.B.C. She wrote:

I knew you were not very polite with those with whom you are conversing—

Mr. Choquette: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The television debate between Mrs. Jean Desprez and the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) may very well have been most interesting, but it has nothing to do with the departmental estimates now before us. Nobody cares who won the debate. What we want to know is what reforms the federal government can look forward to with regard to the C.B.C.

Mr. Caouette: Why cannot the hon. member for Lotbinière mind his own business and realize that Mrs. Jean Desprez is getting a good share of the $86 million the federal government is called upon to grant the C.B.C., inasmuch as she is working steadily, 12 months a year, free-lance. Therefore, the interventions of the hon. member for Lotbinière are unwarranted and I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to keep him in his seat, so he will not stick his nose into things which do not concern him.

The debate which took place between Mrs. Jean Desprez and the hon. member for Villeneuve dealt with the C.B.C. and the nonentities, failures and incompetent people found among its staff, as Jean Desprez formally stated before the whole French Canadian public. That was the subject of our discussion. So I ask the minister to name the persons responsible for C.B.C. programming.

The Canadian people are not against bearing the cost of programs that make sense, but when it comes to having one's mind poisoned, there is a limit. Mrs. Jean Desprez herself said she knew people at the C.B.C. who were nothing but dead wood, nonentities, nincompoops and lazybones, not people like the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette).

An hon. Member: The hon. member for Lotbinière is a hard worker.

Mr. Caouette: That is what I have just said, Mr. Chairman.

Why does the minister not give us the information we are asking for? When Mrs. Jean Desprez writes the following in her letter:

Well, go ahead. We will have a good laugh, gentlemen from Ottawa.

She no longer attacks a small group, she tackles the whole parliament in Ottawa.

Go ahead.

At the end of her letter she says:

If Messrs. Alphonse Ouimet, or Marcel Ouimet, or my immediate department heads in Montreal asked me what I think of it, it would be my duty to answer them. But you—

Speaking of me.

—you do not really think that I would put arms into your hands—

Here is a woman paid by the C.B.C. who would refuse to provide any member of parliament with the names of those who are nincompoops, dead wood, nonentities, incompetents, lazybones in the C.B.C. This is the common sense of Mrs. Jean Desprez.

After saying I had not given her any time to speak, all the letters I received the next day were to the effect that all the guests of Jean Desprez in any program on the radio or on t.v., complained that they had not been given any time to say anything, that she had been the only one to speak, and this is what everybody says. All the letters I had received accuse Mrs. Jean Desprez of being haughty and probably one of the nonentities in the C.B.C.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask you for a ruling. Are we going to hear about Mrs. Jean Desprez all afternoon? We want to know if there are reforms to be

suggested in connection with C.B.C. expenditures. It is suggested that Mrs. Jean Desprez be fired? What was said on the following day, the comments on the debate, are of no interest to the public.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Lotbinière has again stuck his foot in it. I have been speaking precisely about the expenditures on such people as Mrs. Jean Desprez who spent their time broadcasting twaddle, who while paid by the C.B.C. refuse to give us names other than those of Messrs. Alphonse and Marcel Ouimet or their immediate employers whom we do not even know.

We ask the minister who was responsible for inviting Mrs. Jean Desprez, or, for instance, who is her immediate boss? Who is Michel Chartrand's employer? Who does the inviting for the C.B.C.? Who invites—?

Mr. Choquette: It is the producer.

Mr. Caouette: Who is he?

Mr. Choquette: All you had to do was to look it up, it was indicated on the screen.

Mr. Caouette: So that is it. The producer has absolutely nothing to do with it, he is a public servant.

That is what we are trying to find out from the minister. Who is responsible for the programming? Who decides to invite Michel Chartrand and Jacques Berque?

Mr. Choquette: How do you know it is not the producer?

Mr. Caouette: We know that he is not the one.

Mr. Choquette: Upon what grounds do you base your arguments?

Mr. Caouette: Who invited Jacques Berque to appear on the C.B.C. network? The hon. member for Lotbinière does not understand anything about that, as usual.

Mr. Choquette: It is the producer.

Mr. Caouette: The producer. They are hiding behind the producer who is being paid by the C.B.C.; he, on the other hand, is not afraid to be in the forefront. The same thing happened when it was said in the house that certain C.B.C. officials were communist, socialist, communist or socialist propagandists.

Mr. Choquette: Would the hon. member allow me to ask a question?

Mr. Caouette: Certainly.

Mr. Choquette: When you were invited, who asked you? Who was responsible?

Mr. Caouette: It was Mrs. Michèle Tisseyre's program "Aujourd'hui".

Mr. Choquette: Who called you?

Mr. Caouette: Mrs. Michèle Tisseyre's representative. I have his name; but what is the other's name? That is what I want to know.

Mr. Choquette: Ask the person who invited you; there is no problem there.

Mr. Caouette: It is not the same person.

An hon. Member: He wants to get free advertising.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, it is not the same person, for one thing, but what I want to know and what I have requested from the minister for a long time, is who is responsible for the invitations that are sent out? This is what we want to know.

Much was made of the statement that there were some communists, socialists, and sympathizers of both groups, in the C.B.C. As a matter of fact, some performers called us up to tell us they were branded as communists since this statement was made in the House of Commons. I could name several of those who called me; and yet, when we spoke of the C.B.C. management, we mentioned no performers, because we feel they are doing their duty. But as far as the management of this crown corporation is concerned, it is a different thing, because while the performers have nothing to do or say, they also receive some fees out of these $86 million. But they are not responsible for the administration of the C.B.C. and the television services.

We maintain that improvements should be made in the C.B.C. We maintain that this corporation costs too much money. At least, if the C.B.C. costs $86 million to the taxpayers, it should give to the Canadian people programs that are worth that amount.

They should cease broadcasting programs with a subversive or clearly communistic tendency.

They should cease inviting Europeans or Asians as soon as they arrive in Canada in order to praise what is going on behind the iron curtain or in the countries under communist domination. As a matter of fact, if these countries enjoy material advantages, it is always to the detriment of personal freedom.

When I talked to people who were opposed to what we want in our country, that is a public corporation where everybody could

express his opinions, while respecting other people's freedom, they answered that there was freedom in communist countries.

When we attend meetings like the one held by the attorney general of the province of Quebec, we are heckled by a bunch of separatists, of socialists or of extremist separatists who prevent people from speaking. Those people do not know or they forget that if they acted in the same way in Cuba or elsewhere, they would be shot forthwith; they are also unaware of the fact that if they intervened in the midst of a Castro gathering or if they did the same in Russia, they would be shot down without further ado.

Do we want the same thing to happen in Canada? The C.B.C. must play a part in this field; they must provide information; they must work for the education not only of mature people in Canada, but of the growing generation as well.

A well known artist stated recently in Ottawa that we are lazy, that we do not know how to assume our responsibilities. He was right up to a point.

Here in Ottawa we also have responsibilities and if the C.B.C. comes under the federal parliament, the time has come for the latter to assume its responsibilities and to suggest, even order the C.B.C. to show educational programs, programs which will help to educate our young people, to inform the public, instead of going about aimlessly, failing to give anyone a sense of direction.

Young people expect a lot from us and we can, through the state radio network, if we face up to our responsibilities, direct our young people with regard to their own future and the future of Canada. In fact, it is not so much for our future that we are working now, it is not so much for the future of a member of parliament or a political group, but rather for that of our young people.

We are heads of families; we have young people to look after and if we do not see to their education now, if we do not show them some leadership and give them confidence in the future of their country, in their own future or that of their families, we will lose fateful years in the House of Commons. It is to give leadership to the whole country that I tell the Secretary of State that the time has come to probe into the affairs of the C.B.C.

Why should we be ignored or told to keep quiet by officials of the C.B.C., which spends $86 million a year. The Canadian taxpayers are providing these fantastic amounts, and it is high time that the C.B.C. should be asked to direct its programming toward the education of our young people, and to give satisfaction and leadership to the Canadian people at large.

[Mr. Caouette.]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, do not worry, I shall not start a virulent discusion with the hon. member for Villeneuve. On the contrary, I shall discuss the problem from another angle, because this is a thing which comes back every year, more particularly on the estimates of the Secretary of State.

With regard to the C.B.C., and briefly to sum up my way of thinking, it should simply be said, repeated and reiterated that we want a French radio and television network in Canada. This is obviously a very serious claim, which it may be difficult to answer in practice, but if the existence of the French fact from sea to sea is to be recognized, as well as a policy promoting French culture throughout this country, instead of a policy tending to limit the existence or the spreading of that culture to a single province, then, I would say that the federal government has a primary responsibility to assume, and that television is doubtlessly one of the most powerful media available in this respect. On this point, I support the hon. member for Villeneuve's contention, when he says that television can deeply influence the education of the younger generation, which is now growing up. The hon. member is perfectly right and it is just because this medium is available to the federal government that the latter should assume its responsibilities, if not right now, at least in the near future, and promote a French radio and television network of national scope, reaching from sea to sea.

To my mind, the matter should be examined by a committee, either a committee on radio and television, or a special committee, which would consider the possibility of carrying out this project.

It would also be of interest to have the opinion of the English speaking members on this matter, in order to see whether, though not daring to oppose it for political reasons—deep down in their hearts, they consider such a request sheer nonsense.

It would be interesting to know what they think, because we firmly believe that French culture should spread throughout Canada and that the best way to do this, in short the most powerful means to attain such an end is precisely through publicity over the radio and on television so that such a culture could expand not only in Quebec but throughout Canada.

That is why, this year, as in future years, I shall continue to demand the establishment of a French radio and television network in Canada, and I think I have the support of the French Speaking members of parliament in this respect.

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Chairman, as we are considering the estimates of the Secretary of State, I should like to take this opportunity to talk about the national film board and the C.B.C.

With regard to the national film board, everything of course is not perfect, but I want to pay tribute to its personnel for the very good work they have done and I am convinced that, if the government decided to increase from $6.1 million to $10 million the estimates of that agency, the board could extend its activities and also make a contribution to our Canadian culture.

There is in Joliette an office of the national film board. The manager, Mr. Marier, is well qualified but unfortunately even though he does his best, he lacks the necessary funds to expand his office which deals with an important part of the province of Quebec.

I urge the minister to see to it that the national film board not only get its estimates increased, even up to $10 million as I have suggested, but that a more substantial amount of money be provided for the Joliette office which covers an important part of the province of Quebec.

Mr. Chairman, as for C.B.C. we have heard rather sharp criticisms by members from both sides of the house.

Every time the C.B.C. estimates are before the house there is a row. Criticisms and even charges are made. It seems that there is some uneasiness among the members, even general dissatisfaction with regard to the activities of the C.B.C.

It is difficult for everything to run smoothly of course within an agency whose budget reaches the $88 million mark, the operating expenses of the international broadcasting service included.

But if there are faults with the C.B.C., there is also some good, and we must say that the corporation contributed to national unity and rendered tremendous services.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, in view of the attacks made by hon. members on both sides of the house, from every political group, no matter what government is in office, it seems that some action must be taken. I think it would certainly enhance the prestige of the C.B.C. if a royal commission were instituted to look into all the activities of that corporation with an $88 million budget; it would also be a service to the taxpayers. National organizations, English or French, could present their briefs and make appropriate recommendations, and the C.B.C. would certainly come out of it a better agency, thanks to the constructive suggestions that would be made.

As far as the French network is concerned, I know that the great majority of the members of the House of Commons have only one hope, and it is that the network will develop from sea to sea. I wonder whether it would not be possible to increase the budget even up to $100 million so that the additional $12 million could be spent every year to develop the French network from sea to sea, wherever there are substantial French speaking minority groups.

Mr. Chairman, I should also like to ask the minister whether, under the constitution, censorship is a provincial responsibility or whether the federal government could have its own censorship as far as the C.B.C. is concerned. I know that there is a conflict on that matter with the provinces, and I wonder whether it would not be possible to leave the censorship of programs and movies to the provinces who already have a special board of their own for that purpose.

In closing, I suggest that it is in the public interest that a royal commission be set up by the government in order to examine all aspects of the operations of the C.B.C. I am convinced that if the government were to decide upon such action, it would have the support of the great majority of the Canadian people who have serious grievances against our national network.

I must also mention that some private television stations are abusing their liberty. I think private stations lack firmness and discipline. The act should be amended if necessary in order that the B.B.G. or any other body may have some control over the operation of private radio and television stations.

Mr. Chairman, I make those remarks without any ulterior motive. I make them because all hon. members often receive letters protesting against certain programs televised over the national network. I believe a national investigation is necessary to go into all aspects of the operation of the C.B.C. whose stature would be enhanced by such a move. And we would probably also save several million dollars.

[*Text*]

Mr. Simpson: Mr. Chairman, I have one or two questions I should like to direct to the Secretary of State while we are dealing with this particular item. I feel quite sure that when I have put them to him he will agree with me that they are of tremendous importance to a great number of people.

On many occasions in the past when we have been dealing with the estimates of the C.B.C. I have limited my remarks specifically to the important question of the extension of services. Not too long ago, on October 27, I had the opportunity to put on the record many of the views of the people of northern Manitoba and many of my own views with respect to our feeling that the C.B.C. has been moving at too slow a pace in this regard.

We all realize that the corporation is trying to develop the national service as quickly as possible, as it says, and that it takes money to do so. But as I have mentioned before we are being asked to approve expenditures in excess of $85 million under this particular item, and the C.B.C. has finally told us approximately what it is going to cost to complete the provision of service to all of the people of Canada to whom they feel they can provide television service.

In order to be brief I should like to put on the record once again a passage which appears in the annual report of the C.B.C. for the year 1963-64 so that the minister will have a greater understanding of the point I am trying to make. This extract has to do with the coverage policy of the corporation and reads as follows:

> At the present time the corporation's planning in radio takes into account all areas of Canada with a population of more than 500 which could be served by one transmitter. In television, because of higher costs, the minimum population figure is 2,000. All areas which, on the basis of the latest available d.b.s. figures, have this many people are entered on the corporation's planning lists. At the present time there are approximately 122 communities on the radio planning list and about 60 on the television list. The possibility of bringing service to each of these areas and the costs involved have been given preliminary study and priorities established. . . .
>
> The system of priorities outlined above has been followed by C.B.C. for some years and is in line with the proportion of the over-all budget which it is felt can be devoted to this aspect of development. On this basis it is clear that the needs of these communities cannot all be met at once without seriously neglecting other phases of the national service. In fact, at the present rate, the communities mentioned above will not all be served for perhaps 10 years.
>
> The capital cost of extending service to these communities over a 10 year period starting in 1964 would probably be upwards of $15 million.

[Mr. Pigeon.]

> Strong suggestions from many quarters, however, have caused C.B.C. to study the cost and time factors in other possible methods of meeting the problem.

Here is the part to which I should like the Secretary of State to pay particular attention.

> It has been suggested that this program be accelerated as a matter of national importance. If, for example, parliament were so to decide, and to provide the financing in the form of a special grant, it would probably be possible to shorten the time factor to a few years, with the co-operation of equipment companies. The aspects of this are being explored.

The point I should like to make is that for many years, in consultations with the officials of the C.B.C., I have asked them why they did not include in their proposed expenditures a special item to complete the extension of services as rapidly as possible, an item in which it would be stated that the money would be spent in this way. They have never seen fit to do so. No doubt they have studied the question fully but they have never done so. In their last annual report they have thrown the ball back to parliament. They have put it directly up to the house to supply this extra grant and if it is provided they will do the job.

This is one of the questions I should like to ask the minister. Will he take a further good look at this particular part of the annual report which I have brought to his attention to see if it would not be possible to make a special grant to the C.B.C. and direct them to complete the extension of services to the unserviced areas of Canada as quickly as possible? I should also like to ask the minister whether the government has this in mind already in order that the people in these areas will have some idea of the thinking of the government on this very important matter. If the minister is not able to reply at this time, I am sure he could answer these questions during the further discussion of his estimates this evening. I realize that the house desires to get the estimates through as rapidly as possible but I think we should have some statement from the Secretary of State on this very important matter.

Mr. Herridge: I should explain before I get started on these cultural activities that I am a simple son of the soil. I am not very much at home in this field. I have not the technical knowledge to judge what is a good documentary film or, in many cases, a good program. What I am doing, Mr. Chairman, this afternoon is simply presenting to the

house the position of my constituents. I must say that I am one of those who, through the years, has always supported the C.B.C. strongly. I do not always agree with all its programming, but I think the C.B.C. is something of which we can all be proud in Canada because it contributes to our Canadian way of life and so on.

I find in travelling around my district, and I am very fortunate in this respect, that everywhere I go I hear nothing but this: Will you please give us C.B.C. radio and television? I represent a riding which is very interested in C.B.C. programs. I hear this wherever I go. I realize that this problem is related to funds, and things cannot be done overnight. Once again I want to bring to the minister's attention the need for the smaller communities in Canada to be served by radio and television. So far as our area is concerned at the moment, we are fairly well served by radio. We have some blank spots so far as television is concerned. These people who make their living, shall I say, in the hinterland are just as entitled to receive these programs as those who live in the larger centres. I do urge therefore that everything be done that is possible to provide these services to these smaller communities. I believe the hon. member for Churchill had the same thing in mind when he was speaking.

Now I want to say something about the national gallery. First of all, I ask the minister when he replies if the Marquess of Lorne's picture is at present hanging in the national gallery, because I have been interested in that subject for a number of years. I understand that for some time it was in a packing case somewhere in some warehouse. I do believe that should be hung in the national gallery. I have risen particularly, in this instance, to bring to the minister's attention the fact that the security guards who operate in the national gallery are employees of some private security service. I understand that this organization is really owned, almost in total, in the United States. I should like the minister to explain to the house why we have not got the corps of commissionaires in that national gallery. It seems to me it is a place where they could perform a very useful service, and it would provide an opportunity for some of these over-age veterans to obtain employment.

Now, I come to the national museum. I have very little time, indeed. I understand that since last year there has been some reorganization of the administrative services of the national museum. I do not know if the minister mentioned this when he was introducing his estimates, but I shall look this up. I am mentioning the national museum because I do think there is an opportunity for the national museum and the provincial museum of British Columbia to co-operate to make certain that in this ghastly flooding of the Columbia river there are no records of the past destroyed. I should like the minister to inform the house later what has happened to the Arrow lakes-Kootenay canoe that was in the national museum. It was brought down some two or three years ago, and I understand it was put in storage because the atmosphere was not humid enough.

I should like to see these two museums co-operate to make certain that there are none of these underground dwellings that are overlooked, and also that the Indian paintings on the rocks are photographed before this beautiful valley is sacrificed to producing power and irrigation in the United States, and so on. Then there are other artifacts, and the like, which can still be discovered between the big bend and Castlegar on the Columbia river. I believe he should bring this to the attention of the people in the national museum, to see what can be done in that respect.

I have a word here for the national film board. Here again, I am simply representing the views of my constituents. We have an excellent organization in Kootenay West which co-operates with the national film board in the distribution of the films throughout the district. There is a great deal of appreciation for the service performed by the national film board. Here again I am going to ask the minister if he will do something for a chap who is in a rather tough position at the present time. Could he possibly have a documentary film made of the Columbia river, a colour film, which would cover the section from Castlegar to the big bend? This film would show the land as it was, the 18 communities that are going to be flooded, the 50 miles of sandy beaches and many other aspects of this beautiful district. I do urge that he give consideration to asking the national film board to produce a colour film of this most beautiful district which we call the garden of Eden. I have been asked to bring this to his attention by several people throughout the district. I hope it receives favourable consideration so that prior to the destruction of this beautiful valley we will have a record of the past and what it was like in days gone by.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I think in discussing the C.B.C. and other cultural activities of the government of Canada, we must start with the understanding that it costs money to be a Canadian. I mean that we are very close to that tremendous colossus to the south of us and Canadians are influenced every day by material which emanates from the United States. Canadians read magazines from the United States. We see films made in the United States. We watch television programs which originate in the United States.

Since its inception, the C.B.C. particularly has been given the task of trying to help develop and maintain a Canadian identity. I think the C.B.C. has done a tremendous job in this respect. This does not mean, Mr. Chairman, that I have or anybody else has to like every program which the C.B.C. has produced or is likely to produce. I must admit that I am not particularly devoted to opera. If the C.B.C. televises a two hour opera I am likely to turn the television off and begin to read. I think it is to the credit of the C.B.C. and to the credit of the Canadian government that they have tended to encourage this kind of program.

I wonder how many Canadian cities would have symphony orchestras today if, during the last 20 or 25 years, a nucleus of musicians in Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal and Halifax had not earned a substantial part of their living by virtue of the fact that they were employed by the C.B.C. In the same way I wonder what kind of dramatic groups there would be in Canada, what reason there would be for building the cultural centres which are being proposed in Ottawa and other cities, if C.B.C. radio and television had not encouraged, sponsored and paid for the live drama which over the years was broadcast on both radio and television.

This does not mean that I must like every dramatic program which the C.B.C. broadcasts, that I must agree with the message contained in any particular program, but I think the C.B.C. should be congratulated on what it has done and should be supported. The same thing holds true for the public affairs programs which it broadcasts.

I believe we need to take a hard look at the whole organizational structure of the C.B.C. Personally I am not convinced it was a good idea to transfer the headquarters of the C.B.C. from Toronto to Ottawa. This can only tend to increase the importance of the bureaucracy and decrease the importance of the creative, production people who, in the final analysis, will make the C.B.C. as important as it ought to be. The real operating headquarters of the C.B.C. ought to be in Toronto because that is where the English network headquarters are, and in Montreal where the French network headquarters are.

I hope that in the not too distant future a parliamentary committee will have an opportunity to discuss these things, but I believe that if such a committee were going to discuss the C.B.C. alone, it would be discussing the whole question of radio and television in a vacuum.

I was flabbergasted to hear the speech made several weeks ago by the hon. member for Jasper-Edson in which he proposed that we ought to sell the C.B.C.'s individual stations to private interests, who would be very happy to get them. Of course they would be happy to get them. The Pilkington commission report in Great Britain, which dealt with private television, said in effect that a licence given to a private t.v. station was a licence to print money. That is precisely what private television station licences will be in Canada, if they are not so already.

When the C.B.C. appears before a parliamentary committee it is my contention that we must look at the whole spectrum of television and radio, and to that end I hope we will be able to bring the B.B.G. before the committee, and also the operators of private television networks and individual stations. The board of broadcast governors was given a certain task, and I quote just one paragraph from the act which set up the board:

> The board shall, for the purpose of ensuring the continued existence and efficient operation of a national broadcasting system and the provision of a varied and comprehensive broadcasting service of a high standard that is basically Canadian in content and character, regulate the establishment and operation of networks of broadcasting stations, the activities of public and private broadcasting stations in Canada and the relationship between them and provide for the final determination of all matters and questions in relation thereto.

When the B.B.G. was given the task of deciding in what areas second, private television channels would be permitted, and what groups and individuals should be given those channels, it received a large number of applications. In each city where a second channel was to be permitted, a large number of applicants applied and they were required to supply the B.B.G. with a very detailed outline of the kind of programming which they proposed to establish if they were given the rights to a t.v. channel.

It would be interesting to know how much attention the B.B.G. paid to those applications, because never was such a hoax perpetrated

on the public as the promises made to the B.B.G. by the successful applicants. The head of the group which got the private t.v. channel in Ottawa, Mr. Bushnell, had the gall—that is all I can call it—to suggest to the B.B.G. that it ought to compare the high quality of the programming which he and his group were proposing to give the citizens of Ottawa and adjacent areas with the much lower standard of programming which the other applicant groups were proposing to offer.

Mr. Bushnell and his group got the rights to the private television station in Ottawa, and I wish to refer briefly to some of the promises which Mr. Bushnell made on behalf of his group, not a single one of which has been honoured since he and his group got the rights to that channel.

They proposed that they would provide a high percentage of live Canadian programming in the prime hours of the evening. I do not know how many hon. members watch television, but there is virtually no live Canadian programming in the prime hours over station CJOH. What we get are old films, canned murder mysteries and westerns, purchased cheaply from the United States. I am not criticizing the owners of CJOH if they can get away with it, but I do suggest that in terms of developing a Canadian identity and in terms of the promises which they voluntarily made to the B.B.G. they have welshed, virtually 100 per cent, on their promises.

They promised that at least once a week they would show live dramatic programs, and that at least once a month one of those programs would be produced in Ottawa, using Ottawa actors and producers. To my knowledge station CJOH has never had a live dramatic program, and certainly never one that was produced in Ottawa.

They promised that they would give an award to the best Canadian playwright for a play produced in Ottawa. Of course they have never lived up to that promise.

They promised, in view of the fact Ottawa has a very large percentage of its population which is French speaking, that they would televise as much as ten hours a week in French. Recently when they were checked up on that by the student newspaper of Ottawa university their answer was that they had looked into the matter but they could not get the advertisers to make it worth while. When they made these promises to the B.B.G. they did not mention any condition that they would do this only if they could get the advertisers to pay for it.

Not one of these promises has been kept. Station CFTO in Toronto owned by that great Canadian patriot and citizen Mr. Bassett promised it would spend more than 25 per cent of its estimated gross revenue on live talent. Well, I venture to say that it has not spent 5 per cent of its gross revenue on live talent unless one includes in the cost of live talent the cost of televising football games. I am in favour of football. I like football and I like to watch football on television. But this certainly was not what Mr. Bassett promised the board of broadcast governors when he was applying for the channel in Toronto.

Mr. Woolliams: Especially when Kapp is passing for Vancouver.

Mr. Orlikow: Similarly, the owners of station CFTO promised they would be televising performances by the Toronto symphony orchestra, that they would be televising "live" ballet, that they would be televising concerts of serious music. None of this has ever been done and I think the Canadian people and members of this house must bear all this in mind when they compare the schedules which, in fact, are offered with the standards of programming which the C.B.C. carried on so effectively before the private companies were permitted to enter this field—standards which the corporation has been obliged progressively to reduce as a result of this competition.

Station CFTO promised it would make available to its viewers a wide selection of Canadian programs of an artistic and dramatic nature. Its sponsors undertook to produce "live" dramatic plays. Of course none of this has been done. What we are given, as Canadian content almost exclusively over the private stations and over C.T.V., are quiz programs of the lowest type in terms of their appeal to those interested in any program content which would make them think.

Similarly the channel in Winnipeg promised to televise discussion groups, music by symphony orchestras, and so on. It undertook to give an opportunity to the ethnic groups in Winnipeg, of which there are many, to illustrate their various cultures; it promised to televise their music, their dancing and their folk art. None of this has ever been accomplished. I could go on for a long time. But these are some of the things which the applicants for private channels promised

the board of broadcast governors. These applicants were interested primarily in making money, but I am not blaming them for that. Similarly, the C.T.V. network submitted to the board a list of no less than 45 programs which the sponsors said they were ready to produce both for Canadian consumption and for distribution around the world—programs dealing with sport, with life outdoors and with wildlife, with games of all types, with the work of dramatic groups, and so on. Few if any programs of this type have been available. I know the owners of the private stations and of the network will probably say they have been unable to do these things because they have not been able to make enough money. Indeed, I believe this is why the board of broadcast governors has gone easy with them and has failed to press them to keep their promises.

But, Mr. Chairman, this was not just a private arrangement made between private applicants and a body without official status. This was a promise made to a government board representing the people of Canada and I am naïve enough to believe that such promises should be lived up to, whether they are made by ordinary citizens or by the big owners of private television stations and networks. Not only have the promised programs failed to materialize but pressure has been placed on the C.B.C. to lower its standards in order to meet the competition which these people are providing. This is why we must take a serious look at the reasons why the board of broadcast governors have not done the job which was given to it by the legislation setting it up.

It is true we will not have time to discuss these questions in detail to the extent that their importance makes desirable. It is true, as the minister will no doubt tell us, that a committee headed by Mr. Fowler has been appointed to look into this question. I have a great deal of respect for Mr. Fowler and I am hopeful we shall get a worth-while report from him. I wish, however, I could really believe we shall see more action as a result of the report which he will be submitting within the course of the next four months than we saw in connection with the last Fowler report. What has happened in recent years, and this has been the case whether Conservative or Liberal governments have been in power, has been the gradual erosion of the ability of the C.B.C. to do the job which it has to do, and which it was required to do the day it was set up by a former Conservative government back in the thirties.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

The corporation has tried to carry out these obligations, but their discharge will be increasingly difficult unless the same standards are applied to its competitors as are applied to the C.B.C.

It is important we should look at what these private stations are doing. Some people think that having given them a licence we simply let them put on what they please. But private radio and television, the latter, particularly, are not in the same position as are other private businesses. If 20 different individuals want to open up grocery stores in Ottawa, Winnipeg or Montreal, nobody will question their right to do so; they will either make a go of it or not, on the basis of the amount of business available. But it is obvious to anybody who gives the matter thought that there is a very definite limit to the number of television channels which a country with a population the size of Canada's can permit. The limit would be two in most cities, or possibly three in the largest cities; four if one includes French and English channels. When parliament has set up a regulatory body, surely we can expect that body to select from among the applicants for licences those who propose to give to the Canadian people the best, the most educational, the most entertaining and the most provocative programs. If the regulatory body makes that choice then I expect them to exercise some type of supervision. If the B.B.G. had ever exercised supervision, with the exception of the supervision it exercised on the televising of the Grey cup last year, then I do not know about it.

It seems to me that having given the present operators of private television stations the right, as I said earlier, to spend money, they probably forgot about it and instead of becoming a regulatory body as instructed under the act they became the friends, the protectors and lovers of private television stations and networks. The public is not getting from the B.B.G., and therefore from the Canadian government, the B.B.G. being a creature of the Canadian government —perhaps not this government but it is a creature of the Canadian government—the kind of protection to which it is entitled.

I hope that it will not be November 24 next year before the parliamentary committee to look into radio and television is set up. I hope it will be set up early in 1965. I do not think it is necessary for the parliamentary committee to wait to be set up until Mr. Fowler and his associates make their report. I hope the committee is appointed early in

the new session and that it gets down to business right away. I trust we will hear from the C.B.C. a report in much greater detail than we have here. I agree with the minister that he is not responsible for the decisions on programming by the C.B.C. but I hope a parliamentary committee will have an opportunity to hear a thorough and complete report from the C.B.C. in explanation of some of the things they have done.

I am not thinking of censorship. It may be I do not like a particular play or program. I can say—it is no secret; I have said this to the people working on particular programs —that I am not enamoured of the program "This Hour Has Seven Days". I did not like the Rockwell interview, not because I think the C.B.C. should not run that kind of interview but simply because I believe Rockwell represents no one in the United States. In my opinion the only reason for putting on that interview was as a means of sensationalism, as a means of getting viewers. I think the C.B.C. needs viewers and exciting programs, but they should not stoop to putting on what I consider cheap sensationalism. But that is my personal opinion and I am not suggesting for a moment that any member of parliament or the minister in charge should interfere with individual programs put on by the C.B.C. Last week they put on an Ibsen play. I watched it and I did not like it. I noticed that the television critics in both Ottawa newspapers thought it an excellent play. That is understandable, because people react in different ways to different programs. I like football, but many people think there is too much football carried on television. I hope the C.B.C. continues to make its own decisions, but I think it is time that they came before the parliamentary committee, told us what they have been doing, what they are planning for the future, and gave us an idea of what this will cost. I do not for a moment believe the C.B.C. loses money. I call the expenditure of money for the C.B.C. the development of a Canadian identity. I want to remain a Canadian; I do not want to be a citizen of the United States.

Mr. Cowan: Would the hon. member allow a question?

Mr. Orlikow: Certainly.

Mr. Cowan: The hon. member said he does not consider the C.B.C. expenditure a loss of money, that it is an expenditure on behalf of culture. Would he explain to us where the culture was in the program "This Hour Has Seven Days", when Rockwell said that F. D. Roosevelt was the biggest communist the world has ever seen, with the exception of his wife?

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member asked a question which indicates he has not listened to me, or if he has, has not understood a single word. I think I speak in language which 99 per cent of the people understand. I said I am not going to set myself up as a judge of which C.B.C. program is good and which C.B.C. program is bad. The C.B.C. puts on a great many programs which I suppose the minister and I would consider culture. I do not know what the hon. member for York-Humber would call them, but he can speak for himself. The C.B.C. also puts on programs which are not culture but information. They put on discussions and programs which I would only classify as entertainment.

My point is that it is the function of a television network, whether it be a private network or a public network, to offer a well rounded variety of programs to its viewers. Until the last year or so I think the C.B.C. did this very successfully, and if the hon. member wonders how successfully he just needs to look at the list of former C.B.C. writers, producers, actors and performers who sang and danced and have now moved to the United States or to Great Britain where they are able to earn anywhere up to ten times what the C.B.C. pays them. If the hon. member does not know of whom I speak I will be glad to give him a list on a later occasion.

This is what I think the C.B.C. should do, and it is also what I think private networks should do. When you look at a private network program you will see quite a bit of time is spent, so far as Canadian content is concerned, on news and public affairs. Is there a single member here who would suggest that these news programs come anywhere close to those of the C.B.C.? They are not even in the same league. These stations have what they call public affairs programs. They have a program which is put on once a week in which my colleague from Port Arthur is master of ceremonies. I think it is a good program and I wish they would show it in my home city of Winnipeg, but they do not. There is a program every night in which Pierre Berton is master of ceremonies. I do not always agree with him, particularly when he is foolish enough to suggest he will vote Liberal, but I think he is a pretty provocative person and I give him credit for his program, even though it does not originate in the city of Ottawa.

Having given these two examples I challenge anyone either inside or outside the house to show the Canadian people what other public affairs programs the private networks are putting on on a regular basis. Where is the use of Canadian talent? Where is the use of Canadian performers? Where is the use of Canadian journalists or professors who can speak on public affairs? They just do not exist on private networks. The same thing has happened with regard to the other things they promised the B.B.G., and therefore the people of Canada, that they would do.

May I say in closing that the parliament of Canada, which represents the people of Canada, ought to take a very close look at the thinking which went on in the formation of the C.B.C. For the benefit of the hon. member for Jasper-Edson, who made a bitter and I think completely unwarranted attack on the C.B.C. several weeks ago, I should like to quote some words to him about the C.B.C. used by a former prime minister of Canada in 1932, Right Hon. R. B. Bennett. These are the words of Mr. Bennett.

Mr. Bigg: Hear, hear.

Mr. Orlikow: I am not sure the hon. member will applaud after he hears the quotation.

Mr. Bennett said that Canadians have the right to a system of broadcasting from Canadian sources equal in all respects to that of any other country, that this country must be assured of complete Canadian control of broadcasting from Canadian sources, free from foreign interference or influence.

Mr. Bigg: Hear, hear.

Mr. Orlikow: Obviously the members for Jasper-Edson and Bow River have forgotten, if they ever read the thoughts of Mr. Bennett about the needs of Canadians, the kind of organization which the C.B.C. has been in the past. The hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings has been a great supporter of the C.B.C. I wish those hon. members would read his speeches, particularly when their speeches have been so consistently and persistently in recent years an attempt to cut that organization's throat.

The Chairman: Order. I would remind the hon. member that his time has expired. Does he have leave to continue?

Mr. Orlikow: I will be able to complete my remarks within two minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I hope the kind of question I have raised today, which is basic to the needs of Canada if Canada is to survive as an independent nation, can be discussed in the very near future.

We on this side of the house have raised various matters and must accept our share of responsibility for taking up many long days during this session, which we hope is now approaching its end. We do not have sufficient time at our disposal to discuss in detail the activities of the Canada Council and other cultural and educational efforts of the government. As far as radio and television are concerned, we do hope that early in 1965 we can have a serious, detailed and careful consideration of the problems that beset these media in this country.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I may be permitted to add a very short footnote to the remarks which have just been made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North, and I should like to do so for the benefit of my hon. friend, the member for York-Humber.

Not too many weeks ago I tried to listen to that member when he was making a rather impassioned speech on the general subject of how the C.B.C. was attempting to cram culture down the throats of Canadian people. I would now remind that hon. member that one day not too long ago I wanted to listen to a program of entertainment on either radio or television, but I discovered that four of the five radio and television services in Ottawa which are part of the C.B.C. network were carrying the world series baseball game, and when I turned my television to the private station it was covering a football game. I thought at that time warmly of the member for York-Humber and felt that at some suitable time I should suggest to him that if we are having any kind of culture rammed down our throats by the C.B.C. and the other stations, it is the culture which pertains to football, hockey and baseball.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, in rising at this time to make some comments about the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's expenditures, and I note that the minister responsible is in the house, I would like to state that only this afternoon I and other members of this house became aware of a supplementary estimate which was tabled yesterday in relation to the Department of Transport. This supplementary estimate amounts to $1 and could have a profound effect on the operation of private stations and the C.B.C. Is it the

intention of the government to allow a detailed debate about this supplementary estimate in the Department of Transport estimates, through which an effort is being made to place community antenna television under the supervision of the board of broadcast governors, or is this to be allowed to whistle by when the Department of Transport estimates are being considered? This subject must be debated in detail. This move will have an effect on the operations of the C.B.C. and private broadcasting stations, so is this the time to consider it, or should a lengthy debate take place during our consideration of the estimates of the Department of Transport some time presumably between now and Friday evening? I should like an answer to that question before I continue my comments in relation to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, the house leader is present at this time. This item is not within my responsibility, so I do not think a discussion about it could properly take place at this time.

The Chairman: The item to which the hon. member alludes is, I believe, item 50c of the Department of Transport, so it would properly be discussed when the committee is considering the estimates of the Department of Transport.

Mr. Cowan: I am happy to receive your comments in this regard, Mr. Chairman, because I know that when that supplementary estimate comes up for discussion, during our consideration of the estimates of the Department of Transport, many members of this committee from all parties will wish to take part. This represents a drastic change which will affect public and private broadcasting services, if and when it is put into effect. I will reserve my comments on that subject until the estimates of the Department of Transport come before us for consideration, I hope before the end of this week. Only one item in those estimates has been passed to date.

At this time I should like to emphasize as strongly as possible that this House of Commons does not have much opportunity of showing any responsibility for the actions of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, because of the manner in which we are told not to question the C.B.C. about this, that and the other thing, as it is independent in its operations and parliament must allow it to go its merry way.

The estimates as they relate to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation are very interesting to members of parliament. The main estimates appear at page 54 of the blue book where vote No. 1 is shown as:

> Grant in respect of the net operating amount required to discharge the responsibilities of the national broadcasting service (details, page 55)

Page 55 is the next page, and one finds details of this expenditure of $85,900,000. Exactly 26 words including numerals give the details of this expenditure. Those words and details are:

> Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—
>
> Vote 1—Grant in respect of the net operating amount required to discharge the responsibilities of the national broadcasting service (20) $85,900,000. (1964-65)

Those are the details of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation expenditures, yet we are told on page 54 that the details are to be found on the opposite page. Those being the complete details given to members of parliament, one can understand easily why the members are provoked by the lack of responsibility shown by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to a body which is asked to fork over $60 million, $70 million, $80 million or $85 million in a given year, and in this case more than $100 million. We are not being asked to vote only $85,900,000 as shown on page 55 of the estimates. If you turn to page 516 you will find there a tricky little entry under the heading, "Loans, investments and advances, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation". The number of the vote is L10 and it reads as follows:

> Loans to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for the purpose of capital expenditures subject to terms and conditions prescribed by the governor in council, $14,250,000.

How in the name of heaven the government can make a loan to a crown corporation which has no means of repaying that loan except by a parliamentary grant, and call it a loan, is a euphemism, as the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings called it a few days ago. Under the heading of "Loans, investments and advances" we are being asked to lend $14,250,000 to the C.B.C., and I ask you where the money is going to come from except out of the current expenditures of the government at some time in the future? Why can this expenditure of $14¼ million not be included in the main estimates along with the $85,900,000 that is shown on pages 54 and 55?

I must say that having sat here for many months and having listened to the answers,

that are given to questions regarding the C.B.C., I wonder whether I am legally right in commenting on the C.B.C. even tonight. I presume my first function should be to congratulate the government for the speed it has shown in bringing down the C.B.C. estimates. Last year we discussed the C.B.C. estimates on December 21, 1963, when the expenditures for nine solid months had already been made and there were only three months to go. I have a quotation here in my notes from the member for Algoma East in which he points out that the great responsibility of parliament is to examine the proposed taxes that a government may impose on the people and that these proposed taxes must be examined before the money is spent and before the taxes are laid on the backs of the people.

Last year the C.B.C. had already spent nine months of its allotment before parliament even had an opportunity to speak on the matter. Yet nothing was done. A number of us participated in the debate but the money went through without too much obstruction. The C.B.C. figures that members have had their say and they have got their money, so what is there for the C.B.C. to complain about? This year we have advanced the date from the 21st of December to the 24th of November. This is real progress. The C.B.C. has only spent eight months supply money before any discussion of their expenditures which are crushing the taxpayers of this country to death unnecessarily.

There are so many facets to the public and private broadcasting world today that it is difficult to know where one can speak most profitably for the taxpayers of the country who have to carry this load of $100 million to supply the C.B.C. We do believe that a little bit of responsibility by the C.B.C. to the House of Commons would be appreciated. They not only do not give us any details with regard to the expenditures they are going to make but they go their own sweet way in their programming. I will not comment on their programming, as I look at television and listen to radio very little. My objection to the C.B.C. is that it should not be in business at all.

Many years ago the federal government built the Rideau canal. I was born on the banks of the Rideau and I was raised on the banks of the Trent in the city of Peterborough. These two canals were built at government expense. The Glassco report recommends that they should be sold, or turned over to the province of Ontario as tourist attractions because they are of no future value to the federal government. I maintain that in the course of progress things that were satisfactory 30, 40 or 50 years ago are not necessarily so today. If these two canal systems that were so vital to the well-being of Canada in years gone by are now to be dropped by the federal power and offered to the provincial authority as tourist attractions, I say that the day of public ownership of national radio and television networks is past.

The government got into the field of radio in the 1930's, as I mentioned in another speech in the house, in order to protect the six channels that had been allotted to this country by international agreement in the very early days of radio. The government felt that if these six channels were allotted to individuals they would be offending scores and scores of people who would like to have these six channels, so in order to shut off criticism from scores of applicants for the right to broadcast privately the federal government decided to create a radio commission and broadcast on these six bands themselves. At the same time, however, they gave the right to private stations to broadcast in the farthermost parts of the country. Radio was so new in the early thirties that no one was aware of its potentialities or possibilities and it was thought that private stations in the far flung reaches of the country would not offend the stations on the bands in the central part of the country. The net result has been that with private stations allocated to certain areas and public stations to the larger cities we have had a private system growing up alongside the government stations, but as these two systems have been growing side by side the private stations have been paying their own way while the C.B.C. has been dipping into the pockets of the Canadian people more and more.

I have mentioned to the house before and I can only repeat tonight that as the national network of the C.B.C. expands and extends itself the competition which it provides against the printed communication media increases and increases. In the discussion of the proposed CATV service it has been brought out that the government is adopting the attitude that they must protect existing Canadian television stations and must see that they remain profitable. Has the government made any effort to see that the magazines and newspapers of the country remain profitable by forbidding television and radio stations to spring up in their communities?

The history of print media in this country over the past 30 years shows magazines sus-

pending publication month after month and year after year. Many big newspapers are no longer in existence because of the competition for advertising provided by the C.B.C. which is supported by the government all the way. I have complained on behalf of the print media of this country before that the advertising rates charged by the government system do not measure up to the cost of operation. A private publisher of a magazine or newspaper must secure an advertising rate high enough to cover his cost of production. On the other hand, the C.B.C. can go out and quote whatever rate it wishes and whatever rate the advertiser will pay. Then the advertiser, who is getting a cheap subsidized rate from the C.B.C., can turn around and tell the printed media publisher, "I am getting a cheaper rate from the C.B.C. than you are offering when I consider the number of families I reach per $1,000 spent".

This government subsidized competition is really strangling the print media business in the Dominion of Canada. But what does the federal cabinet care? Their only concern is that the now established radio and television stations shall not have any competition from other stations, as shown by the ruling with regard to the London application yesterday, and the wording on the CATV proposal shows they do not want any CATV competition for the television stations and radio stations now in existence.

In this country which is described by many speakers as one of free enterprise, why does the government show so much concern for the existing stations as to put newspapers and magazines out of business? Why does the government show so little concern for the print media that are forced to go down the drain because their advertising revenues are being sucked off into government subsidized television and radio stations?

Speakers today and during interim supply debates have been trying to get a committee or commission to investigate the C.B.C. There is no doubt that such a commission is long overdue. There are many Canadians who would like to get answers from the C.B.C. The members of the House of Commons are really provoked when the Secretary of State stands up and in reply to questions states, I will pass it on to the president of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and that is the end of that. A week later when members ask another question we are told it will be passed on to the C.B.C. and if they have a reply, it will be brought back. Of course, when they do not have a reply, it is not brought back and that is the end of that. If we had a parliamentary committee and we could get replies from the C.B.C., I am certain many interesting facts and figures could be adduced for the guidance of members of parliament. We are asked simply to vote $85 million or $100 million toward the operation of the C.B.C. without any explanation.

Now, there are a number of questions that we might ask. I have just received from C.B.C. headquarters information to the effect that the cost of the new head office building in Ottawa was $3,100,000 and that the new furnishings cost $35,000. This is a total of $3,135,000 for the building and furnishings out on Riverside drive in what I believe is called Confederation heights. Anyone would think that a $3,135,000 building would have some class. However, I am advised that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation held a program committee meeting, in which they called in the vice presidents and all their auxiliary help, at the Seigniory club down on the Ottawa river. Is not a $3 million building on Riverside drive suitable accommodation for the C.B.C. program council meeting?

Mr. Fisher: Not enough class to it.

Mr. Cowan: The C.B.C. is seeking to reach the mass market, not the class market, I understand. Why do they, in their efforts to reach the mass market go to the Seigniory club? It would be very interesting to know why that meeting of the program council could not be held here in the city of Ottawa in a building that was opened during the past few months and which cost the taxpayers of the country $3,135,000. Frankly, I believe the reason they went to the Seigniory club was that they want to live in the style to which they have become accustomed since they got on the C.B.C. payroll. This is simply one question that we might like to have answered if the government would appoint a committee to investigate the operations of this bloodsucking behemoth that is drawing off more and more money every day.

Then, I should like to know the truth as it relates to a statement that has been bruited around the country that the C.B.C. spent $87,000 to send a camera crew to China. You remember that Mr. Faibish, after he had done the necessary work for the minister of agriculture in the previous administration, left the Department of Agriculture, went to the C.B.C. and wound up in China on a seven weeks tour. They spent $87,000 on the China expedition. Some programs have been placed on C.B.C. showing that China expedition. I have been told that the French network of the C.B.C.

refuses to run the picture. I should like to get an answer to that statement. I am told the French network feels it is a little on the communistic side, and also that they would like to send a French camera crew over to China to take pictures of the Chinese because the English camera crew does not take good pictures of the Chinese. This is the story in C.B.C. circles, and I should like to get a direct answer to it. I hope we will not be told that the matter will be taken up with the president of the C.B.C., period, period, period.

I mentioned once before in speaking about the profligate hand with which the C.B.C. throws money around, that the newspapers of Canada did not send any representative of their own to the Holy Land when the Pope visited Palestine some months ago. The board of directors of Canadian Press, which is a co-operative organization of all the newspapers in the land, decided that the visit of the Pope to the Holy Land could be adequately covered by having Reuters news agency in Europe report to them, plus the Associated Press of the United States. Then, the larger Canadian newspapers could buy the official foreign services of such organizations as the New York *Times*, the Los Angeles *Times* or the Chicago *Tribune*, all of which operate news services under their own name. However, this did not apply to the C.B.C. As I reported before, the C.B.C. sent seven or nine people over to Palestine to record the visit of the Pope to that country.

The most interesting backlash of that visit is that we are now advised a French camera crew and an English camera crew arrived in Palestine unknown to each other to cover the visit.

Mr. Barnett: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Cowan: Yes.

Mr. Barnett: Would he be willing to tell us if the French network was prepared to televise the program which he is now describing?

Mr. Cowan: I trust that my next few words will cover that subject.

I wanted to report to you that C.B.C. personnel have advised me that when the English camera crew and the French camera crew found that they were in Palestine together, they agreed that the French would shoot silent French footage and the English camera crew would shoot silent English footage. If you can tell me what silent English footage is compared with silent French footage in Palestine, I would appreciate getting the information. I do not want to be told, we will ask the president of the C.B.C. and if he deigns to answer the inquiry such as you are making we will pass it on to you. This is a report that comes to me from several people who are well placed and well able to give me the information that I am passing on to you.

Now, I have remarked on the irresponsibility of the C.B.C. in not giving us an explanation of the vast expenditures they are making year after year. I think it is absolutely ridiculous—I cannot think of a stronger word—the way the C.B.C. flouts the good name of the parliament of Canada. In 1962, the immigration department of this Canadian government issued a stop order against George Lincoln Rockwell being allowed to enter Canada. There were good and sufficient reasons for that order being issued. The present government reinforced the order of 1962 which had been made by the previous government. This means that two consecutive Canadian governments had issued an order prohibiting the entry of George Lincoln Rockwell into this country. Why, then, in the name of heaven has the C.B.C. the right to spend taxpayers' money sending a camera crew down to Washington to interview Mr. George Lincoln Rockwell in Washington, put it on tape and bring it back to this country? If the immigration department has forbidden the man to enter the country, I do not believe that taxpayers' money should be spent in sending a camera crew down to see him because he is not allowed to enter this country.

Then, the immigration department of this country took a chap by the name of Sands off a plane from Chicago, I believe, at the Toronto airport. They said he was non persona grata in this country and he was sent back to Cleveland, Ohio, on the next plane leaving for the United States. There is a cease and desist order against this chap, or there was at the time, forbidding his entry into Canada. We pick up the C.B.C. on Sunday night and find they have brought this gentleman—I will use the term loosely in this case—to the United States-Canadian border on the Rainbow bridge at Niagara Falls. Despite the fact the immigration department of this government has said the man is non persona grata, they give him the national network at taxpayers' expense. They even photograph the international boundary to show that the C.B.C. would not allow Mr. Sands into this country. The immigration department will not allow him into the country, so we will just keep

him across the painted line and give him a national network show in Canada at the taxpayers' expense. If that shows any sense of responsibility, then I do not understand the meaning of the word.

I ask this question bluntly: The C.B.C., at the taxpayers' expense, has made a monkey out of the department of immigration. Are they planning to bring Harold Chamberlain Banks up to the Rainbow bridge and photograph him across the border in order to make an ass out of the Department of Justice? There should be some sense of reason and decency shown in the operations of the C.B.C., but we have got few examples of that recently.

During the last few days hon. members have been reading quite a bit about a charge from Winnipeg, Manitoba, regarding young boys who have signed some papers, and their fathers complain that when they want the boys to jump from one junior team to another they are informed that they signed papers when a mere lad, and they are stuck with those papers from now until the end of time.

You may wonder what this has to do with C.B.C. estimates. I would like to point out that there is a revolution coming in free broadcasting of sporting events on radio and television because the professional athletes of this continent and of Great Britain are fed up to the teeth. They entertain people sitting in their homes thousands of miles away, and they do not get a single, solitary cent for the entertainment they provide these people.

There is now a move afoot to unionize these athletes. Everyone knows that the owners of professional football teams, the owners of professional hockey teams and the owners of professional soccer teams—I am thinking of Great Britain now—are fighting the unionization of players hand and foot, tooth and nail, but it will not be stopped because the players feel that when they entertain tens of thousands, and even hundreds of thousands of fans, sitting in their own homes, they should be recompensed for the services they are rendering the public through the means of entertainment.

There is an editorial in the *Globe* this morning entitled "Bondage". It is quite a nice editorial and it compliments the government on its intimation that there is going to be an investigation into these charges out of Winnipeg. But I can tell you there is no combine in the pro-sports world, none whatever. Nothing is signed, never has been and never will be; but when six owners get together one will say, "Jack, when I pick up a 15 year old boy in Winnipeg who looks pretty promising I will let the central office in Montreal know about it and you leave the family alone." Another one of the owners, walking around quite casually, says "We would not like to interfere with your property." That is the word they use, "property", so "bondage", as the heading of the editorial, is very good. Then another club owner says, "I have found a very good hockey player in Wetaskiwin. I will notify the central office in Montreal that this boy is going to be our property," and when the other five gentlemen owners of the hockey teams hear this they do not go near that chap.

No, there is no combine, not at all; there is nothing to break the combines law; it is just a gentlemen's agreement.

I have been in the newspaper game in Canada all my life. There is no combine in Canada with respect to the employment of people by newspapers, but I know newspaper chains that will not hire a man from another chain or from another paper. Of course there is an understanding but there is no combine. There is just an understanding that "if you leave my writers alone I will leave your writers alone. Anyway, why should you bid that man $10 a week more to drag him across to your paper when all I will do is raise my bid to $15 and then you will go up to $20? This is ridiculous. Why should the newspapers cut up one another?" Why should they offer the experienced help more money? The only person going to gain on it is the employee.

There are some employers who do not approve of that, but in the hockey business these men have no combine, no trust. They just do not bid against one another, so that thereby the players' remuneration would be greatly increased. The television and radio world is going to be revolutionized and more and more players in the baseball world, the football world and the hockey world will demand that they be shown only on either theatre, television or closed circuit television where the public will have to pay to see them perform.

Perhaps hon. members think that day will never come. I remember the junior member for Halifax making some comments a little while ago in which he said sports spectaculars could never be taken from the people, that they belonged to the people. That is a very nice phrase to coin, but what about the players?

In the city of Toronto today you can not only see pro hockey players playing on the ice at Maple Leaf Gardens but you can go to theatres in the city and pay admission, and

there you can see the players playing on big screens. The away from home games are shown this way in St. Catharines, Hamilton and Toronto, and so long as the crowds remain at capacity in the Gardens, and so long as the theatres are selling out for theatre television the free broadcasting—any more than 75 miles and further away—will continue because it is through the free advertising that the C.B.C. gives hockey that it has reached its great popularity in this country today.

A royal commission, or preferably a parliamentary commission investigating the C.B.C. would turn out the facts to show how much it costs to broadcast a national league hockey game across Canada from coast to coast. You people may think it is those sponsors whose names are shown on the screen or which are heard over the air who are paying the full shot of the program. You could not be further from the truth. If they were paying the full costs of these sports spectaculars from coast to coast they would only be able to sponsor about two games a year.

The C.B.C. underwrites a tremendous portion of the sports spectaculars broadcast from coast to coast. It would be interesting to know whether sponsors of the Grey cup games and the N.H.L. hockey games are paying what are known as spot advertising rates or full program rates for the advertising they put on the air. Many of us who are experienced in the field are certain they are paying close to spot advertising rates rather than full program rates for the sports spectaculars with which their names are identified.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I must advise the hon. member that his time has expired.

Mr. Ricard: Go ahead.

The Deputy Chairman: Does the committee agree that the hon. member should continue?

Mr. Churchill: For how long?

Mr. Fisher: Oh, let him go.

Mr. Cowan: I can sit down now.

Some hon. Members: Go ahead.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee for its consideration. I was just remarking that it would be wonderful to know the amount in millions of dollars of free advertising that the C.B.C. has given to such businesses as professional hockey and professional baseball. Why does it not give that same kind of free advertising to other businesses in the country—the sale of furniture, the sale of automobiles, the sale of houses, the sale of pleasure boats? Why confine its free will advertising to sports businessmen and not support the whole commercial field throughout the Dominion of Canada?

I regret that I do not have more time to speak about the C.B.C. Frankly I think it ridiculous that on the 24th day of November we are discussing the expenditures of an organization that is going to take $100 million from the taxpayers of the country. There will be possibly two hours consideration of the matter and, come Friday, everything goes through in one mass vote without any further consideration; and a year from now somebody will say, "Oh, the C.B.C. was thoroughly considered, you remember, on November 24 last. Three or four fellows got up and talked about it, and that was that."

There has got to be a committee appointed to investigate the operations of the C.B.C. Its cost to the country today is greater than the cost of the C.N.R. The C.B.C. has asked for $100 million and C.N. is asking for $67 million. Some elections have been fought, won and lost in this country on the expenditures of the C.N.R. when they were little more than one half the cost of the C.B.C. today, yet when the C.B.C. estimates come up people get up and say, "This is terrific. This is culture. It is the best."

But the submission of the association of Canadian radio and television actors to the Fowler commission shows that 64 per cent of the programs on C.B.C. radio and 64 per cent of the programs on C.B.C. television are entertainment. Yet we hear all this stuff about culture, culture, culture. As I asked the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, what culture is involved in describing a great president of the United States as the biggest communist the country has ever seen, with the exception of his wife? Yet that is what was sent out from coast to coast not too long ago, and that is what the Canadian taxpayer had to pay for.

I regret exceedingly that discussion of the C.B.C. estimates is being so completely and thoroughly choked off. Since I have used up the time allotted to me, and even a few extra minutes, I will thank the committee for the consideration they have shown and keep to myself my reflections on the degree of thoroughness with which parliament is allowed to scrutinize public expenditures.

Mr. Fisher: May I call it six o'clock?

Mr. McIlraith: I wonder whether the hon. member would agree that we should try to conclude these particular estimates so that we might get on to others.

Mr. Fisher: Surely the hon. gentleman does not expect the committee to complete before eight o'clock a study of the estimates he listed last night?

Mr. McIlraith: No, just these. Then at eight o'clock we could go on with a new department. I understand the hon. member wishes to speak.

Mr. Fisher: Yes, but I do not wish to penalize everyone who is here now.

Mr. Churchill: Go on.

Mr. Fisher: Well, I want to make a further point I had in mind in connection with the national film board. It is my information that the division between employees of the board recently reached a stage where opposing briefs were presented to the head of the organization. I should like the minister to check this and confirm my information. I should like to know whether these contending opinions were referred to the board itself and what opinions the board may have expressed on them, or what opinion the head of the board may have taken with regard to them.

The other point I want to touch on—and I take some pleasure in doing so, because I see some representatives of the C.B.C. sitting in the gallery—is an incident of which I think we should all be thoroughly ashamed in the House of Commons. It relates to the treatment given by the C.B.C. to the man who produced the Pearson film. I think it is one of the most disgraceful episodes in parliamentary history and I think we all share in it, including the Prime Minister—perhaps, particularly, the Prime Minister.

This is not a question of whether or not the film should be shown. Assume the C.B.C. has the right to make the decision it did. But when the C.B.C. made that decision its officials uttered what were in effect slanders upon the ability and technical prowess of the person who produced the film. The reason they gave for not showing it was its technical or intellectual inadequacy, or words to that effect. That is fine. But they publicized these reasons to the extent that the reputation of the man who produced the film, Mr. Ballentine has been placed in a very bad light. It is only natural that in the circumstances Mr. Ballentine should seek to obtain some form of redress, some opportunity to prove particularly by using the film, that he is not as incompetent as the C.B.C. labelled him. There is the story of his efforts to buy the film, for example. He offered $35,000 for it. But the C.B.C., loaded with the $17 million that the hon. member for York-Humber was talking about, is not interested in $35,000. If indeed the C.B.C. really believed this film to be inadequate and lacking in intellectual grasp, one would suppose they would be prepared to accept the $35,000 offered not only by Mr. Ballentine but by other people. At the moment though this is not the point. They made statements about this man's reputation and capacity, and let them stand; and they have been niggling and petty and small about giving him the opportunity to get and use the prints in order to put forward his case.

I have all the correspondence which passed between Intervideo and the C.B.C., largely with Captain Brooks, and there could not be a stuffier kind of correspondence than the pomp of those answers; there could not be anything better put, to my mind, than the simple request that the C.B.C., in view of the fact that they had damned this man in his professional capacity, should at least give him the film so as to demonstrate that he had some answers on this particular question. He received a request from a famous museum and film gallery in the United States, the Huntingdon museum, to show his film. He asked the C.B.C. to release him from the very narrow contract terms which had been arranged at the time when there was no understanding that the film would not be shown on television, so that people might have an opportunity to see it at this place where, in a sense, the reputations of film producers are in many ways determined. What was the answer he received? The C.B.C. would not accede to this request but was willing to let him have other pieces of film he had produced for them to show on this occasion. I cannot thing of a sillier or more backward answer—an answer which seemed to prove some kind of fear on the part of the C.B.C. beyond my understanding.

I am convinced that the Prime Minister of this country wanted the damned film shown. Perhaps there is some great integrity in the C.B.C. demonstrated by not acceding to that point of view or to what was obviously the wish of parliament. As far as I am concerned, and as far as Mr. Ballentine is concerned, the

issue whether it should be shown on television or not is dead. The fact remains that here is an individual whose reputation has been smashed as a result of the refusal of the C.B.C. to use this film. Yet they niggle, they whine, they cheat, they waffle all the way through in the face of his attempts to get free use of the print so that he can take it to the people across this country in order to show he is not the incompetent, the emotionally immature person the corporation has labelled him.

We in this house have permitted the C.B.C. to behave in this way and I think it is a disgrace. Members can say all they please about political influence. Maybe the Pearson film was an issue; maybe it was not. Certainly it made headlines. The fact remains we have this big, stiff, swell-headed organization with a bunch of arrogant people at the top—damned arrogant—who have knocked the little man on the chin and who are refusing to give him a fair shake. I just want to let those people in the gallery, those big shots in the C.B.C., know, having looked at the correspondence and followed this case throughout, how I feel about it. Maybe they have an argument in support of their decision not to show the film for various reasons. Maybe there was no political interference. I do not really care any more. But they should have nothing but shame for their conduct with regard to this particular film—their action in refusing to sell it and let this producer have his "go". I think we should all be ashamed of what the C.B.C. has done in this connection.

I should like to close my observations on this subject by saying that I think the Prime Minister shares the blame even more than the rest of us do. After all, it was he and fundamentally his reputation on which this whole thing balanced. I am pleased to find that the sort of resentment and malice I happen to feel in this regard is not shared so much by Mr. Ballentine, who perhaps is larger in spirit than I. But if I were he I would feel terribly let down by any prime minister who would not take some step, even if it is just the persuasive one of getting the president of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to sit down and talk sense about the matter over the table. It is pretty disgraceful to have that sort of situation in your head office in this country.

I am sorry to have been so extreme in expressing this point of view but it seems to me that anyone reading this correspondence and following this "Mr. Pearson" film incident through cannot help but be ashamed that we have such stiff backed, swollen headed, arrogant types at the head of a corporation who would treat any small individual in this way. It is as though they are taking out on him all the meanness which has been generated in them because of the boobs pulled by their organization over this "Mr. Pearson" film. To me it is regrettably pathetic that a giant organization with a budget of over $100 million a year should continue to have such a narrow and malicious point of view toward an individual who is doing what is really, in effect, in money or in other terms, a relatively small job for them.

The last point I want to touch on in connection with the C.B.C. is to remind the minister of a meeting I had with him last year with some representatives from my area regarding the extension of television service to the Geraldton-Longlac area. This matter seems to me typical of the kind of frustrations expressed by the hon. member for Churchill and those of us who have spent seven years trying to see an advancement in the policy of extension of service both through the C.B.C. and at the encouragement of the B.B.G. When this delegation came to see the minister, frustrated and fuming after spending an hour with Mr. Ouimet and Mr. Fraser, he assured them that the government would look at the problem of extending services to see whether this would not be possible, since Mr. Ouimet had told us that for a sum of $20 million to $25 million television service in Canada could be extended in a blanket coverage. I have never had an answer from the minister to those representations, and if he checks the file he will see I followed up with a letter which specifically asked him about this matter. But still no indication of the position of the government in this regard. This is basically the same question asked by the hon. member for Churchill.

More than that, Mr. Chairman, when we met representatives from the C.B.C. last winter they told us that within a month or six weeks they would have received some bids or quotations on a potential satellite transmitter in the Geraldton-Longlac area. That is many months ago. We are now almost to Christmas and it is still impossible to get any kind of firm answer from the C.B.C. The last letter I had from them was about two weeks ago and the whole matter is still up in the air. This is typical of my experience through the seven years in which I have had

dealings with the C.B.C. in terms of extension of service.

There is a beautiful castle erected in honour of Mr. Ouimet on the outskirts of Confederation heights, about which our friend from York-Humber was talking, and I have often wondered what is done there. This seems to me a good question to ask. Certainly minor attention has been paid either to budgeting or planning for an extension of service in the way the members of parliament have been asking for seven or eight years. They never seem to be able to live up to their deadlines in terms of the introduction of projects. At one place, Terrace Bay, they promised a better, low power relay station one year ago, and I doubt whether the damned thing has been put in yet. At least, I had a letter the other day indicating that it had not. There is always this kind of delay and procrastination in projects, putting them over to some future date.

This matter may seem particularly in contradiction with the fulsome phrases extended to the C.B.C. by my hon. friend from Winnipeg North. My comments are directed toward the function of the C.B.C. as a program producer and apply to the substantial administrative weakness of the C.B.C. and lack of flexibility in responding to questions which we have asked as parliamentary representatives, having nothing to do with programming. So this is not interference with their programs. I should like to ask the minister about the public accounts hearings. Did the minister read what Mr. Ouimet told us at the public accounts committee a couple of months ago, in the summertime? Mr. Ouimet, obviously reluctantly, undertook to provide certain information for the public accounts committee, and urged both by the Auditor General and the members of the committee he undertook that this information would be provided. I still have not heard about it. I do not know where the information is. I had assumed some of it would be in the next annual report of the C.B.C., which is one of the most uninformative documents one can find. I notice our financial critics are always analysing the annual reports of companies, whether they are good or bad, and I wish they would look at the C.B.C. reports, because if they did so they would find out how well things can be cloaked. Any report which can figure out to a quarter of a cent a day how much each one of us contributes as a taxpayer to the C.B.C. as so-called shareholders, and yet cannot give us a more informative picture is, it seems to me, a bit of a cover up job.

My point is that in my experience the C.B.C. has been very lax in providing members of parliament, or parliament, or parliamentary committees with information and material. The president of the C.B.C. may remember that a few years ago he was before the broadcasting committee, and at that time I was one of those who was most anxious to have all this information. I am sure he will remember how he fought the battle from point to point and from day to day before giving any information about the cost of programs. Finally he did. I hope we will not be faced with the same kind of point to point resistance to the provision of information in connection with the figures before the public accounts committee for which we are asking. Let me tell the minister, and through him the C.B.C., that several of us on that committee do not intend to let the C.B.C. fall back into any of its old attitudes in failing to provide this information. We would ask him to inform us now whether he has any information as to when the C.B.C. will provide this information, how it will provide it and what sort of distribution it is going to get.

That concludes the remarks I wish to make, Mr. Chairman, and I thank the committee for its patience. Before I finish completely I want to mention one point in connection with the argument made by the hon. member for York-Humber about hockey players. I think generally I agree with him, but he is not completely accurate when he says that there is just a gentlemen's agreement existing. There are forms which are signed. Perhaps they would not stand up in court but the fact remains that forms are signed which tie a youngster through the amateur ranks and so on. I remember the son of a friend of mine who had a host of hockey scouts hovering about, and as the boy approached his sixteenth birthday a few years ago they all wanted his signature so that they could wire Clarence Campbell and get him registered in order that he would become their chattel.

Mr. Cowan: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Fisher: Yes.

Mr. Cowan: I would ask the hon. member for Port Arthur, does he consider a signed document which is an agreement between a player and a hockey team the same as a combine signed by six owners? I made

reference to a combine signed by six owners; I said nothing about players' contracts.

Mr. Fisher: I can see the hon. member's distinction but I was only making the point that they give the impression that the whole thing is a gentlemen's agreement. I think if anyone wants to check on the business of professional sports organizations, he should look at the reserve clause, and if he really wants to look into the situation he should read the reports of the United States House of Representatives committee chaired by Mr. Cellar of a few years ago, before which Clarence Campbell and all the baseball and football magnates appeared and gave evidence.

I just wanted to put that on the record in case someone reading *Hansard* at a later time might wish to pursue the subject.

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, just before you call vote 1 I should like to deal with some of the points raised during the course of this discussion.

In the first place, the hon. member for Port Arthur has spoken at length about the film board and the chairman. As far as I am concerned I do not intend at this stage to defend the film board, which has gone on winning international awards, or Mr. Roberge, who has proven over the years to be a very highly competent administrator and a devoted public servant.

I do not think either that the hon. member has read or carefully studied my speech, in which I said improvements were desirable and that the chairman and members of the board were conscious of this situation. I went on to say, and I think this covers a lot of the points the hon. member has raised, as recorded at page 10084 of *Hansard* of November 13, 1964:

> They have begun a reappraisal of the institution itself and they are reviewing its programs and operations in several fields of activity in the light of current demand of course, but also of its national purpose and the relative importance of the functions assigned to it by parliament.
>
> As an agency at the service of Canada and its people in the fields of information and culture, the board has already decided to strengthen its program for community audiences, and to undertake a survey and analysis of its distribution operations in Canada, with a view to identify and evaluate more precsely its audiences, in relation to their needs and to the purposes the board pursues.

While the present situation may need some improvement, as the hon. member has said, the board is already conscious of the changes that have taken place recently and over the years. It is already aware of new needs, and is trying as fast as it can to meet those new needs.

Mr. Fisher: It is the old needs that I was worried about.

Mr. Lamontagne: The hon. member may have brought his criticisms too late to the board. In any case, I am quite sure the board will be happy at some later stage during the next session, if it is found desirable at that time, to appear before this standing committee on cultural affairs, if we decide to set up such a committee.

Three hon. members have raised the problem regarding the extension of the services of the C.B.C. Of course, as far as alternative service is concerned, there is a freeze at the present time, and this freeze will be maintained until we get the report of the advisory committee.

Where there are no services at the present time, the extension of services is of course a very important matter to those who are not covered. There is, however, a question of priority in the extension of services where they do not exist at the present time, and also a priority in other fields of services.

Mr. Fisher: Like French in Toronto.

Mr. Lamontagne: These decisions were taken a few years ago, as the hon. member is aware. So the whole question of financing, both short and long term, of the C.B.C., is before the Fowler committee at the present time. I am hopeful that we will get its report early in 1965, at which time, when priorities have been determined both by the committee and by the government, I will be happy indeed to give immediate attention in terms of government decision and policy to this important question.

As the hon. member for Churchill has suggested, I am sure the Fowler committee will, as we will, give special consideration to the possibility and desirability of establishing a special grant for this purpose.

I will certainly present the proposals that were made this afternoon by the hon. member for Kootenay West to the national museum and to the film board, in so far as the Columbia river project is concerned. It would be very worth while to try, as much as we can, to save objects of value which are there, and also to record, on film, this great river in its present state.

[*Translation*]

I should now like to say a word about the suggestion made this afternoon by the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm

(Mr. Pigeon) who intimated that the government should, at this time, institute a royal commission on the C.B.C. and broadcasting.

The hon. member must have forgotten that last May 25 I announced on behalf of the government that a three member committee would be asked to look into all aspects of broadcasting. The investigation is now under way. The terms of reference of the committee are very wide and will not be limited in any way. The committee also has unrestricted authority. It is empowered to call as witnesses any organization or individual who is interested in this problem, it can examine briefs and investigate the C.B.C., private stations and the B.B.G. I fail to see what the establishment of a royal commission would add; in my opinion, it would just be duplication.

Mr. Pigeon: Will the committee publish a report?

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, I have already announced that the Fowler committee report would be made public as soon as it has been received by the government.

[*Text*]

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the minister one further question arising out of his remarks about the Fowler commission report. It is my understanding that one of the advantages of having the deputy minister of the Department of the Secretary of State, and having that minister's former executive assistant secretary as members of that small group, not holding open hearings, was so that this report could be obtained quickly and would form the basis of government policy. Is that right?

Mr. Lamontagne: Yes.

Mr. Fisher: I am not interested in whether the report of this commission is published quickly, or immediately made available. The important thing is when the decision is made by this government, and when it will be in a position to lay down new policy guide lines or even legislative changes as a result of the report.

The spectre of waiting for a report in English and French, this sort of coming forth like a royal commission document and then being commented upon across the country is not, it seems to me, what we understood we were going to get from this particular committee.

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, the last time I discussed this with the chairman of the committee he told me he was hoping to have the report completed by the end of March. If this turns out to be so I am sure it will give ample time to the government to make up its own mind and to present legislation at a fairly early stage of the 1965 session.

Mr. Barnett: In relation to the question just raised by the hon. member for Port Arthur and having regard to his earlier remarks concerning the establishment of priorities in the extension of service to areas not now served, I should like to ask the minister whether this means that no government action on this question can be contemplated until March? I might say to the minister that it is only through exercising considerable self-discipline that I for one, and I imagine quite a number of other members who are in a similar situation, have refrained from commenting or raising questions at length on this subject. Many of us have experienced the frustrations referred to by the member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, I suppose that this is unavoidable. I think the government has not lost any time in this field. When we came into office we felt very strongly that we needed a new look at the whole field of broadcasting. We certainly needed a new look at the whole problem of short term and long term financing of the C.B.C., especially in view of the new need for consolidation projects in Montreal, Toronto and elsewhere. As was made quite clear this afternoon, there are limits to the activities of the C.B.C. and there are limits to the amount of money that parliament can provide to the corporation for the whole of its operations. It seems to me that the Fowler committee should have the chance to look at all the new needs that the C.B.C. will face very shortly in order to decide some order of priorities among those different needs. It seems to me it would be relatively unwise as far as we are concerned to proceed at the present time without a general plan.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, the minister just said that there are limits to the money that the government can supply to the C.B.C. I should like to ask him whether at $100 million for the current year we are anywhere near the limit?

Mr. Lamontagne: This is not for me to say, Mr. Chairman. This answer will be provided by parliament.

Mr. Fisher: After listening to that answer all I should like to say to the hon. member for York-Humber is that I hope he knows

more about what parliament means than I do. I should like to ask the minister this question. As I understand the timing of things, the budget of the C.B.C. for next year has been approved and has gone through treasury board very recently. I understand it is done every fall. Can the minister now give any indication whether there is any flexibility in that budget in order to allow for more extension of services next year rather than putting a lot of money into the Montreal and Toronto white elephants that the corporation wants to erect?

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, I will certainly look into this matter very carefully. As the hon. member knows, there are some delays in proceeding now with these consolidation projects and perhaps this will leave some money available for this other very desirable purpose. The budget of the C.B.C. has not yet been considered and approved by treasury board.

Mr. Barnett: In connection with a question I raised earlier I should like to remind the minister that some of us were members of the house when the earlier Fowler commission report was tabled and we had high hopes then of seeing some action. I think he can appreciate the impatience that a great many of the people who have not so far had the benefit of any services at all feel about the long and frustrating delay in being able to participate in the benefits of our public broadcasting service.

Mr. Lamontagne: As I have just said, we will do our best to reconsider this matter in the light of the delays in the realization of the consolidation projects.

Item agreed to.

BOARD OF BROADCAST GOVERNORS

1. Salaries and other expenses, $374,300.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question about the board of broadcast governors. I understand Mr. Stewart has sent notice of his intention to resign from his position. I have had a private member's public bill on the order paper, the intent of which is to force the government to give notice to those people whose appointments are not going to be renewed. Following that up and being consistent it is only fair that I should ask the minister whether the government has given any notice of its intention to renew or not to renew the appointments of the other two permanent members of the board of broadcast governors, aside from Dr. Andrew Stewart?

Mr. Lamontagne: No, Mr. Chairman. There is only one other member whose term expires next year, and we will certainly want to look at the Fowler report before making a decision.

Mr. Fisher: I would not think that the Fowler report would pass judgment on his capabilities, but I would ask the minister to please give the man adequate notice if the government is not going to reappoint him.

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what will be in the report in so far as the board of broadcast governors is concerned.

Item agreed to.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF CANADA

1. Administration, operation and maintenance, including the payment of $243,000 to the national gallery purchase account for the purpose of acquiring works of art in conformity with section 8 of the National Gallery Act, and grants as detailed in the estimates, $1,297,000.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, I have one question on the national gallery of Canada. Is there any intention at present or are there any plans under way to find a replacement for the present head of the national gallery?

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, as I said in my speech about 10 days ago, the government is now preparing new legislation to improve the status of the gallery and if and when this legislation is approved by parliament we will then have to consider making appointments.

Item agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: This completes the estimates of the Department of Secretary of State.

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Chairman, there is still another agency. Before the house made this new agreement about consideration of estimates I had proposed when I first spoke on the estimates of my department that I would make three separate statements, one on the department itself and a few other agencies, a second one on the so-called cultural institutions and a third one on the centennial commission. If the committee is ready to consider the votes for the centennial commission, which are included in the privy council estimates, I would be at the disposal of the committee. Otherwise this might be postponed until we come to the privy council item.

Mr. McIlraith: Carried.

Mr. Fisher: Is the house leader asking for the item to be carried? I would appreciate it if it could be postponed because I have a couple of colleagues who, I think, want to speak upon it. I would not want it to go through at 7.30 when they were not here.

Mr. Lamontagne: The only difficulty, Mr. Chairman, is that I have to be out of town tomorrow and Thursday, precisely for the purpose of preparing for the centennial. I have to be in Toronto for a meeting of the national committee on the centennial, but I would be back on Friday and would be at the disposal of the committee at that time.

Mr. Fisher: Friday would be a good day; you would be fresh.

The Deputy Chairman: Vote No. 20, privy council, centennial commission.

Mr. Fisher: Stand until Friday.

Mr. Barnett: This might be a good time, Mr. Chairman, for you to notice that it is six o'clock.

The Deputy Chairman: It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Indian Affairs—

15. Administration, operation and maintenance including expenditures on works on other than federal property, grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, recoverable expenditures under agreements entered into with the approval of the governor in council with the governments of the provinces and territories and with local school boards in respect of social assistance to persons residing on Indian reserves other than Indians and the education in Indian schools of children other than Indian children, and to authorize the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to provide, in respect of Indian commercial activities, for the instruction and supervision of Indians, the furnishing of materials, the purchase of finished goods and, notwithstanding any other act, the sale of such finished goods, $47,742,400.

Mr. Barnett: At the outset I would like to inquire of the leader of the house as to the whereabouts of the minister.

Mr. McIlraith: He is coming, he is right here.

Mr. Barnett: We have reached a stage in the discussion of the estimates when some of us would like to ask questions of the minister rather than indulge in lengthy remarks. Having been in the chamber at 7.30—

An hon. Member: Here is the minister.

Mr. Barnett: —I felt we were getting into the position of having to deal with members of the government in relays. For that reason it may be a little difficult for us to bowl them down when they come in refreshed after a more extended recess than most of us had.

I have been trying to assemble the various pieces of material which I got ready on a number of previous occasions in the hope of making a few remarks and addressing some questions to the minister on the estimates of the Indian affairs branch. I listened with a great deal of attention to the minister's speech upon the administration of the branch. I do not recall everything he said, perhaps even he may not, but on listening to his remarks I got the impression that what he was suggesting as a program to meet the needs of Canadian Indians had a familiar ring. This led me to do some research on earlier discussions which took place in the house on this subject, particularly with respect to recommendations from parliamentary committees.

In this connection I would like to draw the minister's attention to one of the recommendations in the report of the 1948 joint committee on Indian affairs, a recommendation which was not included among his recent proposals. It is to be found at page 189 of the minutes and proceedings of that committee, and is a recommendation to the house:

> Your committee recommends that the rules of the House of Commons be amended to provide for the appointment of a select standing committee on Indian affairs.

I am firmly of the opinion that it would have been the better part of wisdom had this recommendation been acted upon long ago, so that now we would have the machinery through which to give regular consideration to the problems faced by our Indian people. I hope the minister will consider these recommendations made by our predecessors in this house in 1948.

I find there were some other recommendations made by that 1948 committee which closely resemble the subject matter of the speech made by the minister when he introduced his estimates. For example, again on page 189, the committee had this to say:

> Your committee therefore recommends that the government consider the desirability of placing on the agenda of the next dominion-provincial con-

ference, for consideration by the provinces, the following matters: education; health and social services, fur conservation and development and Indian traplines; provincial fish and game laws; provincial liquor legislation; validity of marriages solemnized by Indians.

The year 1948 was not the last year in which a committee of the house and the Senate met. In the report of the 1961 committee we find the following recommendation on the subject of health and welfare. It is recommendation No. 6.

(a) The question of transferring health services for Indians to the provinces should be discussed at a dominion-provincial conference, but the present health program should be continued and extended until such time as this can be accomplished.

(b) Provincial welfare legislation and services should be used for the benefit of the Indian population.

And so on. So in 1948 and 1961 we find committees putting forward proposals very much along the lines of those made by the minister in his speech introducing the estimates of the Indian affairs branch. I point this out to remind the hon. gentleman that a few months ago I did suggest in a speech made in this chamber that what we really require is a crash program. I am certainly not placing upon the shoulders of the present minister responsibility for the fact that the recommendations of the 1948 and the 1960-61 committee have not been implemented—they are still in the discussion stage at dominion-provincial conferences, and in secret, as my hon. friend from Skeena pointed out. Nevertheless I believe the hon. gentleman has very little time in which to do the things he is talking about.

Some of the modest increases proposed in certain items of the estimates of the branch are in the right direction. The proposal for a community development program, while extremely modest and, in my opinion, inadequate in its scale, is nevertheless a move of the right kind. I hope the minister can offer some explanation of the relationship between one aspect of these estimates and one of the statements he made in the course of his speech. The minister said, and I quote his words, that we shall need to considerably strengthen the branch staff in this field. I have tried to understand the estimates as laid out in detail, and as far as I can see the total increase in the establishment of the department for which provision is made is in the order of two or three persons out of a total of more than 600. Can the minister explain to us the relation between the proposal in these estimates to provide for wages and salaries showing little increase as against past years with his opening remarks to the effect that there is a need to considerably strengthen branch staff? Does the minister believe that the provision of two or three people represents a considerable increase in the staff of the branch? Depending on the kind of answer the minister has to give me to this question, I may or may not have further questions to put to him later in this regard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: I think this is a good opportunity to comment on the many remarks made last Friday by some hon. members about the administration of Indian affairs.

Of course, I will not have enough time to discuss in full detail the particular problems raised by those who took part in the debate so far, but I feel that I should give explanations on a number of general problems which have been raised, especially by the hon. members for Skeena (Mr. Howard), Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher) and Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett).

First of all, I would like to deal with what was called the transfer of jurisdiction as proposed by the government, that is, the transfer of the jurisdiction to the provincial authorities.

I only wish to state once more what I often said in this house—and this for the information of the committee—that at no time did the present government consider transferring this administration or jurisdiction to the various provinces. Even if this government considered such a transfer of jurisdiction, it would be totally illegal because under the constitution at it exists, no power reserved to the central government or to a provincial government may be transferred to another level of administration, since such a measure on the part of the central government or of the government of a province would be declared ultra vires, that is, overstepping the powers to them granted by the constitution. Therefore, the central government cannot transfer its jurisdiction respecting Indian affairs to a provincial government.

Second, the federal government would act against the constitution which gave the central government the power to legislate respecting Indian affairs, and I believe that in certain cases it would be contrary to the powers which were assumed by the crown when it signed treaties with the Indians, to transfer certain powers respecting Indian affairs, to the provinces which, in the opinion of some persons, could fulfil, better than

the central government, those responsibilities toward the Indians.

But there are other reasons beside the traditional respect of the central government for the constitution, in regard to its obligations towards the Indians. The federal government is aware that it has a duty, a responsibility to all the Indians in this country, that is to help them to reach the goal everybody is looking forward to, namely the complete independence and control of their own affairs.

I feel that all Canadians wish that before the centennial of confederation, all the Indians in this country will be able to enjoy, as soon as possible, all the privileges and advantages the other Canadians now enjoy. Then those Indians will be able to say proudly: We belong to this Canadian nation, to this Canadian confederation the centennial of which we are going to celebrate in 1967.

It is because we are conscious of that task that we do not want, for any reason whatever, to give up the powers granted to us by the constitution and which, as I said earlier, are sanctioned by several treaties with regard to the Indians in our country.

But that having been said, and in view of the fact that we are conscious that the Indians themselves, in various numbers, are anxious to benefit like the other Canadian citizens from some services now provided by the provinces, it was thought that the time had come to submit both to the provinces and the Indians the project dealing with the extension of some provincial services to the Indians who wanted them. That gave rise to the idea of holding a federal-provincial conference on Indian affairs.

As you know, that same matter had been discussed by a committee which sat last fall, at the time of the federal-provincial conference on fiscal matters, and after a debate within that committee, the wish had been expressed to hold a full federal-provincial conference to deal only with problems related to Indian affairs.

As we know, this conference had originally been planned for last May but, for various reasons, it was postponed until fall. We were very happy to welcome to Ottawa the delegates from the various provinces to discuss with them, not the problem of the transfer of jurisdiction, but the attitude of the various provincial governments toward the Indians' problems.

I know some delegates suggested that we invite the Indians themselves to this conference, inasmuch as problems concerning them directly were to be discussed. We all know that the conference was held without any Indians being present, and as I have already said to the house, the government did not wish to invite the Indians to this conference, for the following reasons:

That conference, of course, was not held to make any decisions with regard to any program which might affect Indians, and this is so true that the problem of consultation was put as first item on the agenda of the conference. We were, indeed, very much aware that any change, even with regard to the so-called extension of provincial services, would have to be submitted to the Indians in the first place, and that it would not be advisable for the federal government to conclude an agreement with any province, or to introduce a system which would apply within the country, without the Indians having been consulted and having stated their position, even as to the details of each program.

That is why the consultation principle was put as first item on the agenda.

What was the result of this conference, from the point of view of consultation? We decided, we of the federal government—and the provinces agreed—that from now on systematic consultations should be held in Canada with the Indians; that it did not suffice to greet a group of Indians to be able to say: The country's Indians accept this or that program, this or that legislation. There was going to be, for the first time in Canada, what has been called a consultative organization. I know Indians have appeared, singly, in groups or in bands, before the joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on Indian affairs.

I know also that through our officials the Indians could express their wishes and claims to the department or to the government. But everyone deplored the fact that there was not in Canada a system under which the Indians could regularly, especially in connection with the details of the programs, express their views and wishes.

The central government and the provinces agreed unanimously on the need for consultation with the Indians and recognized two principles in that respect.

First, that consultation must start at the level of the Indians themselves, that is to say that the Indians, wherever they live in the country, whatever tribe they belong to, whatever ethnic community they may belong to, must be able, through duly selected representatives, to express to the central govern-

ment or to a provincial government, if need be, their wishes, complaints and opposition.

Therefore, consultation among all the Indians was the first principle. But, as I have already said in this house, that consultation would be related to the second point which I will develop later on.

That consultation would take place at the regional level or, as it were at the provincial level, but in regard to Indian affairs, we always refer to regions that correspond approximately to provincial boundaries.

Regardless of the recommendation of the consultation given by the Indians and their representative in this form, it was recognized that no decision could be forced on any particular band. Therefore, a new level of consultation was needed—a more traditional one —the council of the band which retains its right to reject or accept any provision which might apply within the area or the province.

Therefore, those two kinds of consultations have been accepted in a general way by the central government, which told the provinces: With you, if you wish, or alone, we shall, in each area of this country, establish Indian advisory committees to which every problem of importance in respect of Indian affairs will be submitted. You will give your advice to the government and decisions will be made in the light of those consultations. But this consultation will not necessarily be binding on all bands in the territory, which shall remain free individually. In other words, these bands will remain free to accept this consultation or this decision of the majority of the Indians in the area, or to accept a special status.

It is because we wanted the provinces to express their views on the principle of consultation that we thought—and that is one reason—that a federal-provincial conference at government level should be held before submitting any program directly to the Indians.

The second principle was that nothing should be done concerning Indian affairs without preliminary discussions with the Indians themselves and with the provinces concerned about the problems which could arise by extending provincial services. One of the conclusions reached was that everything that had been discussed at the conference should be reconsidered at a conference with the Indians, in every region in the country. I think I am now answering the hon. member for Skeena who was concerned about the Indians having to decide on some programs without knowing what stand would be taken in that connection by the province in which they lived, since Indians did not attend the federal-provincial conference.

But since the conference recognized the principle whereby there would be consultations at the regional level and the provinces themselves, jointly with the federal government, would have to submit to the Indians their views on extension of education, welfare, health and community development services, precisely because that consultation with the Indians was to be held at the regional level, it would be at that level that the program in which the central government and the provincial governments were interested would be submitted to the Indians.

Therefore, that is another reason why the Indians were not called upon to attend this conference whose purpose was merely to support the principle whereby, there would be submitted, at the regional level, any particular program which would show some degree of flexibility in relation to other programs which could be established in other regions of the country.

You may say that some financial problems were on the agenda of that conference. That is true, but it was merely in order to ascertain the reactions of the provinces concerning what could happen in a certain district should a special educational or welfare service be extended to the Indians, how the provinces could participate in those programs, and what financial problems would arise should such services be extended.

In the other fields, there was merely an exchange of ideas, and those discussions will be resumed at the level of each and every province and region.

Hence, it can be said that this federal-provincial conference on Indians was merely a first step, a precedent in the frank and open discussion between, on the one hand, the central government which has full responsibility over Indian affairs, and the provinces which, through the school boards or municipalities, are already engaged in the extension of some Indian services, and that gives rise to some problems.

It was immediately realized that it was necessary for those provinces to make their reactions known so far as the financial aspects of that conference were concerned.

That is the story of the federal-provincial conference which, in my opinion and in the opinion of most of the participants, was a success. It resulted in two major effects: a consultation system was set up, and it was

recognized as a principle that a general service extension plan could not be established in this country, but that there had to be a particular agreement with each province, after consultation with the Indians of that province, who would be consulted collectively and, after that, individually, within each band.

A second general point which was raised during the discussion on Indian affairs estimates is the problem of the Indian claims commission. I merely want to say this: even if the government was blamed for proceeding slowly with the establishment of that commission, I am not so much concerned with that criticism, because the delay is the result of a systematic consultation, of course not with the same methods which will be used in the future, but a consultation which was carried on by mail. My predecessor had sent at that time letters to all the provinces, to all Indian associations in the country, to all Indian bands, asking them for their comments on Bill No. C-130 which had already been tabled in the House of Commons and was in relation to the setting up of an Indian claims commission. It would have taken a lot of time for each and every one of those Indian groups to start working seriously, to study the aspects of that legislation and after that systematic work, we began receiving briefs and recommendations.

There are hundreds of briefs, some much more elaborate than others, but we made a systematic study of all those briefs and recommendations.

Following that study, we have now brought a certain number of reforms or amendments to Bill No. C-130 regarding Indian claims. We hope that very soon we shall be in a position to bring before the house a bill to amend Indian claims.

Those were, Mr. Chairman, the two main points brought up during the examination of my estimates, first, the federal-provincial conference and the whole problem of consultation with the Indians and, second, the problem of Indian claims.

I realize that other points have been raised by various hon. members. I would be very glad to send my comments to each of them individually on the points they raised while discussing my estimates.

[*Text*]

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the minister's statement on the two points with which he dealt, namely the federal-provincial conference and the matter of services being provided under arrangement with the provinces. I fully agree with him that this is a matter which has to be dealt with on a regional basis or among the Indians within each province. Therefore I will confine any questions I have on this aspect of his remarks to my own province of British Columbia.

I think I can say without fear of being contradicted by any of my Indian friends that there is a generally accepted desire among the Indian people in the coastal region of British Columbia to be treated the same as any other citizens of the province in respect of services such as education, health and welfare and so on. Can the minister tell me what the attitude of the government of the province of British Columbia was? Is he in a position to say whether that government is prepared to enter into a suitable arrangement or whether a suitable arrangement has already been worked out with the provincial government in respect of the provision of these services if, as a result of further consultations which the minister indicated will take place provincially, the Indian people themselves confirm what I feel to be their desire to have these services rendered under some more direct form of provincial administration?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, no general program was set up at that federal-provincial conference, neither for the whole of Canada nor for any particular province.

I do not have the right, of course, to disclose the stand taken by each of the provinces, but what matters most is not so much what a province's representatives might have said at that conference but what will be said when the provinces and the central government meet and the provinces express their views. That is when a particular program, for British Columbia for instance, can be submitted to the Indians in British Columbia and a consultation can take place with the Indians of that province.

I think it is in keeping with the general spirit of the federal-provincial conference to wait until those conferences and consultations have been held at the provincial level to really know what particular programs will be submitted to the Indians in each of the provinces.

[*Text*]

Mr. Barnett: Can the minister tell me whether a date has been set or a timetable has been arranged for the conference between

the Indian people of British Columbia and the federal and provincial authorities?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: It is extremely difficult to set up a schedule. We intend to set the dates as soon as possible for consultations with the provinces throughout Canada, but I do not know when we can discuss the problem with British Columbia. However, I trust it will be soon, because we are anxious to have consultations with the Indians.

[*Text*]

Mr. Barnett: In the light of my earlier references to some of the things recommended in committee reports, I should at least like the minister to tie this down by saying whether these conferences are going to take place within six weeks, six months or six years.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: If all goes well, Mr. Chairman, we should hold all these conferences in the spring. I do not know exactly when, but the plans have been drawn up. My officials tell me that plans have been made for these consultations to be held as early as possible, and this means in the spring.

[*Text*]

Mr. Barnett: I suggest to the minister that he should adopt the slogan of the Minister of Labour, "Why wait for spring, do it now". I should like to ask the minister whether a report from British Columbia I read recently is correct. I understand an announcement was made by the Indian commissioner for British Columbia that effective on January 1, 1965, welfare payments to the Indian people of that province who require such assistance would be made by the Indian affairs branch on the same levels as payments now being made by the welfare department of the province of British Columbia. With relation to that announcement I was wondering whether this had anything to do with the imminence of a particular arrangement with the province in the general welfare field.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, I am told that in British Columbia, it is hoped to be able very soon to bring the welfare payments to the Indians up to the level of the welfare payments that are now being paid to the other citizens of British Columbia.

This is in accordance with another principle which it is our intention to apply, that is, that the welfare payments in any province be the same in the case of the Indians as in the case of the other citizens of that province, with this provision that in none of the provinces should the welfare payments be lower than they are now.

[*Text*]

Mr. Barnett: Is this provision contained in the estimates now before us? I read the announcement about the same time that the latest supplementary estimates were tabled and I looked for an item in those estimates but did not see one. Is there already provision in the estimates we are discussing?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Chairman—

[*Text*]

Mr. Kindt: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration confined his remarks to the federal-provincial conference and the claims commission as if those two items covered all the problems of the Indian people. I want to say a word or two about the problems of the 5,000 to 8,000 Indians on five reserves in my riding. I rise in my place because I feel I have a duty to these people and so far the minister—I should like to have his attention—has not given any intimation whatsoever as to what his department intends to do with regard to a program on the reserve for these people.

What are the problems that should be solved? On these reserves you will find that the Indians do not have any feeling of ownership. In turn they are not given an incentive, as white people are under our free enterprise system, to go out and earn and save their money. If we are going to start to solve the problems of these Indians on reserves we have to introduce a system of farm management to deal with the problems that exist there. You have to give these people a feeling of ownership and the feeling that when they work on the land on their reserves they will have something to show for their efforts. At the present time no program has been worked out by the department.

I want to congratulate the minister on promoting Mr. Battle to the position of head of Indian affairs. He is a very fine man and I wish to congratulate the minister on having made that appointment. But at the same time, without encouragement from the minister, without encouragement from the top, even Mr. Battle will not be able to put measures into effect that will give the Indian the incentive to put his best foot forward and give him

the feeling that he is operating under a free enterprise system. As it now stands, it is apparently a socialist system, a 100 per cent communist system, on each one of these reserves. This is where the problem arises. I wonder if the minister has thought through this problem? I wonder if the members of his department have gone into these reserves and thought about these things from the point of view from which the Indian is forced to think of them? Many people criticize the Indian and say he is shiftless; that he will not take care of his affairs; that he will not put his best foot forward. This is not true; if he had the incentive to do it, he would. Put any white man in the same position as an Indian, and he will not do any better than the Indian. The white people who are governing these Indians, who are controlling them or guiding them, are not providing proper leadership.

What I am trying to say to you is to think about this problem and adopt a constructive program to deal with it. I have heard nothing from the minister that would lead me to believe he has any program in mind along the lines which I consider to be most vital for the solution of these problems. There is the whole problem of schools, education and health. You can lump them all together, if you wish. Certainly, if you are familiar with the Indians you will know that they want a square deal in connection with education, health and other problems. I do not believe they are getting it now. There is just too much squalor and all the rest of it on these reserves.

We can go ahead and double the foreign aid program for the minister of external affairs; I have no objection to that if we can stand it financially. At the same time, however, I believe that our aid should start at home with our own people, the Indians and the Eskimos. I notice that this vote is around $60 million or $70 million. Our foreign aid for this last year was jumped by more than $75 million. Why could not more money be put toward taking care of our Indians and Eskimos and less for the people in foreign fields? It is all well and good to do this, but there has been a strong minister of external affairs who had the ear of the treasury board or somebody and so has been able to get a doubling of his foreign aid program. What is the justification for it in relation to the requirements of these Indians? I say to the minister who is listening to me that this Indian appropriation is the vote that should be doubled under which more services should be given to our Indians. Let us cut foreign aid programs unless we can afford to do both.

I do not want to take up any more of the time of the committee, Mr. Chairman, but I did want to put my own views on the record. I hope the minister will give consideration to the type of program which he intends to implement on these reserves and start from first principles, that is the problems of the Indians and how those problems are going to be solved.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, the other day I introduced the subject which I thought was the No. 1 problem of the Indians, one of which we are not proud, and that is alcoholism and drunkenness. Shortly after that time I was speaking to the hon. member for Athabasca and he suggested to me that this is just a symptom, not really a cause of anything. I understand his reasoning very well. You only have to look at the difficulties created by alcoholism in our own society, where almost any community has an organization of alcoholics anonymous and in most larger towns and cities in eastern Ontario we have an office of the alcoholic research foundation spreading information and prepared to give assistance right up to psychiatric assistance to people who are suffering from alcoholism. I think most people in the educational realm are worried about the problem.

Recently I have been deluged by letters, as I am sure other members have, from people who are concerned about the promotion of alcohol and the amount of advertising on television, particularly in connection with beer. The whole content of this advertising seems to be to make drinking a kind of fun thing, an okay thing to do, a thing at which athletes and socially prominent or worthwhile people in the community spend their time. This is an aspect of the problem of drinking as it affects our society in the main, and our record is nothing of which we can be proud. I think we know enough about our own situation as it exists on parliament hill to realize that very few of us are in a position or have the sort of clearcut integrity to be our brother's keeper in this particular regard.

But I come back to the problem as simply and as bluntly as I can. Except for the Indians in the north who are nomadic and who are unable to get to substantial sources of drink, who have not yet developed skills in brewing their own, the largest single difficulty we encounter in northwestern Ontario with the Indian problem is drinking. Now, whether it is a symptom of their dissociation from our society and our culture, whether it indicates bad treatment on our part, this re-

mains the central problem. The thing that bothers me is that you can go through the estimates and you can find $84,000 for burying destitute Indians who have died; you can look, and I have looked at every bit of publicity I can find that ever came out of the department at various times, and all you get are comments that touch on this matter peripherally.

I think it all comes down to the fact that we are embarrassed to talk about the subject. We are embarrassed when talking about it to our Indian friends. I admit the very same weakness. I remember going to one band and taking notes of a meeting that lasted for about five hours. I got 60 different grievances. Later, when I had these grievances explained to me, and they covered the whole range from the fact that an illegitimate child was not registered within the band to the fact that somebody could not get unemployment insurance or the welfare allowance was not big enough, I found that in case after case the grievance hinged on the fact that there was too much drinking in a family and, as happens repeatedly, a child had been left inadequately cared for and drink was at the root of it.

Just recently a young friend of mine who is a children's aid worker and who is studying for the ministry, a very able boy and not a sissy by any means, because he has been an excellent football player, landed into a reserve to check on a couple of children. The children's aid were concerned about whether or not they were getting the proper care. He found the child, less than a year old, just a mass of scabs, with maggots around in the bed and no responsible adult taking care of it—just a couple of children. Where were the parents? They had gone out on a drunk in town, and they had taken it too far and had been thrown in jail.

This is not an isolated thing. I am not talking about something that happens once every week or once every month. The minister and his officials should be aware—the men on the local scene are—that this is constant among almost every Indian group in northwestern Ontario, and one of my colleagues from B.C. tells me it is the greatest single problem there.

The very least one could ask is that the department should have some analysis and appreciation of the problem. It is an extremely difficult one and should be faced up to. We need to have some advice from the alcoholic research foundation of the provincial government. We need some advice from a group such as Alcoholics Anonymous to see if they have any suggestion about how their particular method of meeting this problem might be translated into the reserves and the Indian situation in general.

I do not expect any thorough or complete answer from the minister. All I ask is that he accept that this is a major problem and that he give some indication the branch is prepared to do some studies on it. From the number of papers that are presented I know we have anthropologists and sociologists working on many problems. In fact I remember reading a most interesting study dealing with a comparison of the Indian community and Eskimo community up at the mouth of the Mackenzie river, and with the social attitudes and responsibilities of both. I was most impressed with the kind of analysis conducted by the man who made that study. It is people such as that who must go into some of these band and tribe situations and see whether it might be possible, working with the Indians themselves, to get some kind of movement towards temperance, or to achieve at least a realization that alcoholism and over drinking, bootlegging and home brewing are some of the worst factors in demoralizing and ruining the situation as it exists at present.

One of the really tragic parts of this concerns individual reserves comprised of a couple of hundred people, who send 20 or 25 of their children away to boarding schools for example at Fort William or Spanish. When the kids move away they get discipline. They are set within some kind of ideal and a philosophy, usually a religious philosophy. Their care is complete and I have no complaints about it. But at the end of the school year the kids go back to the band and quite often the first thing they see in their homes, which are mostly shacks, is a can on the stove with a bunch of yeast, raisins and sugar brewing away. They return into an atmosphere where the biggest worth-while thing the adults can think of is to go on a rollicking drunk on Saturday night.

Hon. members may say I am exaggerating the situation. Maybe the minister and his officials think so and, if they do, I am prepared to take them on a tour through my area, to talk to some of the Indians and to some of the people who work with them, who can confirm that this is the situation. I finally reached the stage a few weeks ago of feeling there was no use ignoring it any longer. I felt that any time an Indian band brought a problem to me that touched on welfare or jobs, one of the great dilemmas I had to face

was this whole question about drinking and the irresponsibility which it engendered.

There are a couple of good communities in my area. I know some of the Indians at Pickle Crow gold mines who have fitted in very well there, and my information is that they are good employees and are worth-while people in the community in the sense of total responsibility. I know that at Heron Bay the Ontario Paper Company for a number of years has encouraged men of the tribe to work on the flume where the logs go shooting down to the shore of lake Superior for delivery. The company has turned up a number of good workers and this has had a considerable effect on the reserve.

If one looks at that particular reserve and its housing, where the same basic provisions apply as over at the other side of lake Nipigon, it can be seen that band has a much higher standard in home furnishings and the kind of material comforts that tend to mean so much to all of us. They also have a higher attitude toward education for their children. I know economic opportunity also fits into this, but too often it is brought to ruin by drinking, and by the fact that too often in our bush communities the Indians live on the periphery, and their touching point with white society is usually in the noisiest of beer parlours or at the bootleggers.

I am not going to deal further with this particular point. I insist it is the most serious problem I know of in connection with the Indians. We have to face it openly and we must ask many of the Indians to face it openly.

Another point I want to touch on with the minister relates to the Department of Industry and the Department of Labour. We have designated areas to which special tax incentives are given, depending on whether a particular area qualifies under a formula, worked out by the Department of Labour, based on its unemployment statistics. The minister may be aware that most of the Indians in northwestern Ontario are not on the unemployment rolls or unemployment statistics. They just do not figure in the majority of them. Therefore they do not play any substantial part in determining whether the unemployment statistics are up or down.

This becomes important when you get into a situation such as one in my riding where there are two Indian reserves adjacent to the village of Longlac. A large United States plywood concern has expressed interest in establishing in that community, but of course it is looking around at other places where it would have the advantage of a designated area tax incentive. Longlac has been seeking to see if it can qualify as a designated area but it finds that although it has serious unemployment, particularly among Indians, the formula has been determined in the main by the unemployment and employment statistics of the cities of Port Arthur and Fort William, 180 miles away. This is obviously unfair because the lakehead unemployment and employment situation is not a reflection of the situation at Longlac.

I understand the Department of Industry has been inflexible on this matter. I have talked about it to people in the department of economic planning and development of the provincial government, who say that three times they have raised this issue strongly with the federal government and got nowhere. I ask the minister to look at the situation closely as it applies to the community of Longlac because that plywood mill, if it should be established there, would mean much employment for the Indians on those two reserves.

I mention this in particular because a few of the Indians on those reserves have regular employment with the sawmill that is run by the Kimberly-Clark Pulp and Paper Company. This may seem to be an isolated problem, but it opens up one of the difficulties about economic development. We have a whole host of agencies involved in this, federal and provincial, but it seems to me it is very difficult to get any co-ordination or co-operation.

The last point I want to touch on relates to members of parliament who have a considerable number of Indians in their constituencies. It is apparent to me that despite the general interest each of us has in the Indian problem, there are no more than 20 or 25 members who have a substantial number of Indians in their constituencies and who get these problems brought to them in great detail. Offhand I can think of the hon. member for White Bay-Grand Falls-Labrador, the hon. member for Churchill, the hon. member for Skeena, the hon. member for Fort William, the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River and so on; but the number is not large.

I suggest one of the things we might do, in order to achieve a closer understanding on our part of the branch's problems, is that the minister arrange some kind of informal meetings, possibly a special informal committee, that could get together on several occasions during a year and have a rundown from the officials of the branch on Indian problems. It seems to me this would save considerable time for us when we come to consider these

matters in the house. It would also assist us greatly in our understanding of what is developing. Some may say: Is it not the responsibility of the member to deal with the branch? But I could be writing or telephoning the branch almost every day in connection with Indian matters, and one is engaged in a great many things. It seems to me that this special effort should be considered by the branch in order to keep us better informed.

Another thing I should appreciate as a member with a considerable number of Indians in his constituency would be a copy, at least several times a year, of any major decision taken in connection with the Indians in the region in which I am most interested. I am not pressing for any secret information or for any internal memoranda. What I have in mind is information regarding the appointment of officials to various posts, the extension of areas of authority, the development of a winter works program or of a woodcutting program on a particular reserve. It seems to me that information of this kind should be given to us almost automatically. I do not think it would involve a great deal of trouble or time and it would certainly serve to remind us that we are, or should be, closely in touch with Indian matters.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Chairman, before we take up another item I should like to come back to an extremely important point mentioned by the hon. members for Macleod (Mr. Kindt) and Skeena (Mr. Howard) last Thursday. They made a comparison between the estimates of Indian affairs and the estimates of the assistance to underdeveloped countries.

I think that the question asked by the hon. member for Macleod is a very good introduction to the program I announced in the house, namely the community development program concerning the Indians.

I think that to increase indefinitely the amount of money allocated for the various Indian reserves in the country is not the proper solution. All those who have experience in Indian matters and all hon. members who have followed closely the development of their reserves, in their own ridings, know very well that even if the government were to decide tomorrow to double the amount allocated for the the Indian reserves in the country, that would be no solution to the Indian problems that every hon. member is facing, no matter where they sit in the House of Commons. That solution was already found, not by us, but by all those who experimented with what is called community development, which means that when one group has problems, in some society, the best way to solve that problem is to make them realize that they must themselves take a good look at their situation to find a way to improve their own lot. That is the experience we are trying to apply in the development of Indian affairs.

The amount of $3,500,000 may seem little, but we must not forget that the amount will be used to pay the salaries of community development experts. The regular expenditures for Indians will appear in the estimates already before the committee and they amount to some $60 million.

I believe that with $60 million much can be achieved for the Indians, especially if this amount is increased by a special budget of $3,500,000 for community development to be spread over a period of three years.

Specialists could be hired to help the Indians examine their position and devise means of improving their lot. After the Indians have studied their problems and drafted programs to their convenience and in conformity with their wishes, then the amounts that can be allocated to them will be useful and will allow them, on a long term basis, to develop their own initiative and assume their normal rank in the Canadian society.

This amount of $3,500,000 seems small, but it will allow us—according to the experiments conducted by our own department at the provincial level and by other countries—to eventually solve the problems facing the Indians.

I just want to say a word about the extremely important problem raised by the hon. member for Port Arthur. I refer to alcoholism in our country's Indian territories. I should like to tell the hon. member that we are greatly concerned about this matter. We are anxiously awaiting a report from the Ontario body which has been studying this problem for approximately four years and which is called the alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation of Ontario. We hope it will soon be in a position to submit a report to us on that subject.

On the other hand, we are doing all we can to provide Indian services with specialists on all the problems of alcoholism one could find on the Indian reserves. Such specialists would be of great use to us.

Now, a suggestion was made by the hon. member for Port Arthur, namely to set up a committee made up of members having a

large number of Indians in their ridings to discuss administrative problems with the officials of the Indian affairs branch.

My assistant deputy minister, the director of the Indian affairs branch, tells me that he would be very happy to co-operate with all hon. members of the house and to give them information beforehand—since that is another point raised by the hon. member for Port Arthur—about all the new programs that might deal with the country's Indian affairs.

[*Text*]

Mr. Cadieu (Meadow Lake): As another member who has a large number of Indian reserves in his riding I, too, am deeply interested in this subject, particularly in the educational aspect.

I well recall that back in 1958 hundreds of Indian boys and girls in my constituency did not have the opportunity to attend school at all. I am pleased to say that in 1963, however, there was not one Indian boy or girl in my constituency who was not reasonably near a school. I am happy to find we have succeeded in reaching these children. However, in some cases there is great difficulty in getting these children to school. Great strides have been taken in connection with the integration of schools which are now providing instruction both for Indian children and for others. This was a wonderful step forward. But there is great difficulty in securing transportation to schools on the reserves themselves. Buses have to be provided by the Indian affairs branch, and great difficulty has arisen in this connection. I also found great progress in the integration of the Indians in our public schools.

One great disadvantage to the Indians is that in some parts of the north we are taking away their livelihood and have failed to provide alternative provision for them, such as fishing, trapping and hunting. We have taken such a large portion of this activity away from them with our tourist trade and we have not made alternative provision for them. Therefore the Indians find it very difficult to make a living. I realize we have increased three times the number of houses on Indian reservations but we have not gone nearly far enough. I also realize it is a great problem. I admit we have made great strides to increase the number of houses, but we have only scratched the surface of the problem.

I also found in the southern part of my constituency that the Indian population which has a chance to farm or to raise livestock are willing in this day and age to go ahead with this activity, but we have only made a start in this direction. One speaker mentioned the Colombo plan, and I am sure we could do much more by way of providing equipment and encouraging these people to make their own livelihoods. The people in the northern parts of the country live differently from those in the southern part, which is why I am interested in what we have done to compensate the Indians for their loss of livelihood. In the Cold Lake area we have deprived the Indians of their livelihood through the construction of the bombing range there. We have also never fulfilled our part of the bargain by repaying these people for what we have taken from them. I have noticed that when we have given the Indian population the chance for progress they have taken it, and I am happy at the increased opportunities provided for the education of our Indians. But I am sure we must go a lot further yet.

Another difficulty I have noticed for our Indian farming population is that many are unemployed because they cannot obtain loans. We make provision for them to go into other fields of endeavour, and to do so they are forced to take their children out of school. This makes it difficult both for the children and for the parents. I have particular reference to the Indian families which work in the beet fields. In such cases a whole class at school can be upset. Perhaps the teacher was making great progress with the children of a family which goes to work in the beet fields, taking their children with them. In such cases they have no chance to attend school and possibly the whole year is wasted. I have seen what the Indian people will do if we would only help them. I have seen this particularly in the north where we provide them with saw mills, planers and materials for house building.

The drinking habits of Indians have been mentioned, but I do not think that they are any worse than those of the white man. In my constituency a lot of these Indians have only just obtained permission to go into beer parlours, so one might expect some problems; but it is amazing how they begin to conduct themselves in many cases better than the white people. The big problem is that we are not getting enough housing accommodation for them. We are not making enough provision to enable them to commence farming, or purchase livestock and machinery. If we are to reach the stage where these people take

their rightful place in the economy we must make greater progress than we have; and this should be forthcoming in view of the little which has been done in the past few years.

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Chairman, I will follow the example of the hon. member for Meadow Lake and make my remarks brief and to the point. I should like to confirm what my colleague from Meadow Lake has said, that the improvement on reservations the last few years has been noticeable and I think we should strengthen the gains which have been made. But because there has been gain it does not mean that we should be satisfied. Tonight I propose to make one or two suggestions, which I hope will be practical and acceptable not only to the minister but to his officials.

First of all, to give weight to my arguments I have to refer to the circumstances existing in my constituency, in which I have eight reservations. These reservations are on land along the Qu'Appelle river, with one exception south of Broadview. Some of the land on these reservations is fairly good land for farming, and much of it is exceptionally fine land for pasture. So far there has been no good reason why the Indians should develop this agriculture land or these pastures. I do not intend to go into the reasons, which are purely local and well understood by the Indians. I want to make my positive proposal in the interest of pushing forward the efforts of the Indians on these reservations, who are making an effort to improve their lot, without very much help. This proposal has to do with encouraging those on the reservations who are now making serious efforts to get into grain farming. Fortunately for them the crops over the last three years have been good and they have been able to finance any improvements which have been made from the surplus grain which has been sold. At the present time they are encumbered by the fact that because the reservation land cannot be used to borrow money they cannot move into commercial farming operations like the rest of the farmers, because of their inability to borrow money on the land which belongs to the reservation or to the band.

My suggestion is that wherever an Indian farmer has demonstrated to the satisfaction of his band, to his neighbours on the reservation and to the farmers close by that he is a successful farmer, the Indian affairs branch, either by backing this Indian farmer's loan with the Farm Credit Corporation or by making the money available itself, give the farmer an opportunity to prepare a program to show the Indians affairs branch and the band concerned that the money invested will not only return interest but that he will pay the capital back and increase his own capital at the same time. I know that several Indians on each of the reservations in my constituency are prepared to sit down with competent Farm Credit Corporation advisers and work out such a program, and if they meet the rigid test of the corporation's supervisors then I believe this backing should be given.

I should like to remind the minister of a similar situation existing in other countries besides our own in connection with young people. Young people on the farms in general, both in the United States and Canada, who have no parents to support their applications for loans from various government lending agencies are, generally speaking, unable to get loans. The exceptions are that certain sections of the farm improvement loans act of the United States make it possible for young people to go to local banks, and if a number of local farmers agree that the young person concerned has a chance to farm successfully and they sign their name to that effect, the young person is given credit as if he had land and assets. In the beginning they had to pay a deposit of $50, backing up their claim that these young farmers were worth-while individuals and deserved government assistance. This worked so well in several districts in the United States that the neighbouring farmers are no longer being asked by the banks to put up the $50 deposit.

This is the kind of legislation we must consider in relation to the Farm Credit Corporation's lending operations. We could allow local farmers, if they are willing, to put down so much money to indicate their good faith and judgment that the young farmers involved would not make mistakes and would be able to pay back the loans plus interest, while at the same time substantially increasing their standard of living. I suggest this type of operation could take place to the benefit of Indians on reservations, provided their neighbours, who are, after all, the best judges of their ability to farm, were willing to back these young Indian farmers as being capable of operating commercial and self-sustaining businesses. In view of the fact the Indians cannot use land on reservations as collateral the Indian affairs department could by this means provide the necessary collateral.

The other alternative is that the band councils could recommend that certain Indian

farmers on reservations are deserving of this type of assistance, and become a signatory to a loan backed up by the Indian affairs department, making a deposit to show good faith, and this signature could then be used as collateral by the Farm Credit Corporation.

To summarize the suggestion I am making, Mr. Chairman, we should now take the next step in relation to young Indian farmers, who are making an honest and sincere effort to improve their standard of living. If they can come up with a practical proposal, indicating that they can not only pay back the principal but the interest, while at the same time improving their standard of living, satisfying the farm credit supervisor, but due to the fact that the Indian cannot use his land as collateral, the Indian affairs could then provide the necessary assistance.

I would estimate that there are perhaps five to eight farmers per reservation in my riding who could meet the qualifications required to obtain the signature, and the deposit of $500 from the Indian bands, on the understanding that if the farmers were not successful the band would lose the $500. I think that would be a reasonable enough provision to secure any assistance advanced, and I feel that we should take this step to help these Indian farmers become self-sustaining.

I am personally aware of a young Indian farmer who, with a loan of $15,000, having at the present time 230 acres under cultivation, could increase his cultivated acreage, add to his herd of beef cattle, which is a fine one, and within 18 months to two years arrive at the end of the year with a net income of $4,000, after paying expenses. That is as good an income as any average farmer can expect in this country under those circumstances.

If we could put family after family into an operation of this kind, giving them that type of net income, even though it might only apply to five or six families per reservation, we would be assisting these Indian families and by their example do more for the other Indian families on the reservations than we could do by any amount of persuasion.

The Department of Agriculture has assisted a great deal in this particular area by using 45,000 acres of these Indian reservations, after making a tour of them with the band councils, and putting them under administration and operation by the P.F.R.A. They have assisted in putting cattle on these lands, paying the usual six cents per day per head, thereby increasing the cattle population. Under this agreement between P.F.R.A. and the Indian bands the Indian gets first right to put his cattle on these pasture lands, which will eventually carry 9,000 head. Using very round figures this means an increase in income to these four reservations of approximately $1,500,000 per year. I should mention that Indian people take readily to beef farming operations because there is no intensive labour type operation involved, and they can work a few months in the wintertime feeding their cattle, then put the female stock out to pasture and work the land growing enough fodder to carry the remainder through the winter.

Mr. Chairman, this operation would not only be self-liquidating as far as the department is concerned, but would assist family after family to establish respectable self-sustaining businesses. That in brief is the first proposal I should like to make.

I had hoped that I could cut my remarks short at this stage by asking the minister to indicate that he and several of his officials will discuss this type of operation with me to see whether we can make an experiment in a few cases to prove to the minister and his department that this proposal will work. I hope the minister will be kindly in his attitude toward my suggestion.

The second type of operation I should like to describe today relates particularly to hay lands. The Department of Agriculture, through its P.F.R.A. operations, controls the movement of water down the Qu'Appelle river. In controlling this water sometimes it is necessary to dam up the river and flood some of these Indian reservation lands, destroying their economic possibilities as far as the Indian people are concerned. They are at those times not able to obtain full use of their hay lands. I believe the Indian affairs department could work with the P.F.R.A. officials in controlling the flow of water so as not to dam up the water during haying seasons, enabling the Indians in this area to take full advantage of the tremendous productivity of this land now subject to almost annual flooding. The P.F.R.A. officials have been very good in this regard, without any kind of pressure being put on them at all. They have carried out a voluntary survey of these areas of the Indian reservations, particularly the Muscowpetung reservation where the Indians have already done a lot of diking work. These people would like to co-operate with the Indian affairs department to organize this operation in such a way that the hay can be stored, and then, at the time of the

inevitable shortage of hay, which will come within the next two or three years in Saskatchewan, it could be sold first of all to the Indian reservations, which are building up their cattle herds, and then to the neighbouring farmers.

Once again in this way with almost no expenditure on the part of the Indian affairs branch the revenue of the Indian bands could be added to, to the extent of $20 per ton for 3,000 or 4,000 tons of hay per year. That would provide a tremendous increase in revenue to these Indian bands.

Mr. Chairman, these suggestions are not impossible things. In fact, the expenditures are very small in respect of the second proposal, and none at all in respect of the first, except the amount required to back the credit. I hope that I can discuss these ideas personally with the minister at some time.

Finally, I should like to remind the minister that he made an announcement in the house not long ago about his negotiations with the provinces. I have discussed this proposal with some of the bands in my area. I have presented the arguments for and against, and have found that many Indians in my electoral riding have expressed a willingness to consider this proposal fairly. They realize that in some cases they probably will have to pay taxes, and also provide a right to certain services in the province of Saskatchewan. I cannot indicate for certain what the final outcome will be, but I can say for all bands in my area that they will consider the minister's proposals fairly. Naturally they are concerned, because they feel their long term rights cannot be tampered with, and the province of Saskatchewan has guaranteed that there will be no such infringement on their traditional rights. I think we must accept the fact that the word of the government of Saskatchewan is good.

The point that does worry them a little bit, of course, is the proposal in regard to roads. They know that they will have to expect to pay municipal taxes for their share of the roads through their municipalities. It may well be necessary that the Indian affairs department will have to consider that any cost in this regard is in fact a tremendous investment in social capital, particularly in the early stages. I feel that a little bit of help should be given in the earlier stages of the plan. Indians are also very much interested in the proposal to go in with the school districts, as far as nearby town schools are concerned. They are very interested in obtaining the same social welfare services as the rest of the people in the province.

They know quite a bit about hospitalization and medical care and this point worries them a bit. If some ambitious young Indian boy or girl leaves the reservation at the present time and gets a job in the nearby town, which I think they recognize is the only future for them, the minute they go off the reservation they lose their right to the payment of hospitalization and medical care if that applies. This causes many of them to be frightened about leaving the reservation. When they go to the nearby town they have to learn about a new type of civilization and they are somewhat frightened about the fact that they are not covered with respect to the payment of hospitalization unless they are paying into the government scheme.

I think we should encourage the movement of these young people away from the reservations by providing that for a period of two or three years after they leave, their hospitalization premiums will be paid for them so they will not feel they are forced to go back to the reservation because of fear about not being covered for hospitalization.

These are small matters but I have tried to be constructive in putting them forward in the hope that by a slight change of attitude we can continue this mixing of the cultures of our country and help the Indians to make the necessary adjustment. At the present time in my constituency approximately half the children on most of the reservations go to the nearby town schools while the other half attend the reservation schools. I think you will find gradual acceptance of the fact that there is a slightly better standard of education in the town schools and that the tendency for them to go to these schools will increase.

Finally, I wonder whether the minister would provide me with copies of the brief presented by the provincial governments at the federal-provincial conference in which each province lays down its position with regard to what it will do for the Indian. I have the one for Saskatchewan and I should like to get them for the other provinces. Second, the Indian affairs branch provided a very fine briefing book for the discussions at the provincial level and I should also like to get a copy of that. If the minister can provide me with these documents I will be very happy.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, before the minister makes any further reply perhaps I might be allowed to raise a point again which

he did not deal with in his previous remarks. The committee will recall that a little earlier this evening the minister suggested that the answer to the problem of the Indians was not to continue to pour endless sums of money into a sort of blind program. I certainly agree with him in that regard. While I am not familiar with the details of the suggestion just made by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, I think this is the sort of approach for which we are looking.

Because I am so interested in the success of the community development program, however, I am concerned whether the scale of the program will in any way be adequate for the job that needs to be done. I am concerned that with the scale of recruitment envisaged by the minister we will wind up with a situation where we have all generals and no privates in the implementation of the program. I must say that my fear is based in part at least on my own observation of the present situation in the operation of the Indian affairs branch, and in this connection I should like to draw to the minister's attention yet another quotation from his opening speech on the branch which is related to the question I raised earlier and which he did not answer. The minister said:

> The present staff can only do so much. There is a need to strengthen the operations of the branch in both the field and support services. More highly qualified staff are required to do the job.

I ask the minister again to relate that statement to the fact that, unless I have missed it completely in my study of the details of the estimates, there is no provision for more staff, more people to do the job. I had hoped to raise this point earlier in the discussion but did not have the opportunity. However, I would point out that I have had in my files since December 21 of last year the answer to an order paper question I asked on the subject of the office of Indian commissioner of British Columbia, and the staff of one of the agencies which operates within the boundaries of my own constituency.

If one makes an analysis of the complement, he certainly cannot help but come to the conclusion that there is some validity to my suggestion that we are in a position where we have the generals but have not got the staff in the field. Apart from the normal clerical positions in the commissioner's office in British Columbia, we have provision for an engineer and a supervisor of construction. I do not want to take too long going over all the details, but I would point out that there seem to be three part time construction foremen.

If I understand the return correctly, in the field of welfare we have only one trained welfare officer for the whole of the province of British Columbia. To take the west coast agency as an example, we find that in the field we have a superintendent and an assistant and two members on the clerical staff, a clerk and a stenographer. In addition we have a captain engineer to operate the agency vessel which goes up and down the west coast of Vancouver island. It is pointed out in this return, and I know this from my own observation, that when the agency vessel goes on a trip up the coast to the reservations a crew of three is required for this vessel under federal government regulations. Who are the crew? There is the captain engineer, and then the agent superintendent and his assistant have to perform the duties of the crew. They may not mind doing this too much, although I think there might be some question whether some of the steamship regulations are not being bypassed. But, more important, who is left in the superintendent's office? There are two clerks, and a clerk-stenographer.

In that one agency there are enough people who have been a part of the welfare case load to require more than the full time service of one social worker under provincial welfare standards, which are none too high in British Columbia. Yet as far as I can gather the only social worker for the whole of British Columbia is in the Indian commissioner's office in Vancouver.

I have a number of questions I should like to raise but to me this is a vital thing because I have seen money go down the drain on housing construction programs because supplies have been shipped up the coast and have been left lying on the beach until they rotted. Nobody was available with the necessary skill to give some direction in getting the construction of the houses started.

I have again drawn the minister's attention to the thousands of dollars that have been wasted on the reserve at Opitsat in respect of water supply systems. Each time it has been a case of too little and too late. It has been a case of sending good money after bad, and there is still no adequate water supply system there. I could go on and name other instances. This is the reason I raise these two questions with the minister. Is he convinced that he is going to be able, under this proposed community development program, to get the people out in the field where the job needs to be done? Second, what if anything is he doing to meet his own statement that the present staff can only do so

much and there is need to strengthen the operations of the branch in both the field and support services?

In concluding, Mr. Chairman, I note that the hon. member for Skeena and I believe the hon. member for Macleod, have related what we are doing for our Indian people to what we are doing in the field of external aid. So far as I am concerned, we need to do both. When I was at the parliamentary conference in Malaysia last year, one of the delegates from the United Kingdom, a delegate who was in the then government party in the United Kingdom, was able to say before that conference that the United Kingdom was devoting 1.5 per cent of its gross national product to its external aid program. When I spoke shortly afterwards, I said that I would have been very happy if I could have said that Canada was devoting the same proportion of her gross national product to that kind of program. I should like to tell the minister, in view of the remarks that have been made by the hon. member for Skeena and the hon. member for Macleod, that if we could lump together our external aid program and our internal aid program in relation to Indians and Eskimos so that for this combined purpose we were spending 1.5 per cent of our gross national product I would be much happier about the situation in both fields than I am at the moment.

Mr. Thomas: I do not wish to delay the committee but I have a question to ask the minister. What has happened to the promise of an Indian claims commission? Has the government given up on the idea or have the Indians ceased to ask for this? The question has been asked in the house on occasions, but so far nothing has happened. This was definitely promised to the Indians two or three years ago, and I should like to have the minister answer that question now while we are considering his estimates.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Chairman, I have already replied to the question, but I think the hon. member was not in his seat at the time.

Briefly, this is what I said. We have consulted all the Indians in Canada and we have received and examined a few hundred briefs. On the basis of those briefs, we have made a few amendments to Bill No. C-130 which has already been introduced and we hope to submit the amended version of the bill to hon. members' consideration shortly, that is as soon as the business of the house will allow.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I should like to answer two questions put by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett).

The first one dealt with the number of officials working on the community development program who could be put at the disposal of the various reserves in Canada.

Our project—and the estimates available to us will make it possible—is to have 60 community development officials across the country and 50 assistants. We thought that, at the beginning with 60 officials specialized in community development across the country and 50 assistants—we would be able to carry out this three year program called community development program.

With regard to the problem of necessity—

[*Text*]

Mr. Barnett: May I ask the minister how many of these people are going to be spending their time in Ottawa and how many are going to be out in the field?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: We already have here in Ottawa at headquarters all the officials needed. Therefore, they are those who will be put at the disposal of the Indians.

[*Text*]

Item agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: This completes the estimates of the division of Indian affairs.

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank all hon. members for their co-operation in the work of examining my estimates.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Teillet: May I ask for the indulgence of the committee to have permission to proceed with the supplementary estimates to implement the increases in war veterans allowances and pensions, amongst other things?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Deputy Chairman: We will now consider the estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND COMMERCE

1. Departmental administration including fees for membership in the international organizations listed in the details of the estimates, $5,180,500.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Chairman, I will not keep the committee very long but there are one or two things I wanted to say on these estimates.

An hon. Member: Filibuster.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): No, it will not be a filibuster; I am not that ambitious. I merely want to make some suggestions with regard to our trade policies in the future. I believe that our whole concept of trade should be changed in the light of developments in the world today and that there should be some consideration taken of our responsibilities and our opportunities with regard to the underdeveloped areas of the world. In fact, if policies of this sort were employed, I think it would amount to an extension of the Canadian economy which would make it that much easier to deal with some of the internal problems with which we have been dealing earlier this afternoon.

As was stressed again and again by the international conference in Copenhagen this year, the gap between the developed and underdeveloped areas is widening and deepening. There appears to be little being done at the moment to close that gap. I suggest we have to base our trade now on a much more sophisticated basis than we have in the past. We have, as it were, to build up some credits for the future in our dealings with areas that are slowly trying to come into the twentieth century. Nor do I think we should allow political considerations to stand in our way of advancing the credits that will be required, in the first instance, to develop trade.

I have in mind, for instance, the position with regard to Cuba. While it is true we have, ever since the revolution, conducted trade in a rather delicate manner with Cuba and with one watchful eye on Washington, we have not really undertaken anything massive in the way of help for developing the economy of that country which might well help solve some of the tensions that now exist in the western hemisphere, if we were prepared to do that. The same thing is true, I believe with regard to the Middle East. If we were prepared to deal with the Arab countries in the same way, I think we might find we were beginning to reduce some of the tensions in that area. There are such things as the Jordan river development to be considered, which will require immense help from the western world. Should these be undertaken successfully we would be on the way to solving the festering sore that lies in the midst of our troubles in the Middle East, the Arab refugees.

Before long we may find ourselves with unsaleable volumes of wheat, and before that time comes we should be preparing the groundwork for future markets. Nor should we consider this a philanthropic gesture. We often speak of that when talking about things such as the export of $350,000 worth of flour to Indonesia. Actually it is of equal benefit to the prairie wheat farmers, and I am sure their interests were of equal importance to the government in its decision in that regard.

So far as I am aware no one is yet in a position to estimate how massive an expansion of this credit program the Canadian economy could carry. But I would remind the committee that in 1939 we also had no idea just how heavy a load the Canadian economy could bear, and we astonished ourselves and the rest of the world by finding what a tremendously heavy load our economy was able to bear from its own resources.

I would suggest that in this new war—and to my mind even more important war—against poverty, ignorance and hunger throughout the world we have an even more important challenge facing us than we had in 1939. I would hope the government would begin to regard our trade policies as part of the responsibilities of Canada, as one of the affluent countries of the world, to try and win this war against poverty, and to remember that as we do so it is not a philanthropic gesture, it is a gesture of straight self-interest and self-survival.

I would like to see the government being considerably bolder in its estimate of what the Canadian economy can afford in the way of credits to the underdeveloped areas of the world, so that we may build up for the future further possibilities of trade for the vast volumes of goods and materials that an automated industry will, before long, confront us with. Because, make no mistake about it, this is one of the problems we are going to face in the next few years or decade—what to do with the enormous avalanche of goods a modern industrial community will supply us with. The rest of the world is going to be in desperate need of them, and I suggest we should now be placing its peoples in a position where they can take advantage of the enormous capacity of North America and other developed parts of the world.

But to do so will need a complete break with the traditional idea of trade for immediate profit, immediate return, trade for the immediate balance of payments problem, trade for the usual 19th century purpose of making a profit in the immediate future. I shall of course admit that if we do this we shall probably have to do as much violence to the more sacred cows in the free enterprise pasture as we did during the war. This does

not disturb me at all, because I have noticed those free enterprise cows are poor milkers to start with, and they preserve most of their milk for the owners of the pasture.

Item agreed to.

15. Canadian government travel bureau—to assist in promoting the tourist business in Canada including a grant of $37,000 to the Canadian Tourist Association, $4,907,300.

Mr. Aiken: In opening perhaps I might commiserate with the minister on his inability to deliver a very excellent speech to the federal-provincial conference on tourism earlier this evening, from which he departed to be present for the discussion of his estimates. I want to assure him his speech was exceptionally well read by the Solicitor General, who I notice has just returned to the chamber. On previous occasions I have raised the question of the adverse balance of payment on our travel account. This was on the basis of the figures for the first and second quarter when we had them before us. The figures for the third quarter are now available and they confirm the belief that in 1964 the adverse balance on the travel account will reach serious proportions as far as Canada is concerned. Perhaps the minister could advise the committee whether there is some hope for the future in this connection and whether the suggestions which I and others have recently made are valid, namely that more travel within Canada would provide an answer to this problem. This is the only point I wish to raise. I think it is the one which most seriously concerns us in connection with the department now under review.

Mr. Nasserden: I should like to make a few brief comments in the time available tonight on the estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce. They are directed to the action taken by the government during the past year, first with regard to the relaxation of the quota on imports of turkeys and second with regard to the Durum wheat situation a few days ago.

I think the action taken on each of these occasions indicates to some extent the attitude of the government opposite and are part of a trend. Already we can see the effects of this laxity or carelessness upon the agriculture industry of this country.

With regard to the quota, it has been said by the Minister of Trade and Commerce as well as by his colleague the Minister of Agriculture that the United States took strong exception to the fact that these quotas were in effect. I would remind him that they were in effect for five years during which time the United States took no action whatever and there was no reason to think there would be

[Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

any change at this time. I believe what has happened reflects a certain carelessness on the part of the ministry.

The decision with regard to Durum wheat is another which strikes at the very heart of what agricultural people as well as governments in Canada over the years have been trying to achieve in international agreements, particularly international wheat agreements. The danger of the situation arising out of the action which has been taken cannot escape the minister's attention because it is of concern to anyone who is interested in the price of grain.

Another matter I wish to mention briefly has to do with seasonal embargoes on imports of fresh fruit from the United States. Many people engaged in this industry in Canada tell me they feel these embargoes should be put into effect three weeks or a month earlier than they are. At the present time United States surpluses are placed on our market where they fill up storage immediately prior to the embargo taking effect, and this works to the detriment of the local market.

Mr. Aiken: I believe the minister was about to rise on the first item. I did not want to delay matters because I am sure he is anxious to get his estimates through. But perhaps he could answer some of the questions which have been asked.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Chairman, during the several days on which my estimates were discussed I took a careful note of many of the questions and suggestions made by hon. members. Indeed, I have with me a very large file in which I have recorded the comments and suggestions made. I do not intend to take the time of the committee in giving replies but I do want the committee to know that I have looked at these suggestions very carefully and those that I consider of merit will be put into effect.

Mr. Lambert: They will be taken over.

Mr. Sharp: Yes, they will if I can get away with it.

There are also some questions which were asked which I would have been ready to answer had the committee been disposed to give me time. It would take me quite a little while so I propose to leave the matter, and if any hon. member would like to ask me a question on some other occasion or address a letter to me I would be very happy to supply the information.

May I answer the question asked tonight by the hon. member for Parry Sound-

Muskoka, who referred to the adverse balance of payments on tourist account which is almost certain to appear in our international accounts this year. He asked whether there was any hope for the future. We are continuing in our efforts to increase our income from tourist spendings in Canada and we have every hope of achieving the target that I have taken over from the preceding government of $1 billion in 1967. I have also been looking at the question of how much help we might be able to give to encourage travel within Canada by Canadians. As the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka will realize if he has looked at the figures carefully, the reason for the adverse balance is not because there has been any failure in our earnings on tourist account but because the great prosperity of the Canadian people has induced them to travel abroad in greater numbers. Therefore we will do what we can as a Canadian government to assist the provincial governments and the Canadian tourist association to encourage travel within Canada, in this way helping to reduce this adverse balance.

Mr. Lambert: One minor point, Mr. Chairman. May I make a suggestion to the minister regarding all these comments he has on points raised by hon. members. Perhaps he could put some of his very excellent staff to work in merely dropping a note to hon. members. This has been done by some of his colleagues and predecessors in office and is very effective. I do not think hon. members appreciate just being ignored.

Mr. Sharp: I thank the hon. gentleman very much for his suggestion and I shall be very happy to follow it.

Item agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: This completes the estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. Fisher: Ten o'clock.

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

1. Departmental administration including administration of the Farm Improvement Loans Act, the Veterans' Business and Professional Loans Act, the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act, the Prairie Grain Producers' Interim Financing Act, the Prairie Grain Loans Act, the Small Businesses Loans Act, the salaries and expenses of the inspector general of banks' office, and grants as detailed in the estimates, $2,710,400.

The Deputy Chairman: The committee will now proceed with the estimates of the Department of Finance, vote No. 1. This item will be found on page 122 of the blue book, the details on page 125.

Mr. Lambert: Just one short point. I do not believe this question was asked on orders of the day today. The Bank of Canada has advanced the bank rate. This follows similar action in the United States, which in turn followed on the deliberate action of the British government in this regard. I am wondering whether the minister could tell us whether this is a protective policy on behalf of the Canadian financial market in case there is a tendency to raid, or send money to the United Kingdom? In other words, is it concerted action or is it merely individual protective action?

Mr. Gordon: My hon. friend may not have been in the house this afternoon when I was asked a question on this matter and gave a rather extended reply, during the course of which I quoted the statement of the chancellor of the exchequer in England who explained why they had increased the bank rate from 5 per cent to 7 per cent. Then I went on to give an explanation of the action of the reserve authorites of the United States in increasing their rate by one half of 1 per cent and also the rate allowed under their regulation "q". This relates to the interest that they allow on farm deposits.

After considerable discussion during the course of yesterday it was felt that the Canadian national rate would properly be raised by one quarter of 1 per cent, despite the fact that the United States rate has been increased by one half of 1 per cent. The reason, of course, is that our reserve position is strong, and we thought this was proper in the circumstances.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the minister one question. Is he aware of the statement made a day or two ago by the prime minister of Great Britain, Right Hon. Harold Wilson, who advocated in his statement, as far as I can understand the press report, the extension of the powers of the international monetary fund to the point where it could create credit in much the same way a national central bank could do so, as a method of solving the question of international liquidity? As far as I can understand, Mr. Wilson was advocating something in the nature of a proposal that is usually associated with one of the professors in British Columbia, Robert Triffin. I wonder whether the minister took note of that statement, and could he indicate what the Cana-

dian government's position would be if such a proposal were formally advanced?

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Chairman, I promised my hon. friend, the member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, that during my consideration of the estimates I would expand on some of the questions he asked earlier about the differences between the reported views of the minister of finance of France and the Triffin plan, and the proposals that were made in discussions that took place at Tokyo.

The major proposal before the board of governors of the international monetary fund at its annual meeting in Tokyo, as the house will be aware from my statement of September 14, was that there would be a general increase in the quotas. That is an increase in the contributions and drawing rights of all members of the fund. The specific figure mentioned by various governors for this general increase was 25 per cent.

As I indicated in my report to the house, and as I said in my speech to the governors at Tokyo, it seems clear to us that the time has come for another general increase in fund quotas. Moreover we considered that an increase larger than 25 per cent could be justified. That is certainly the Canadian view.

The French minister of finance, on the other hand, stated quite explicitly that the 25 per cent increase in quotas did not seem to his government to respond to an evident and urgent need, and that they did not consider the increase of international liquidities to be the main target of the studies which had been undertaken. In my reply to the hon. member for Chicoutimi on September 29, I intended to make clear this distinction between our view and that of the French finance minister.

Turning now to a question raised by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, I believe there may be some similarities between the ideas expressed by the French minister and the Triffin plan. In his statement to the governors, the minister of finance of France envisaged a system based in the first instance, and as is the present one, on gold, but supplemented as necessary by other "sources for supplying owned resources." The minister was extremely cautious in speaking about these other sources and the extent to which they would be used to create additional reserves. For instance, he pointed out that, "as there is always temptation to accumulate an over supply of world liquidities, cautious regulations would be required in order to assess the need for such a creation and to adjust its amount". He added that "if the need were to arise for an increase in the amount of owned reserves, there should be a concerted and limited recourse to additional fiduciary means". These remarks by the minister suggest that he does not consider that there is at present a shortage of liquidity and that he did not put forward his proposal as a means for increasing reserves at least in the immediate future.

[Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

Professor Triffin in his plan suggested that an institution such as the international monetary fund should be empowered to increase the total of international liquidity by creating deposits based either on loans or investments. He recognized, of course, that the power to create additional liquidity should be limited, but thought that the best way to handle the problem might be to limit the increase to a total amount which would, together with increases in the world stock of monetary gold, raise total world reserves by 3 per cent to 5 per cent per year. This suggestion contrasts sharply with the more cautious approach suggested by the minister of finance of France.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The minister did not mention whether he had seen the report from London of the British prime minister's proposal, which seems to go a bit farther than this.

Mr. Gordon: I have not seen the report but I will be interested in looking it up, and I must say that a more expansive approach would be sympathetically received in these quarters.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister of Finance a question which I asked the Secretary of State some days ago, but did not get any reply. I brought up the fact that we have an economic council which reports to the Secretary of State, and in addition we have the Department of Trade and Commerce which is very important in economic matters, and also the Department of Finance, the Department of Industry and the Department of Labour, all dealing in the main in economic questions. The question that many of us have tended to come up with in the past is, how do all these economic ministries of the government, one might say, dovetail? It is not so much a question of who is the senior minister or who is the central person or which is the pivotal office in all of these economic arrangements. It is not a case of probing for cabinet secrets with regard to what may be a private cabinet committee. It is just a question of where

the prime responsibility lies, the central portfolio in all these economic affairs.

Mr. Gordon: I will do my best to answer that question. In government nowadays I think that the various phases of activity in the economic sphere are so all pervasive that appropriately they must be divided between different ministers. I do not think it is any secret that in the present government there is a cabinet committee on finance of which I as Minister of Finance am the chairman. In the last analysis it is the Prime Minister who must accept the responsibility for coordinating the views of different ministers, but to a considerable extent this is decentralized through this particular cabinet committee. We have frequent meetings and we discuss the different views of the various ministers to whom my hon. member referred, and other ministers. I am inclined to think that this approach has been quite effective.

Item agreed to.

Comptroller of the treasury—

25. Administration, including the administration of the superannuation and retirements acts, $24,692,500.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a brief word to the Minister of Finance. I am sure he knows what it is.

Mr. Churchill: Do not say it, then.

Mr. Knowles: Well, if I thought he would consider the matter without my saying anything about it, perhaps it would be a good idea to sit down. I want to tell the minister what I am sure he knows from the correspondence he has received, that the superannuated civil servants are not at all satisfied with the answer the government has given to their request for an increase in the pensions of civil servants already retired. I hope the minister will not think that because this matter has been looked at two or three times while he has been Minister of Finance, that the answers the government has come up with are at all satisfactory or at all final. The whole concept of what people are entitled to in their years of retirement has definitely gone through a good deal of revolutionary thinking in modern times. There are many jurisdictions that have increased the pensions of persons already retired. I know of employers who are starting to do this. It is true that, in some cases, it is achieved because of collective bargaining. However, the old idea that people, once retired, are off the hands or their former employers is definitely out of date. I am speaking I am sure for the retired civil servants generally and I think I am expressing the mind of a good many, if not most, of the members of this house, when I say we are not satisfied with the kind of reply given. I express the hope that this whole question will be reviewed much more sympathetically and much more humanely than has yet been the case by the present government.

Mr. Monteith: Agreed.

Item agreed to.

Tariff board—

30. Administration, $238,800.

Mr. Lambert: I have one brief question for the minister and he can let me have a reply by way of correspondence. Can he give us a list of the outstanding references to the tariff board and when he expects reports from the board in regard to them? He can give us the information by written reply.

Mr. Gordon: I will be glad to supply the information to my hon. friend.

Item agreed to.

Royal Canadian mint—

35. Administration, operation and maintenance, $2,344,600.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask the minister briefly what the plans are for the extension of the mint? As the minister knows, there is a great backlog of persons asking for coin collections. I am sure members find themselves in the same position as I am, having repeated requests from people wanting to know why it is they cannot get sample coin collections.

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Chairman, there has been an absolutely phenomenal increase in the interest in what is known as numismatics. The number of coin sets the mint has been asked to produce has exhausted the capacity of the mint. There are plans for expanding these facilities and, incidentally, increasing the price of these coin sets slightly, although I think there is no way of setting a price that will overcome the avidity of collectors in this or other fields. We need new facilities, we need expanded facilities. Having said that there is of course no assurance that the rather phenomenal demand of the last two or three years will be continued. However, this is something that I am personally convinced of, that there should be some expansion of our output, and I hope this will be possible within a reasonably short time.

Mr. Barnett: Just while we are on this general subject can the minister tell us

whether we are going to have a gold coin minted as part of our centennial celebrations?

Mr. Gordon: I think it highly improbable, Mr. Chairman.

Item agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: This completes the estimates of the Department of Finance.

Mr. Knowles: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Churchill: Could we take two items on which we do not intend to say anything more? They are in the supplementaries—5b—industry—which deals with defence development programs, and 15a—national research council—which deals with research in industry.

Mr. MacNaught: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Deputy Chairman: Department of Labour—vote No. 30.

Mr. Knowles: Ten o'clock.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall I rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again?

Progress reported.

Resolutions adopted in committee of supply this day reported and concurred in.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McIlraith: Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, we propose calling first the estimates of the Minister of Forestry, then the unemployment insurance commission item, the Department of Public Works and the Department of National Revenue, the latter two departments not necessarily in that order. I would also ask hon. members to be ready for any smaller items that may not have been dealt with as yet.

It being thirty six minutes after ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Supply—Items Passed

[The following items were passed in committee of supply this day:]

DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—

1. Grant in respect of the net operating amount required to discharge the responsibilities of the national broadcasting service, $85,900,000.

International broadcasting service—

5. International broadcasting service including authority to credit to the appropriation revenue from the rental of facilities in Montreal, Sackville and Vancouver to an amount of $427,000 and to re-expend these moneys for the purposes of the international broadcasting service, $2,100,000.

Loans, investments and advances—

L10. Loans to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for the purpose of capital expenditures subject to terms and conditions prescribed by the governor in council, $14,250,000.

Board of broadcast governors—

1. Salaries and other expenses, $374,300.

National film board—

1. Administration, production and distribution of films and other visual materials, $5,792,900.

5. Acquisition of equipment, $307,700.

DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL RESOURCES

National museum of Canada—

25. Administration, operation and maintenance, $1,489,600.

National Gallery of Canada—

1. Administration, operation and maintenance, including the payment of $243,000 to the national gallery purchase account for the purpose of acquiring works of art in conformity with section 8 of the National Gallery Act, and grants as detailed in the estimates, $1,297,000.

1a. Administration, operation and maintenance and grants as detailed in the estimates, $17,000.

Public printing and stationery—

1. Departmental administration, $180,700.

5. Printing, binding and distribution of official documents and publications for sale and distribution to departments and the public including the Canada Gazette and the Annual Statutes, and the purchase for sale of such other publications and related material as the treasury board may approve, $2,766,400.

Loans, investments and advances—

L33a. To authorize the operation of a revolving fund in accordance with section 58 of the Financial Administration Act for the purpose of paying for the printing of publications by commercial printers; the amount to be charged to the revolving fund at any time not to exceed, $250,000.

Public archives and national library—

A—Public archives—

1. General administration and technical services, $840,400.

1a. General administration and technical services, $21,500.

B—National library—

5. General administration including a payment of $100,000 to the national library purchase account for the purpose of acquiring books, in conformity with section 12 of the National Library Act, $469,300.

5a. General administration, $20,000.

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Indian affairs—

15. Administration, operation and maintenance including expenditures on works on other than federal property, grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, recoverable expenditures under agreements entered into with the approval of the governor in council with the governments of the provinces and territories and with local school boards in respect of social assistance to persons residing on Indian reserves other than Indians and the education in Indian schools of children other than Indian children, and to authorize the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to provide, in respect of Indian commercial activities, for the instruction and supervision of Indians, the furnishing of materials, the purchase of finished goods and notwithstanding any other act, the sale of such finished goods, $47,742,400.

15a. Administration, operation and maintenance including expenditures on works on other than federal property, grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates—to extend the purposes of vote 15 of the main estimates for 1964-65 to include authority to make grants and contributions pursuant to agreements entered into with the governments of the provinces or the territories or other groups or authorities approved of by the governor in council, for the provision of welfare and other services to Indians, $3,393,600.

20. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment including expenditures on works on other than federal property, assistance to Indians and Indian bands for the construction or acquisition of housing and other buildings and related works, land and equipment and recoverable expenditures under agreements entered into with the approval of the governor in council with the governments of provinces and territories and with local school boards in respect of the education in Indian schools of children other than Indian children, $12,400,000.

20a. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $500,000.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Welfare services, allowances and other benefits—

10c. War veterans allowances—to provide, effective the 1st day of September, 1964, that the War Veterans Allowance Act, 1952, be amended by repealing schedules A and B to the said act and substituting therefor the schedules A and B set out in the details of the estimates, and the rates mentioned in section 5 of the said act are amended on the same basis; and to

(a) authorize the governor in council to amend the war veterans allowance regulations by repealing effective the 1st day of October, 1964, paragraph (d) subsection (1) of section 10 of those regulations, and

(b) repeal, effective the 1st day of September, 1964, item 45d of supplementary estimates (D), 1963-64, authorized by Appropriation Act No. 5, 1963, $9,000,000.

15c. Other benefits including treatment and related allowances, $170,000.

Supply—Items Passed

Pensions—

25c. Pensions for disability and death—to provide, effective the 1st day of September, 1964, that the Pension Act is amended as follows:

(a) Schedules A and B to the said act are repealed and the schedules A and B set out in the details of the estimates are substituted therefor; and

(b) in subsection (1) of section 30 thereof, the words "eighteen hundred" are struck out and the words "three thousand" are substituted therefor; and

(c) in subsection (2) of section 30 thereof, the words "ninety six" are struck out and the words "one hundred and eight" are substituted therefor, and the words "forty two" are struck out and the words "forty eight" are substituted therefor; and

(d) in subsection (3) of section 30 the words "ninety six" are struck out and the words "one hundred and eight" are substituted therefor; and

(e) in subsection (2) of section 38 the words "five hundred and seventy six" are struck out and the words "six hundred and thirty six" are substituted therefor, $10,100,000.

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND COMMERCE

A—Department—

General administration—

1. Departmental administration including fees for membership in the international organizations listed in the details of the estimates, $5,180,500.

1a. Departmental administration, $100,000.

Trade commissioner service—

5. Administration, operation and maintenance, $6,500,000.

5a. Trade and commissioner service—Administration, operation and maintenance, $70,000.

10. Exhibitions branch, $2,190,700.

12. Participation in the Canadian universal and international exhibition, Montreal, 1967, $970,000.

15. Canadian government travel bureau—To assist in promoting the tourist business in Canada including a grant of $37,000 to the Canadian tourist association, $4,907,300.

Standards branch—

20. Administration and operation, $3,372,100.

Dominion bureau of statistics—

25. Administration and operation including the fee for membership in the inter-American statistical institute and a contribution of $500 to the international statistical institute, $12,436,000.

26. 1961 Decennial census of Canada, $733,700.

27. 1966 Quinquennial census of Canada, $26,100.

B—National energy board—

30. Administration, $734,000.

Loans, investments and advances—

L37a. Acquisition of uranium concentrates in accordance with the contracts entered into with the approval of the governor in council by Eldorado Mining and Refining Ltd., on behalf of Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada with Rio Algom Mines Ltd., Denison Mines Limited and Faraday Uranium Mines Ltd., and to provide for the costs of stockpiling uranium concentrates purchased under the said contracts, $4,500,000.

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

Administration—

1. Departmental administration including administration of the Farm Improvement Loans Act, the Veterans' Business and Professional Loans Act, the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act, the Prairie Grain Producers' Interim Financing Act, the Prairie Grain Loans Act, the Small Businesses Loans Act, the salaries and expenses of the inspector general of banks' office, and grants as detailed in the estimates, $2,710,000.

1a. Departmental administration including grants as detailed in the estimates, $250,000.

Subsidies and other payments to provinces—

5. Payments, computed in accordance with terms and conditions approved by the governor in council, to the government of each province, in respect of income tax paid by corporations whose main business is the distribution to or generation for distribution to the public of electrical energy, gas or steam; the said payments to be made in respect of such part of the income of the corporations for the taxation year ending in the calendar year 1962 (as determined under and for the purposes of the Income Tax Act) as is derived from the said distribution or generation in the province to which payment is made, $10,600,000.

Government administration—

10. Grants to municipalities in accordance with the Municipal Grants Act and regulations made thereunder, $29,700,000.

15. Contingencies—subject to the approval of the treasury board, (a) to supplement the paylist provisions of other votes; (b) for miscellaneous minor or unforeseen expenses; and (c) for awards under the Public Servants Inventions Act; including authority to re-use any sums repaid to this appropriation from other appropriations, $6,000,000.

15a. Contingencies—subject to the approval of the treasury board (a) to supplement the paylist provisions of other votes; (b) for miscellaneous minor or unforeseen expenses; and (c) for awards under the Public Servants Inventions Act; including authority to reuse any sums repaid to this appropriation from other appropriations, $35,000,000.

15b. Contingencies—To extend the purposes of vote 15 of the main estimates to supplement, in such amounts and in accordance with such terms and conditions as the treasury board may prescribe, the estimates of other departments in order to provide for an accelerated construction and repair program and to provide a further amount of, $5,000,000.

17a. To deem, for the purposes of section 28 of the Public Service Superannuation Act, the expression "public service employer" to include the administrator of a superannuation or pension fund or plan established by an act of the legislature of a province for the benefit of employees described in the act and the said employees to be employees of that public service employer, $1.

20. Government's share of surgical-medical insurance premiums and government's contributions to pension plans and death benefit plans for employees engaged locally outside Canada who are excluded from the Public Service Superannuation Act, to the unemployment insurance fund in respect of government employees paid through the central pay office and to the hospital insurance (outside Canada) plan, $11,365,000.

20b. Government's share of surgical-medical insurance premiums and government's contributions to pension plans and death benefit plans for employees engaged locally outside Canada who are excluded from the Public Service Superannuation Act, to the unemployment insurance fund in respect of government employees paid through the central pay office and to the hospital insurance (outside Canada) plan—To extend the purposes of Vote 20 of the main estimates for 1964-65 to provide for the government's share of surgical-medical insurance premiums, determined on such basis and paid in respect of such persons (and their dependants) as the governor in council prescribes, who are members of the Senate and House of Commons or are former members who are in receipt of an annual allowance pursuant to the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act; additional amount required, $8,000.

Comptroller of the treasury—

25. Administration, including the administration of the Superannuation and Retirement Acts, $24,692,500.

Tariff board—

30. Administration, $238,800.

Royal Canadian mint—

35. Administration, operation and maintenance, $2,334,600.

35a. Administration, operation and maintenance, $100,000.

40. Construction or acquisition of equipment, $231,700.

Municipal development and loan board—

45. Administration, $221,000.

Loans, investments and advances—

Finance—

L15. Loan to the Ottawa civil service recreational association, on such terms and conditions as the governor in council may approve, to assist in the further development of the W. Clifford Clark Memorial Centre, $300,000.

L16a. To authorize the Minister of Finance to make contributions out of the consolidated revenue fund to the international development association in the fiscal years 1965-66, 1966-67 and 1967-68 of an amount or amounts not exceeding in the whole $41,700,000 U.S., in addition to the amount provided by section 4 of the International Development Association Act, including authority for the Minister of Finance, on behalf of the government of Canada, to issue to the association in respect of such contributions, pending cash requirements by the association, non-interest-bearing and non-negotiable demand notes in such form as the minister may determine, notwithstanding that the contributions may exceed or fall short of the equivalent in Canadian dollars, estimated as of May, 1964, which is $45,036,000, $1.

Auditor General's office—

1. Salaries and expenses of office, $1,366,700.

Insurance—

1. Departmental administration, $877,200.

Loans, investments and advances—

Finance—

Government administration—

L18c. To authorize the Minister of Finance, notwithstanding subsection (2) of section 11 of the Canada Student Loans Act, to increase upon application by the government of any province the provincial allocation for the province for the loan year ending June 30, 1965 by such amount as may be determined by the minister, the aggregate amount of all increases authorized by the minister pursuant to this provision not to exceed $8,000,000; and to provide that for the purposes of the Canada Student Loans Act the provincial allocation for any province in respect of which an increase has been authorized by the minister pursuant to this provision for that loan year shall be deemed to be the aggregate of such additional amount and the provincial allocation for the province for that loan year as determined pursuant to subsection (2) of section 11 of the said Act, $1.

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY

5b. To sustain technological capability in Canadian industry by supporting selected defence development programs, on terms and conditions approved by treasury board, $1,000,000.

National research council, including the medical research council—

15a. Assistance toward research in industry—To authorize, notwithstanding section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, the making of commitments for the current fiscal year in a total amount not exceeding $3,000,000, $1.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, November 25, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

TABLING OF ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTING INQUIRY COMMISSION

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the order in council appointing Chief Justice Dorion of the superior court of Quebec to carry out the inquiry announced yesterday by the Minister of Justice. I am sending copies of the order in council to the various party leaders.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, before the minister asks for permission to table the order in council may I suggest that he should read it into the record. It seems to me that all members would be interested in knowing what are the terms of reference.

Some hon. Members: Read it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Minister of Finance.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, surely the minister will read it into the record.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Fairweather: It is the Favreau syndrome you are catching.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I see that copies have been given to two party leaders only; we did not get any.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No party has received a copy.

[*Text*]

I have given copies to be delivered to the leaders of the four parties.

Mr. Fairweather: There are 265 members here.

An hon. Member: Read it.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): There is no objection to reading the order in council. I was just complying with the usual practice.

P.C. 1964-1819

25th November, 1964.

The committee of the privy council, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, advise that the Honourable Frédéric Dorion, chief justice of the superior court of the province of Quebec, be appointed a commissioner under part I of the Inquiries Act to inquire fully into allegations about any improper inducements having been offered to or improper pressures having been brought to bear on counsel acting upon an application for the extradition of one Lucien Rivard and all the relevant circumstances connected therewith, and in particular but without limiting the generality of the foregoing to consider fully the reports submitted to the Minister of Justice by the R.C.M.P. and the evidence laid before him in connection therewith and any further evidence elicited by or laid before the commissioner, to consider such other matters as may appear to the commissioner to be relevant and to report whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant any prosecution for offences that may be involved.

The committee further advise:

1. That the commissioner be authorized to exercise all the powers conferred upon him by section 11 of the Inquiries Act;
2. That the commissioner adopt such procedures and methods as he may from time to time deem expedient for the proper conduct of the inquiry and sit at such times and at such places as he may decide from time to time;
3. That the commissioner be authorized to engage the services of such counsel, staff and technical advisers as he may require at rates of remuneration and reimbursement approved by the treasury board; and
4. That the commissioner report to the governor in council with all reasonable despatch, and file with the dominion archivist the papers and records of the commission as soon as reasonably may be after the conclusion of the inquiry.

R. G. Robertson,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

Mr. Douglas: I presume the minister is doing this under motions?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): It is not a statement. I was just tabling the order in council and my hon. friend asked, so that he might obtain the sense of it, if I would read it. That is what I did, but I did not make any statement.

Mr. Douglas: I would ask you for a ruling, Mr. Speaker. Since the minister says he is tabling a document and has placed it before the house, I ask Your Honour if it is not in

order then to make some comment on the statement which the minister has made.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No.

Mr. Douglas: I am asking the Speaker, not the minister for external affairs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The understanding I had was that the minister was tabling a document under motions, not making a statement under motions; therefore there is no debate.

FINANCE

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN STERLING SUPPORT

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): I wish to announce Canadian participation in a new credit arrangement to provide massive support for sterling. The purpose of this is to enable Britain to meet speculative selling of the pound. Under the new arrangement 11 countries consisting of Austria, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, The Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States and the bank of international settlements have provided credit facilities totalling $3 billion. The Bank of Canada's share of this total is $200 million. These credit facilities are separate from the $1 billion stand-by arrangement which Britain already has with the international monetary fund. A drawing under this stand-by is expected to take place shortly. This will be used in part to pay off presently outstanding short term credits from central banks which was arranged last September.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made by the Minister of Finance, I believe that it would be appropriate for us to make some comments, and it would be in order to ask the minister why the Bank of Canada is entitled to lend $200 million to assist another country—$200 million as a loan to England—whereas the Minister of Finance always told us that the Bank of Canada could not lend money to provinces, municipalities or school boards.

Then our school boards, our municipalities and our provinces will borrow from England and the United States the money which the Bank of Canada loaned to England—

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Grégoire: You will agree with me that it amounts to a complete about-face in the present government's monetary policy.

The government has always maintained that the Bank of Canada could not lend money, and here we find that it made a loan, not to Canadians, but to foreigners.

I wonder if, after making such a statement, the Minister of Finance does not fear the resentment of the Canadian people, who have to borrow money abroad, at a high interest rate, while the Bank of Canada, on the minister's advice, is making a loan to Britain practically interest free.

There is surely something wrong there and, in my opinion, the Minister of Finance should start by telling us what rate of interest is to be charged. While he specified the amount of the loan, he made no mention of the interest rate, and we should be told about that.

Second, is this a new Bank of Canada policy? And under that new policy, will the Bank of Canada now grant loans to provincial governments, municipalities and school boards?

It is all very well to loan money to England but let us start with our own people who need loans, that is the provincial governments.

One knows that the province of Quebec had to borrow $100 million from British Columbia. Why did that province not get the chance to borrow that amount from the Bank of Canada? I feel it would be more normal if the Bank of Canada, rather than another province, were to loan money to the province of Quebec.

Further, Saskatchewan borrowed money from Alberta.

That statement takes us by surprise because it goes against what the Minister of Finance told us previously and it contradicts his previous monetary policy.

We hope the minister will at least tell us what interest rate the Bank of Canada will charge to Great Britain and that he will say whether or not he is willing to let the Bank of Canada lend to public bodies in this country.

In my opinion the statement is most important, because it proves what we have always claimed that the Bank of Canada is in a position to lend money. However, it should stop lending to save foreigners and lend once in a while to help out the Canadian people.

[*Text*]

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, despite the sapient comments of the hon. member for Lapointe I think most informed members of the house

will be very glad to hear that the Canadian government has taken the necessary action in the international monetary field to deal with the straits in which our friends in Great Britain find themselves today. However, I think the very situation we have had to move to correct necessitates a far reaching review of the whole international monetary system and indicates the necessity for taking much bolder action in regard to the solution of these problems than has been taken so far.

I hope the Canadian government, at this particular juncture in history when we have to take this action, will press for much more forward looking policies in this field.

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance.

Could the minister tell us at what rate of interest the Bank of Canada will lend $200 million to Britain?

[*Text*]

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): In the first place, the Bank of Canada has not yet lent this money to Britain. It is a stand-by arrangement which may or may not be called upon. I shall be glad to inquire about the rate of interest and see whether I can make it available with propriety. As I reminded the hon. member in connection with the first arrangement of last September, which in subsequent months was drawn on, the rate was the current market rate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question?

In the first place, I should like to point out to the minister that I did not say "lent" but rather "will lend".

My supplementary question is as follows. Is the minister suggesting that if the Bank of Canada lends money, he himself does not know or could not disclose the interest rate? If so, who is asking that the interest rate remains unknown? Is it the borrowing country, the Bank of Canada or the cabinet?

[*Text*]

Mr. Gordon: I can assure the hon. gentleman that I am sorry he was not here last night when the estimates of the Department of Finance were being examined. On that occasion he would have had the opportunity to go into these matters in some detail. However, in fairness I must say I did not expect them to come up last night either; I only got here just before they were called.

As to this question of the interest rate, I have already said I will ascertain whether it would be proper for me to divulge it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, may I ask one last supplementary question?

Since the minister noticed my absence in the house last evening, I must say that I was at the University of Sherbrooke trying to convince the students of the iniquities of our present monetary system.

Here is my supplementary question. Is the Bank of Canada setting up a new policy in this and will it be in a position in the future to lend, here in this country, to public bodies, provincial governments, municipalities, and school boards, as it is doing for England?

[*Text*]

Mr. Gordon: I think the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands made a very apt remark a little while ago. I do not know whether this is the time or the place to explain the monetary policy of this government. I do not think it would be on orders of the day. I am sorry for the students referred to if they get their only instruction in these matters from the hon. member.

PENSIONS

CANADA PLAN—TABLING OF ACTUARIAL REPORT AND ANNEXES

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table at this time two copies in French of the actuarial report, dated November 6, 1964, tabled earlier in the house in English. In addition thereto I should like to table, in English only, the annexes or appendices which are to be attached to the English version of the actuarial report. I apologize to the house for the fact that the French version will not be available until the end of this month. However, since the joint committee is having its first general meeting this afternoon I wish to have these documents placed before it. All documents concerned will be circulated to all members of the house.

I would ask the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam not to request that these very lengthy documents be read in full.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

VISITS OF YUKON INDIAN AGENCY SUPERINTENDENT TO ATLIN, B.C.

Question No. 1,758—**Mr. Howard:**

Since Mr. A. E. Fry has been superintendent of the Yukon Indian agency upon what specific dates has he visited Atlin, B.C., and for each of those visits (a) by what means did he arrive (b) how long did he stay, indicated by minutes, hours, days, or weeks, as the case may be (c) did he meet with any native Indian people and, if so, who were they and for how long did the meeting or meetings last (d) did he meet with any people other than native Indians and, if so, who were they and how long did the meeting or meetings last (e) by what means did he leave?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No detailed record has been maintained of the superintendent's meetings with the Indian and non-Indian residents of Atlin, B.C., which is a small community that serves as a transportation stop on his field tours. However, the following information is available:

November 21, 1962: (a) by car, (b) one day, (c) not available, (d) not available, (e) by car.

December 7, 1962: (a) by car, (b) two days, (c) yes, with various Indian people, (d) several local officials including R.C.M. Police officer, (e) by car.

January 2, 1963: (a) by car, (b) three days, (c) yes, with various people, (d) several local officials including R.C.M. Police officer, (e) by car.

June 21, 1963: (a) by car, (b) short stop-over on return trip to Telegraph Creek, (c) yes, with some Indian people, (d) none, (e) by car.

September 11, 1963: (a) by car, (b) part of the day, (c) yes, Emma Williams, George Jack and Mrs. Jack and George Etzerza and other various Indian people, (d) yes, the R.C.M. Police officer, (e) by car.

October 21 and 23, 1963: (a) by car, (b) stop-over en route to Atlin and on return from Telegraph Creek, (c) yes, various Indian people, (d) yes, (e) by car.

June 3, 1964: (a) by car, (b) stop-over en route to Telegraph Creek and Iskut, (c) yes, various Indian people, (d) yes, (e) by car.

June 10 and June 17, 1964: (a) by car, (b) brief stop-over, (c) yes, some Indian people, (d) yes, (e) by car.

[Miss LaMarsh.]

September 19, 1964: (a) by car, (b) brief stop-over, (c) yes, some Indian people, (d) yes, (e) by car.

C.B.C. PUBLICATIONS

Question No. 2,171—**Mr. Fisher:**

1. Does the C.B.C. produce or support in any way a monthly magazine called *Radio-T.V.* and, if so, what is the circulation figure and the cost of this publication to the C.B.C.?

2. Does the C.B.C. or the staff have any other publications which are distributed to its employees?

3. Is there a publication distributed to C.B.C. employees called *Inside* and, if so, what is the difference between the function of *Radio-T.V.* and *Inside* and what is the approximate difference in costs of the two publications to the C.B.C.?

4. Has any consideration been given to producing *Radio-T.V.* in a cheaper format?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

1. Yes, this is a two language staff magazine produced by the C.B.C. with a circulation of approximately 8,800 made up of present and former staff members, a limited number of people engaged in or associated with broadcasting outside C.B.C., and Canadian libraries. The annual cost including staff salaries, travelling, honoraria to contributors, photography and art work, printing, mailing and handling totals approximately $61,000.

2. Yes, there are locally produced inexpensive publications in some C.B.C. locations.

3. Yes. *Inside* is a four page brochure printed fortnightly in English containing local news and information for and about the Toronto staff. *Radio-T.V.* is a 24 to 30 page magazine, in English and French, carrying articles and staff information of national interest. There is no real basis for comparison of the two publications. The annual cost of *Inside* with a circulation of about 2,500 is approximately $4,800.

4. Yes. In the last five years, despite rising costs of wages, paper stock and services the unit cost has been reduced slightly and the magazine is now produced on the lowest grade of paper stock suitable for a magazine, the next cheaper stock being newsprint.

WINTER WORKS PROGRAM, PRINCE COUNTY, P.E.I.

Question No. 2,174—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. What projects are included in the $3,000,000 1964-65 winter works program for Prince county, Prince Edward Island, recently announced by the Solicitor General?

2. What is the amount to be expended in each project?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): 1 and 2. The following projects have been authorized under the supplementary federal government winter construction program in the county of Prince:

Dept. of National Defence (air force)	Total cost
Interior painting of hangars	$ 46,000
Storm sash replacement P.M.Q.'s	10,000
Storm sash replacement stn. bldgs	10,000
Dental clinic	13,000
Standardization of fire alarm	14,000
Projects up to $5,000	12,000
Sand storage building	30,000
Alterations to BB 55	156,000
Dept. of Public Works	
Cape traverse—wharf repairs	3,000
Miminegash—north pier repairs	2,500
Tignish—north breakwater repairs	2,000
Tignish—south breakwater repairs	2,000
	$300,500

There was a typographical error in the news item concerning these projects which was corrected in a later edition.

C.B.C. TELECASTS OF FOOTBALL GAMES

Question No. 2,175—**Mr. Basford:**

1. Over what national football league football games, does the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation have television rights?
2. Does the C.B.C. have delayed rebroadcast rights to any football games televised by it and, if not, for what reasons?
3. If the C.B.C. does not have such delayed rebroadcast rights, what steps is the C.B.C. taking to acquire such delayed rebroadcast rights?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that, having been advised by the hon. member that this question relates to Canadian football only, the answer is as follows:

1. To Saturday games of both eastern and western conferences; interlocking Saturday games of the two conferences; first game of eastern conference semi-final; first game of western conference final; second and, if necessary, third games of the finals of each conference and the Grey cup game.

2. Yes.

3. See part 2.

TELEVISION STATION CJOH, OTTAWA—LIVE CANADIAN PRODUCTION

Question No. 2,176—**Mr. Orlikow:**

In their application for the right to operate a private t.v. channel in Ottawa, did the successful applicants undertake with the B.B.G. to provide a percentage of live Canadian production in their programming and, if so, in the months of July, August and September of 1964, what percentage of CJOH's programming was made up of live Canadian production?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Yes. The percentage of live Canadian production was as follows: July 1964, 33.5 per cent; August 1964, 36.9 per cent; September 1964, 37.6 per cent.

TELEVISION STATION CJOH, OTTAWA—CONTENT OF EVENING PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,177—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. On their application to operate a private t.v. channel in Ottawa, did the successful applicants undertake with the B.B.G. to provide during peak hours, from 7 to 11 p.m. that a certain percentage of their content would be Canadian and, if so, what is the percentage?
2. During the months of July, August and September, 1964, how much time from 7 to 11 p.m., week by week, contained (a) Canadian content (b) American content (c) British content?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. Yes, 69.5 per cent.

2.

	Canadian*	American	British
July 1-4	1:30	12:10	2:20
July 5-11	2:20	22:30	3:10
July 12-18	2:20	22:30	3:10
July 19-25	2:50	21:20	3:50
July 26-Aug. 1	2:50	20:50	4:20
Aug. 2-8	5:21	19:29	3:10
Aug. 9-15	2:48	20:30	4:42
Aug. 16-22	8:37	16:32	2:51
Aug. 23-29	5:40	19:02	3:18
Aug. 30-Sept. 5	2:50	20:31	4:39
Sept. 6-12	6:04	17:35	4:21
Sept. 13-19	5:47	17:58	4:15
Sept. 20-26	2:30	23:00	2:30
Sept. 27-30	2:00	10:30	3:30

*Note: The board's logs are broken down to show Canadian, foreign and commonwealth programming. For the above table it was assumed that all foreign programming was American and all commonwealth programming was British.

TELEVISION STATION CJOH, OTTAWA—CANADIAN PERFORMERS

Question No. 2,183—**Mr. Orlikow:**

Did the present owners of CJOH in Ottawa undertake with the B.B.G. to give Canadian artists an opportunity to be seen and heard by international

audiences and, if so, how many, month by month, Canadian authors producers, actors, variety artists, performed for CJOH in 1964?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Yes. Stations are not required in the logging process to file information about the number of authors, producers, actors, and variety artists that they engage. It would be the intention of the board at the public hearing of the application for the renewal of the licence of the station which expires on March 31, 1966, to examine the licensee on the station's operation in light of undertakings given with respect to the employment of the staff and artists.

TELEVISION STATION CJOH, OTTAWA—EXPENDITURES ON LIVE TALENT

Question No. 2,186—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Did the successful applicants for a private t.v. channel in Ottawa undertake with the B.B.G. that they would spend $240,000 of their gross income on talent for live Canadian programming, if they were granted the rights to the Ottawa channel?
2. How much, each year, has station CJOH spent on payment of talent for live programming since it began operating?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. Yes.

2. The board does not make public the financial information it receives on private station operations. It would be the intention of the board at the public hearing of the application for renewal of the licence of CJOH-TV, which expires on March 31, 1966, to examine the licensee on the station's operation in the light of the financial undertakings given.

TELEVISION STATION CJOH, OTTAWA—PROGRAMS BASED ON CANADIAN STORIES

Question No. 2,187—**Mr. Orlikow:**

Did the successful applicants for a private t.v. channel in Ottawa indicate to the B.B.G. that they intended to produce programs for use in Canada and for export, based on such stories as the Jalna stories, the Grey Owl stories, as well as programs called "The Northern Trader" and "Canadian Abroad" and, if so, which of these have been produced and televised?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Yes. The board does not keep a continuous detailed record of the material broadcast by the station since it began operating and is not, therefore, able to provide the information requested.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

TELEVISION STATION CJOH, OTTAWA—REVOCATION OF LICENCE

Question No. 2,191—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Will the B.B.G. give consideration to revoking the licence of the owners of CJOH if an examination of the record discloses that undertakings regarding programming have not been met?
2. Is the B.B.G. considering any alternatives such as transferring the licence to other interests?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. The board has no authority under the Broadcasting Act to revoke a station's licence.

2. The board has no authority under the Broadcasting Act to transfer the licence of a station to other interests.

Under the regulations pursuant to the Radio Act an initial licence is issued for a period of five years. When the licence of CJOH-TV terminates on March 31, 1966, it is expected that an application for its renewal will be filed with the Department of Transport. Such an application will be referred to the board by the Minister of Transport for a recommendation following a public hearing.

On October 7, 1960, the board wrote the licensee of CJOH-TV calling attention to the specific program undertakings given at the time of the original application. It would be the intention of the board at the public hearing of the application for renewal of the licence to examine the licensee on the station's operation in light of these undertakings.

TELEVISION STATION CFTO, TORONTO—EXPENDITURES ON LIVE TALENT, ETC.

Question No. 2,203—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Did the successful applicants for station CFTO in Toronto undertake with the B.B.G., in the first year of their operation to spend over 25 per cent of their estimated gross revenue on live talent and, if so, what percentage of their gross revenue in each year since operations began, has CFTO spent on live talent?
2. Did the successful applicants for station CFTO in Toronto undertake with the B.B.G. to spend a specified sum of moneys for Canadian artists, Canadian writers, Canadian musicians, on scenery, props and costumes on live production in the first 12 months of their operation and, if so (a) what was the amount specified in their undertaking, and (b) how much did CFTO spend in each of these categories in the first year of their operation?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. Yes. The board does not make public the financial information it receives on private station operations. It would be the intention of the board at the public hearing of the application for renewal of the licence of CFTO-TV which expires on March 31, 1966, to examine the licensee on the station's

operation in the light of the financial undertakings given.

2. Yes. (a) The amount specified in the undertakings was $1,646,000. (b) The board does not make public the financial information it receives on private station operations.

TELEVISION STATION CFTO, TORONTO—PROGRAMMING UNDERTAKINGS

Question No. 2,204—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Did the successful applicants for station CFTO undertake with the B.B.G. that they would spend a specified amount for live programming in the second and third years of operation and, if so (a) what was the specified amount for each of the said years (b) how much did CFTO spend on live programming in the first three years of its operation?

2. Did the successful applicants for station CFTO undertake with the B.B.G. that a specified percentage of their costs of live programming would be for (a) drama (b) light entertainment (c) music (d) singing and choral groups and, if so (i) what was the specified percentage in each case (ii) what percentage of their expenditures for live programming has been made in each of these categories in each year since CFTO has been in operation?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. Yes. (a) The applicant proposed to spend $1,846,000 in the second year and $1,945,000 in the third year.

2. Yes. (a) Drama 9.72 per cent. (b) Light entertainment 23.6 per cent. (c) Music 9.6 per cent. (d) Singing and choral groups 13.17 per cent.

The board does not make public the financial information it receives on private station operations.

TELEVISION STATION CFTO, TORONTO—CANADIAN PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,205—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Did the successful applicants for station CFTO undertake with the B.B.G. that they would make available to their viewers a wide selection of Canadian programs of an artistic and dramatic nature and, if so, what was the extent of their undertaking in this regard?

2. Did they inform the B.B.G. that they had contacted other cities, such as Vancouver and Winnipeg specifically, with a view to sharing such programs and costs with these stations and, if so, what was the extent and nature of such information?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. The applicants for station CFTO-TV undertook in their application brief to do one half hour program per week and five one hour dramas to be presented at intervals during the first season. The brief indicated plans for once a month special programs which would be outstanding examples of the telecasting art.

Questions

2. The application brief stated that "when second stations go on the air in the various other metropolitan cities and markets we would attempt to co-operate with them to the fullest degree in productions in order to spread the costs across the country. We have already had conversations with the successful applicants in Winnipeg and Vancouver."

APPEARANCE OF U.S. NAZI LEADER ON C.B.C. PROGRAM

Question No. 2,210—**Mr. Martineau:**

1. Who was responsible for the decision to have George Lincoln Rockwell, head of the American nazi party, appear on the C.B.C. t.v. program "This Hour Has Seven Days"?

2. Did George Lincoln Rockwell receive a fee or remuneration from the C.B.C. for his appearance on this program and, if so, what amount did he receive?

3. Did the C.B.C. expend public funds to arrange the appearance of George Lincoln Rockwell on this program and, if so (a) what was the amount so expended, and (b) who authorized this expenditure?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

1. The program on which George Lincoln Rockwell appeared is a responsibility of the C.B.C. public affairs department.

2. No.

3. Yes. This portion of the program was recorded on film in Washington by a production team which was also working on another program assignment. (a) The cost of facilities, taping, film processing, editing, etc., was approximately $1,200. (b) See reply part 1.

BANK OF CANADA CREDIT ADVANCES TO GOVERNMENTS

Question No. 2,236—**Mr. Balcer:**

1. With reference to credit advances that the Bank of Canada may grant the federal government and the provinces, on what conditions does it do so with regard to each level of government and are provincial borrowings more costly than federal borrowings?

2. Is any consideration being given to amending the Bank of Canada Act in order to maintain deposits with provincial administrations?

[*Translation*]

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): 1. The conditions governing loans and advances which the Bank of Canada may make to the government of Canada or to the government of any province are set forth in section 18 (1) (i) and (j) of the Bank of Canada Act:

[The Bank of Canada may]

"18(1)(i) make loans or advances for periods not exceeding six months to the government

of Canada or the government of any province on the pledge or hypothecation of readily marketable securities issued or guaranteed by Canada or any province;

(j) make loans to the government of Canada or the government of any province, but such loans outstanding at any one time shall not, in the case of the government of Canada, exceed one third of the estimated revenue of such government for its fiscal year, and shall not in the case of any provincial government exceed one fourth of such government's estimated revenue for its fiscal year; and such loans shall be repaid before the end of the first quarter after the end of the fiscal year of such government;"

The rate of interest to be charged is not specified in the act. No advance has been made to a provincial government since 1936.

2. There is no provision in the Bank of Canada Act under which the bank could maintain deposits with a government and no consideration is being given to amending the act in this respect.

[*Text*]

*C.B.C. PUBLIC RELATIONS PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,237—**Mr. Webb:**

How many public relations people are employed by C.B.C., and of this number, how many are employed in each province across Canada?

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that its public relations is largely carried out by the management group as a basic responsibility. The corporation employs three full time public relations people who assist in this work.

MONEY LOST THROUGH CHEQUE TAMPERING

Question No. 2,253—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Does the Bank of Canada keep records of money lost through tampering with cheques and, if so, what is the total loss in each of the last five years?

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): No.

TELEVISION STATION CFTO, TORONTO—DRAMA WORKSHOP

Question No. 2,256—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Did the successful applicants for station CFTO undertake with the B.B.G. to televise a drama workshop which would offer acting opportunities on t.v. to top players from little theatre groups and opportunities and incentives for writers?

2. Has station CFTO offered any live drama programs, produced in Toronto, to its viewers since it began operations and, if so, how many and what are their titles?

3. Is the B.B.G. considering any alternatives such as transferring the licence to other interests?

[Mr. Pennell.]

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. The program schedule included in CFTO's application brief listed a program called "Screen Test" which was described as a drama workshop.

2. The board does not keep a continuous detailed record of the material broadcast by the station since it began operating and is not, therefore, able to provide the information requested.

3. The board has no authority under the Broadcasting Act to transfer the licence of a station to other interests.

TELEVISION STATION CJAY, WINNIPEG—PUBLIC AFFAIRS PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,269—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Did the successful applicants for the private t.v. channel in Winnipeg, Manitoba, undertake with the B.B.G., when they applied for the t.v. rights in Winnipeg, to televise one and one half hours a week of public affairs material in the form of panels and discussions and groups?

2. Since they have begun to operate the station, how much time per week has this station devoted to public affairs programs?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. Yes.

2. The board does not keep a continuous detailed record of the material broadcast by the station since it began operating and is not, therefore, able to provide the information requested.

TELEVISION STATION CJAY, WINNIPEG—EDUCATIONAL AND RELIGIOUS PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,270—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Did the successful applicants for the private t.v. channel in Winnipeg, Manitoba, undertake with the B.B.G., when they applied for the t.v. rights in Winnipeg, to televise adult education and religious education programs on a regular basis and, if so, how much time per week did they undertake to devote to this type of program?

2. How much time per week has this t.v. station devoted to this type of program since they began operations?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. Yes, five hours.

2. The board does not keep a continuous detailed record of the material broadcast by the station since it began operating and is not, therefore, able to provide the information requested.

TELEVISION STATION CJAY, WINNIPEG—RURAL PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,271—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Did the successful applicants for the private t.v. channel in Winnipeg, Manitoba, undertake with the B.B.G., when they applied for the t.v. rights in Winnipeg, to devote a definite period of time each week to programs of rural interest (including music, visits to country fairs, talks by farm experts, etc.) and, if so, how much time did they undertake to devote to such programming?

2. How much time has this station devoted to this type of programming since the station began to operate?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. Yes, five hours.

2. The board does not keep a continuous detailed record of the material broadcast by the station since it began operating and is not, therefore, able to provide the information requested.

TELEVISION STATION CJAY, WINNIPEG—USE OF LIVE TALENT

Question No. 2,273—**Mr. Orlikow:**

Did the successful applicants for the private t.v. channel in Winnipeg, Manitoba, undertake with the B.B.G. to devote a substantial proportion of their television time to live programming and live talent and, if so (a) how much time did they undertake to devote to such programming per week (b) how much time have they actually devoted to such programs since they have been in operation?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Yes. The applicant proposed 45 hours 45 minutes per week of local live programming. The board does not keep a continuous detailed record of the material broadcast by the station since it began operating and is not, therefore, able to provide the information requested.

TELEVISION STATION CJAY, WINNIPEG—TALENT SEARCH

Question No. 2,274—**Mr. Orlikow:**

Did the successful applicants for the private t.v. channel in Winnipeg, Manitoba, undertake with the B.B.G. to provide staff to search for talent of a professional nature to be handled by a producer employed by the station; to give them training; to permit them to train on the station's facilities; and to video-tape their rehearsals and, if so (a) has this policy been followed by the private t.v. channel in Winnipeg, Manitoba (b) how much of this type of programming has been done?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Yes (a) Stations are not required in the logging process to file information of this kind with board. (b) The board does not have this information. It would be the intention of the board at the public hearing of the application for renewal of the licence which expires on March 31, 1966, to examine the licensee on the station's operation in the light of undertakings of this kind.

TELEVISION STATION CJAY, WINNIPEG—LIVE PROGRAMMING IN PRIME TIME

Question No. 2,275—**Mr. Orlikow:**

Did the successful applicants for the private t.v. channel in Winnipeg, Manitoba, undertake with the B.B.G. to devote a substantial part of the prime television time from 9.30 p.m. to 11 p.m. to live programming and, if so (a) how much live televising did they undertake to program (b) how much of this prime time has the private t.v. channel in Winnipeg, Mantioba, devoted to live programming since they began to operate?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Yes. (a) The program schedule included in the application brief listed the hours from 9.30 to 11 p.m. as live programming. (b) The board does not keep a continuous detailed record of the material broadcast by the station since it began operating and is not, therefore, able to provide the information requested.

TELEVISION STATION CJAY, WINNIPEG—MUSICAL PROGRAMMING

Question No. 2,276—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Did the successful applicants for the private t.v. channel in Winnipeg, Manitoba, undertake with the B.B.G., when they applied for the Winnipeg t.v. rights, to televise regular programs of (a) popular music with orchestra, vocalists (prizes for songs especially written for the program) (b) concerts featuring professional musicians, ballet and symphony (c) amateurs—featuring performers picked in auditions all over the province and paid for their performances (d) western music featuring orchestra, vocalist and square dancers (e) ethnic programs—featuring music, dances, songs and costumes in the traditional manner of the large ethnic groups of Manitoba and including an orchestra singers and dancers?

2. If so (a) how much time per week for each did they undertake to provide (b) how much time per week for each type listed above has been provided by the private t.v. station in Winnipeg since it began to operate?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. Yes.

2. (a) 30 minutes each. (b) The board does not keep a continuous detailed record of the material broadcast by the station since it began operating and is not, therefore, able to provide the information requested.

TELEVISION STATION CJAY, WINNIPEG—DRAMA PROGRAMMING

Question No. 2,277—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Did the successful applicants for the private t.v. channel in Winnipeg, Manitoba, undertake with the B.B.G. to televise regular programs of (a)

family theatre—consisting of live productions produced in Canadian cities including Winnipeg (b) excerpts from plays and musical productions or from rehearsals of the same, on a continuing basis, produced in Winnipeg (c) high school or university students in dramatic plays, vocal or instrumental performances, physical fitness demonstrations or panel discussions?

2. If so (a) how much time per week for each did they undertake to provide (b) how much time per week for each type of program listed above has been provided by the private t.v. station in Winnipeg since it began to operate?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. Yes.

2. (a) 30 minutes, 30 minutes and three hours respectively, (b) the board does not keep a continuous detailed record of the material broadcast by the station since it began operating and is not, therefore, able to provide the information requested.

TELEVISION STATION CJAY, WINNIPEG—ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,278—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Did the successful applicants for the private t.v. channel in Winnipeg, Manitoba, undertake with the B.B.G. to produce an adult education series in co-operation with the University of Manitoba, the Winnipeg museum, and other groups and dealing in a documentary and searching manner with important subjects?

2. If so (a) have such programs been produced and shown by the private t.v. station in Winnipeg (b) how often since the station began operations have such programs been televised?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. Yes.

2. The board does not keep a continuous detailed record of the material broadcast by the station since it began operating and it is not, therefore, able to provide the information requested.

TELEVISION STATION CJAY, WINNIPEG—REVOCATION OF LICENCE

Question No. 2,279—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Will the B.B.G. give consideration to revoking the licence of the owners of CJAY, Winnipeg, Manitoba, if an examination of the record discloses that undertakings regarding programming have not been met by the successful applicants for such t.v. rights?

2. Is the B.B.G. considering any alternatives such as transferring the licence to other interests?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. The board has no authority under the Broadcasting Act to revoke a station's licence.

2. The board has no authority under the Broadcasting Act to transfer the licence of a station to other interests.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

Under the regulations pursuant to the Radio Act an initial licence is issued for a period of five years. When the licence of CJAY-TV terminates on March 31, 1966, it is expected that an application for its renewal will be filed with the Department of Transport. Such an application with the Department of Transport. Such an application will be referred to the board by the Minister of Transport for a recommendation following a public hearing.

On October 7, 1960, the board wrote to the licensee of CJAY-TV calling attention to the specific program undertakings given at the time of the original application. It would be the intention of the board at the public hearing of the application for renewal of the licence to examine the licensee on the station's operating in the light of these undertakings.

TELEVISION STATION CBLT, TORONTO—COLOUR REBROADCASTS

Question No. 2,292—**Mr. Gelber:**

What would be the installation cost for CBLT to rebroadcast in colour, network programs which it is presently rebroadcasting in black and white?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that a limited conversion of the facilities of CBLT Toronto sufficient to permit this station only to give colour transmission of the U.S. network colour programs would incur a capital cost of approximately $175,000. This conversion would not permit the colour transmission of any Canadian insertions in these programs, either live or filmed, nor any live or filmed programs originating in the Toronto studios.

EXTENSION OF PROVINCIAL PROGRAMS TO INDIANS

Question No. 2,306—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Has any province indicated interest in extending provincial programs to Indians as discussed at the recent federal-provincial conference and, if so, which provinces have indicated an interest and in which programs?

2. Have any of the provinces proposed an agreement with the federal government to extend the range of services offered by the province for the Indian population of that province and, if so, which provinces, what services and under what terms?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. Yes. All provinces indicated an interest in extending provincial programs to Indians. This interest was expressed at the conference in terms of a broad range of services rather than to particular programs.

2. No firm agreement was proposed. However, various suggestions on the kinds of services that might be made available to

Indians were put forward which might be used as a basis for future discussions, all within the general framework that the Indians in each province concerned must be consulted about proposals before any final agreement is reached.

MARRIED QUARTERS, R.C.A.F., OTTAWA

Question No. 2,312—**Mr. Prittie:**

1. How many units of public married quarters are occupied by commissioned officers of the R.C.A.F. in the Ottawa area at the present date?

2. How many commissioned officers are on a waiting list for such accommodation at this time?

3. How many units of public married quarters are at present occupied by non-commissioned officers and airmen of the R.C.A.F. in the Ottawa area?

4. How many N.C.O.'s and airmen are on a waiting list for public married quarters accommodation?

5. If a separate waiting list for airmen, excluding N.C.O.'s is maintained, how many are on the list at the present time?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): 1. 149.

2. 114.

3. 663.

4. 411.

5. A separate waiting list for aircraftsmen is not maintained.

REFIT OF H.M.C.S. "SKEENA"

Question No. 2,327—**Mr. MacEwan:**

1. Were tenders called for the refit, repairs or conversion of H.M.C.S. *Skeena*?

2. What were the names of the tenderers and the amount of each tender?

3. To what firm was the contract awarded and is the amount of the contract a firm price?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): 1. Yes.

2. Tenders were invited for the conversion and refit of H.M.C.S. *Skeena* on 21 April, 1964. The names of the tenderers and quoted ceiling prices, excluding federal sales tax, are as follows: Davie Shipbuilding Ltd., $2,873,193.75; Marine Industries Ltd., $2,950,420; St. John Shipbuilding and Drydock Co. Ltd., $2,980,000.; Canadian Vickers Ltd., $3,626,727; Halifax Shipyards, $4,332,409.

3. The contract was awarded, 14 July, 1964, to Davie Shipbuilding Limited, Lauzon, Quebec, and the amounts payable under the contract are comprised of two elements: (i) a firm price for overhead and fees; and (ii) a ceiling price, target incentive arrangement for labour and material.

CANADIAN PARTICIPATION, WORLD TRANSPORT EXHIBITION

Question No. 2,343—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Has the government of Canada accepted the invitation to send an exhibit to the world transportation exhibition to be held in Munich next year and, if so, what is the nature of the exhibit?

2. What phases of transportation will it cover?

3. What Canadian groups other than government will be represented at the exhibition?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. The government of Canada did not accept an invitation to sponsor an exhibit in the international exhibition of transport and communications to be held in Munich next year. In so far as the interests of the Department of Trade and Commerce are concerned, it is recognized that the success of any exhibit designed to promote trade depends to a large extent on active participation by industry. In this instance, the long duration of the exhibition running from June 25 to October 3, 1965 made it impractical to expect that exhibiting firms could make senior sales personnel available to man their exhibits in Munich for such a lengthy period.

2. Not applicable.

3. No information has been received by my department that any Canadian groups other than government will be represented at the exhibition.

COST OF CADET PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,344—**Mr. Olson:**

What was the total cost to the federal government for the air cadet program, the sea cadet program and the army cadet program for the fiscal years 1961-62, 1962-63 and 1963-64?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence):

Year	Sea cadets	Army cadets	Air cadets
1961-62	$1,480,000	$3,861,000	$2,371,000
1962-63	1,481,000	4,213,000	2,264,000
1963-64	1,500,000	4,772,000	2,516,000

NEW INDUSTRIES IN DESIGNATED AREAS

Question No. 2,345—**Mr. Coates:**

1. With respect to question No. 1,846 answered by the Minister of Industry on September 14, 1964, what are the names of the companies to which certificates have been granted which have established in designated areas?

2. In each case, what is the area, capital investment, type of industry and employment?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): 1. None of the new industries referred to in the answer to question No. 1,846 has yet

requested certificates for the purpose specified in section 71A of the Income Tax Act as amended June 18, 1964.

2. Not applicable.

CENTENNIAL PROJECTS, ALBERTA

Question No. 2,347—**Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson):**

What are the names, numbers and status of all projects applied for by the province of Alberta for grants under the national centennial commission?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): The centennial commission has received from the province of Alberta the following applications for grants under the federal-provincial centennial grants programs: (1) city of Calgary, construction of a planetarium; (2) town of Bowness, construction and equipping of a senior citizens' lounge; (3) village of Killam, construction and equipping of a sports ground.

Their projects have all been referred back to the provincial authorities for further information.

INVITATION TO TRADE MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,358—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Minister of Trade and Commerce receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): No.

INVITATION TO MINES MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,360—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. W. M. Benidickson (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): No.

INVITATION TO STATE SECRETARY TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,362—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Secretary of State receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): No.

[Mr. Drury.]

INVITATION TO VETERANS AFFAIRS MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,369—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Minister of Veterans Affairs receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): No.

INVITATION TO INDUSTRY MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,371—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the minister of industry and defence production receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): In so far as the minister of industry and defence production is concerned the answer is, no.

INVITATION TO AGRICULTURE MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,374—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Minister of Agriculture receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): No.

INVITATION TO CITIZENSHIP MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,375—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

PUBLIC SERVANTS APPOINTED BY ORDER IN COUNCIL AND UNDER CIVIL SERVICE ACT

Question No. 2,063—**Mr. McIntosh:**

1. As of January 1, 1964, how many of the public officials of the government of Canada, excluding the armed services and the R.C.M.P., held their offices through appointment by order in council?

2. As of January 1, 1964, how many of the public officials of the government of Canada, excluding the armed services and the R.C.M.P., held their offices through appointment under the Civil Service Act.

Return tabled.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF COMMISSION—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 26

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, to move the adjournment of the house under standing order 26 for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely the inadequacy of the terms of reference contained in order in council P.C. 1964/1819 appointing a commission to inquire into certain allegations.

Under the rules of the house I believe I am permitted to give reasons for the urgency which arises with respect to this matter. On Monday last information was elicited from the Minister of Justice to the effect that he had conveyed to him on August 14 last information that serious allegations had been made with respect to certain persons close to the government; that he ordered an investigation by the R.C.M.P., receiving transcripts from time to time, and a final report on September 18. It is now clear that the said report indicates that a certain legal counsel was confronted by the executive assistant of one minister, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Douglas: —and it is alleged that a bribe was offered.

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman. He has I believe the right to discuss the adequacy of the order, at this time; but I just raise for his consideration whether it is right, in view of the fact that there is to be a judicial hearing.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Whitewash.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I am sure we all want to approach this matter in an understanding and intelligent manner—

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is all we are asking over here.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): —and it would be wrong for us since we are going to have a hearing, under the direction of the chief justice of the superior court of Quebec, to say in the house, in discussing the adequacy of the order anything that would reflect in any way upon the kind of matter which is to be determined as a matter of fact by the judge. I know that my hon. friend, whose fairness in these things I recognize, would be among the first to appreciate that there is the greatest merit in what I am now saying.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, I am dealing only with the urgency of debate and I am pointing out not rumours or casting aspersions but facts which the minister himself has already confirmed.

Mr. Sharp: They are not facts.

Mr. Douglas: He has already confirmed that allegations were made by a counsel in Montreal alleging, first of all, that he was offered a bribe—as I have already pointed out—and alleging also that an attempt was made to intimidate him. As a result of these allegations which came to the minister through the report of the R.C.M.P., the minister apparently took no immediate action other than to decide, in consultation with the commissioner of the R.C.M.P.—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I do not like to rise on a point of order, but surely my hon. friend is now commenting upon the kind of matter that will be examined by the commissioner who has been appointed by the governor in council today. I call Your Honour's attention to citation 149 at page 127 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, which says:

> Besides the prohibitions contained in standing order 35; it has been sanctioned by usage both in England and in Canada, that a member, while speaking, must not:

Then there are paragraphs (a) and (b); and (c) is:

> —refer to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending—

Mr. Grégoire: There is no judicial decision pending.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): There is. Today the governor in council appointed the chief justice of the superior court of Quebec to conduct an inquiry pursuant to the terms of the order which has been tabled. My submission, with respect, is that any discussion in this house now on matters within the scope of that inquiry, that are sub judice, would be in violation of this decision—

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Whitewash.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): —and my hon. friend was, I think, the first to suggest that this inquiry should be established. Now that it has been established, if we are to usurp the functions of the commissioner we are certainly prejudicing that inquiry, and I know that is not what my hon. friend wants to do. I do not mind his arguing whether the order is adequate for the purpose he believes, but I do not believe that it is right, that it is fair, that it is within our rules to discuss a phase of this matter that now comes under the order passed by the body that has the executive power and that covers something the commissioner alone can decide. My hon. friend knows that the Department of Justice estimates will be up tomorrow, at which time he may discuss the adequacy of the matter. I do beseech him now not to traverse an area that will be covered under this order in council by a judge.

Mr. Douglas: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the minister of external affairs in one breath says it would be highly improper to discuss this whole case now since an order in council has been passed, yet in the second breath he tells me that tomorrow during consideration of the Department of Justice estimates I will be able to go into this matter fully.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Surely my hon. friend knows I did not say that.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): What I did say was that tomorrow my hon. friend could discuss the adequacy of the order; but at no time, now or tomorrow or at any time until the chief justice comes to a decision, has any member under our rules the right to discuss a matter that is now within the exclusive competence of the judge.

An hon. Member: That is nonsense.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I recognize the hon. member for Bow River.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to answer the minister for external affairs. I was rather interested in rule 149, and should like to repeat what the minister said He read this part:

(c) refer to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending—

I assume the minister means the matter within the terms of reference as laid down by the order in council. Therefore this might depend on his interpretation of what has been laid down, or it might depend on the interpretation by the leader of the New Democratic party as to what has not been laid down; but surely that is a matter for decision and discretion. I suggest that the leader of the New Democratic party is squarely within the rule rather than violating it. The matter which is under discussion is the terms of reference which govern the jurisdiction of the judicial inquiry. Therefore if there are matters not covered in the terms of reference, surely it is relevant for the leader of the New Democratic party to discuss the terms of reference this afternoon.

[Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson).]

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, I will not refer to the happenings of the past few days, if that touches upon the tender susceptibilities of the minister for external affairs. I am led to believe that perhaps this order in council was passed as quickly as it was so as to prevent any discussion asked for yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: All I will say, Mr. Speaker, is that the happenings of the past few days have profoundly shaken the confidence of the members of this house and the people of Canada in the administration of justice in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: Yesterday when the Minister of Justice outlined the terms of reference we requested that those terms be widened; and the Prime Minister said, as recorded in *Hansard*, that the terms of reference would be sufficiently wide to investigate the propriety of the procedures followed by the Minister of Justice and by the government. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the terms of reference contained in this order in council do nothing of the kind.

Mr. Favreau: Read them.

Mr. Douglas: The relevant sentence appears at the bottom of the first paragraph where, after setting forth the allegations which had been made, it states:

—to consider such other matters as may appear—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think we all want to keep this matter in order.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, why is the minister rising at this time?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I rise on a point of order.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Douglas: You rise on a point of order?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Yes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Order.

An hon. Member: You sit down too, Paul.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Is the Secretary of State for External Affairs rising on a point of order?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I am not objecting to my hon. friend's argument as such, but I am—

An hon. Member: Are you rising on a point of order?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): —suggesting that what my hon. friend is—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I should like to ascertain from the minister whether he is rising on a point of order. He cannot simply ask a question at this time, because the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam has the floor.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker; I am rising on a point of order, and my point of order is this. The hon. gentleman under standing order No. 26 has referred to the matter of urgent importance. The only issue before us now is the urgency of debate. If Your Honour and the house should decide that this is a matter which comes within standing order 26, then my hon. friend would be in order in the argument he is now making. What he has to establish is that within the meaning of the rule this matter is of urgent importance. I point out to him—

Mr. Douglas: Do you not think it is important?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): This is a matter of importance, of course, but whether it is a matter for urgent debate within the meaning of standing order 26 is another thing. The estimates will be up tomorrow, so my hon. friend will have an opportunity then to make the argument he is now making. Surely what he must do now is indicate that under standing order 26 this is a matter involving the right of urgent debate.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I am trying to establish, and shall continue to do so if the minister will stop interrupting. I am making the point that the only relevant clause of these terms of reference is "to report on whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant prosecution for any offence that may be involved." I say that is too narrow, and that the matter must be discussed today because—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Surely the—

Mr. Douglas: —once this order in council has been implemented and the judicial inquiry set up we will then be precluded from discussing this matter.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that must be discussed today or never. Although the order in council has been passed, the judicial inquiry has not as yet got under way. If we wait until tomorrow or any succeeding day, the government will then take the position that the judge has already been appointed and has commenced his work; therefore we cannot discuss this matter. It seems to me that this house has a right here and now to discuss these terms of reference and to indicate our opinions with respect to them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, the urgency of debate lies in this, that the government and particularly parliament ought to take immediate action to clear away any suspicion, so as to renew the confidence of the people of Canada in the administration of justice.

Mr. Woolliams: That will be very difficult.

Mr. Douglas: That cannot be delayed but ought to be dealt with now. The government ought to realize that any failure to act now will only increase the suspicion which already exists in the minds of a great many people. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is great urgency to discuss this question of the terms of reference, and to discuss it right now.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, until the Secretary of State for External Affairs intervened there might have been some doubt as to whether the motion made by the hon. member was proper, but the minister certainly removed any possible doubt in that connection. His argument was so cogent that it convinced me entirely of the rightness of what the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam advanced. Let us see what has happened here. Yesterday

the matter was before the house, and in the course of discussion, when the question was raised as to the setting up of the commission I said this, as recorded at page 10426 of *Hansard*:

> Mr. Speaker, with reference to the announcement made a moment ago regarding the setting up of a judicial commission, we in the opposition might want the opportunity of discussing further ramifications in connection with this matter which I am informed will be brought before the house. Therefore I ask the Prime Minister whether he is in agreement that no objection would be raised on the part of the government, should the commission be appointed, to having further discussion of the matter in the house when the estimates of the Department of Justice come back to the committee of supply. To that end I suggest to the Prime Minister that they be called again tomorrow and that the order in council, if it has not already been issued, be held back so as to permit further disclosures to be made.

Sir, the Prime Minister replied in a general way as follows:

> —the hon. member for Yukon made certain charges, allegations and statements in the house yesterday and had, of course, ample opportunity to do so and he had the right to that opportunity.

Now, sir, it becomes very clear why it was that at 10.30 this morning no order in council had been passed. The cabinet apparently met thereafter, and with a zeal that has not been characteristic of the government it rushed through an order in council. That order in council is so limited that what I stated yesterday will in effect be the result, namely that the chief justice appointed will be limited to what the government wants to produce in order to bring about a whitewash.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Minister of Justice raises objection. I saw him on television last night, and after listening to him I can only conclude that the Liberal philosophy today is that it is a greater offence to criticize wrongdoing than to commit it. The day before yesterday the minister said there was nothing to this matter, that it was false that anybody in his department was involved, but yesterday he had to back down. I can understand the annoyance of the government, because after all when wrongdoing is found out then there is immediate repentance, but we do not intend to have the matter swept aside in that fashion. What is the wording of this order in council? The wording of the order in council—

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Minister of Labour on a point of order.

An hon. Member: He has some papers to produce.

Another hon. Member: Produce your papers.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I should like to raise a point of order based upon the motion made by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I have the floor.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The right hon. Leader of the Opposition had the floor, but the minister is raising a point of order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He is raising a point of order on something that did not arise out of my remarks.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. May I have the co-operation of all hon. members. The understanding of the Chair is that a motion has been made by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, and hon. members of all parties have the opportunity under the rules to address the Chair on the question of urgency. While they are doing this I believe it is not against the rules for a member to rise on a question of privilege or a point of order. It is my understanding this is what the Minister of Labour is attempting to do at this stage, and I feel he should be recognized by the Chair.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, all I ask is a ruling on a very simple point. I understand that when a motion of this kind is urged under standing order No. 26 the only possible discussion than can take place is whether the regular business of the house ought to be set aside, whether the proceedings set down on the order paper to occupy us today should be set aside, and that there is no alternative opportunity for debating the matter sought to be raised by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam. I understand that is the only point before the Chair, and we are ready to argue that point. But I suggest that for the Leader of the Opposition to debate the whole attitude and conduct of the Minister of Justice is out of order, that he has been trespassing on the rules of the house, and that he ought to be asked to confine himself to the specific point whether the business of the house should be set aside for this matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: As the Chair mentioned a moment ago, and all hon. members

will recognize this, the point at issue is simply the question of urgency of debate for the guidance of the Chair in reaching a decision whether standing order 26 should be applied in this case. I would invite all hon. members who participate in the debate at this stage to confine their remarks to this limited point, that is the question of urgency of debate.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had been doing a remarkable job of keeping to that point. To return once more to the question of urgency, I said at the beginning that had it not been for the explanation by the Secretary of State for External Affairs I might have understood the objection, but he made it very clear that we are not to have the opportunity tomorrow of dealing with this whole question and bringing forward further allegations, if we so choose, regarding matters that have remained hidden and would have remained hidden but for the hon. member for Yukon. If the government will say now that tomorrow when the estimates of the department of defence are called—

An hon. Member: Department of Justice.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Department of Justice; it is the justice that needs defence at the moment. If the government will say that tomorrow when the estimates of the justice department are called—

An hon. Member: "If".

Mr. Diefenbaker: They are going to be called tomorrow, I understand.

Mr. Favreau: I asked for it yesterday. They will be called because I asked for it myself.

An hon. Member: Did you tell the Prime Minister?

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am going to pay my tribute to the Minister of Justice. He is most anxious to have these things called now, and all I ask him is this.

Mr. Teillet: Stop smearing.

Mr. Monteith: I do not know of anybody better at that than your whole group.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Will he give the house the assurance now that tomorrow we will have the opportunity to discuss fully not only the contents of this order in council but as well such further matters arising therefrom as we think advisable? If he will, I will immediately say there is no urgency and that the matter can be discussed tomorrow. Will the minister say this?

Mr. Favreau: Of course, Mr. Speaker, within the rules of the house.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: The same old bunch.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, that indicates exactly what the government intend to do, to put the lid on this thing and cover it up. That is what they want to do. In view of the answer of the minister I say we will not have the opportunity tomorrow as was suggested by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. The answer of the minister is a fine revelation. They intend to hide behind the rules, to cover this thing up, to conceal it.

An hon. Member: Smother it.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): What are they afraid of?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Never was the question of urgency more completely uncovered and supported than by the interruption by the Minister of Justice. It is obvious now that if we do not get at this matter today we are not going to have a chance tomorrow because the minister has refused to say that he will permit us to discuss it. Sir, the Canadian people are not going to be deluded by a scheme such as this to cover up evidence and to continue the concealment that characterizes the Department of Justice and the Department of Citizenship and Immigration as well as a parliamentary secretary in the Prime Minister's office. There has never been a case where there has been less communication among members of the government or between departments.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We want to get to the bottom of this matter. It is urgent.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The right hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have the floor.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, a point of order.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The hon. gentleman has been going far beyond the prescribed limit of this debate, which is concerned with the consideration of the question of urgency. I am not going to deal with the irrelevancies

that my right hon. friend introduced. I am sorry he wrongly said that the government is not prepared to face any other suggestions with regard to the inquiry. The Minister of Justice was as forthcoming—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friend laughs. What did the Minister of Justice say? The Minister of Justice said "Of course, within the rules". Surely the Leader of the Opposition, who is a custodian of the rules by virtue of his office, would not object to that addition. Of course we must act within the rules. There is nothing—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): There is nothing within our rules that will prevent—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): There is nothing within our rules—

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): This is a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I understand the Acting Prime Minister is speaking to a point of order. We should hear him first and the hon. member can speak to the point of order thereafter.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): It may be a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The Secretary of State for External Affairs rose and got recognition at a time when it should have been the turn of this party to be recognized.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I want to say in fairness—and I know what the hon. gentleman has said—that in the normal routine it would have been his party's turn. I just thought that as leader of the house, and in view of the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition, it was only right to emphasize what had been said by the Minister of Justice, that he would be prepared to meet—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): —this further inquiry; and he added, "within the rules of the house". I say that no hon. member can, on reflection, take exception to that. I say to the Leader of the Opposition, if he will look at the order now as drawn, he will see it was not hastily drawn.

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

Mr. Diefenbaker: No, it certainly was not.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): He will find that, within the context of the matters charged in this house, it is as open as any terms of reference could be.

An hon. Member: This is not a point of order.

Mr. Pickersgill: It is a point of order.

Mr. Douglas: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I understand the Acting Prime Minister is relinquishing the floor to the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam on a point of order.

Mr. Douglas: Whether he is or not, I am rising on a point of order.

Mr. Pickersgill: He was on a point of order.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Douglas: The Acting Prime Minister is now proceeding to discuss the order in council and the terms of reference, the very thing he denied me the right to do when he asked Your Honour to intervene and prevent me from doing that. The rules ought to apply, since he pays such tribute to them, to both sides of the house. I was denied the right to discuss this order in council and the terms of reference. Now the leader of the government gets up and says the Leader of the Opposition should read the order in council, then he proceeds to discuss the order in council under the pretext of raising a point of order which is no point of order at all. He rose on what was allegedly a point of order and proceeded to take part in the debate. It seems to me that if Your Honour is going to allow the Acting Prime Minister to discuss the order in council, then it would be very wise to accept this motion and let us all discuss the order in council.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The point raised by the hon. member is well taken. The Chair has invited hon. members to limit their contributions to the motion now before the house and to the question of urgency. Going back five or ten minutes, I believe the right hon. Leader of the Opposition had the floor, and I suggest if all points of order have been taken up and exhausted, we should return to him.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the time I was so cavalierly interrupted I was trying to point out the urgency, and established the urgency out of the mouth of the Secretary of State for External Affairs as well as the Minister of Justice. His interruption cleared up the matter absolutely. What

the government intends to do, having secured this order in council, is to take the stand when the subject comes up on the justice estimates that we shall not be able to discuss these matters because, as the Secretary of State for External Affairs has said, they are sub judice.

Well, sir, that was one of the major reasons that yesterday I asked the government to refrain from tabling the order in council until there had been an opportunity to bring out further revelations if we chose to do so. That has now been denied.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, no, they say. Well, if they are changed tomorrow, I can only say that their attitude for the last several days has been the very reverse. Since August 14 they have hidden everything. Now that revelations have taken place they do not want parliament to discuss the matter any more. The Minister of Justice admits that tomorrow, within the rules—and the rules have already been set out by the Secretary of State for External Affairs—we would be denied this opportunity. In other words parliament is being throttled. Members of parliament are being denied the opportunity to place before parliament and the country additional matters which may be of interest; matters, I am sure, that will reveal to any objective individual further support to what has already been advanced in the past two days.

I am surprised the government is not anxious to discuss this, because I would have thought the Minister of Justice would be the first to say "Let justice be done, though the heavens fall". That is one thought that should certainly apply when political considerations are being considered or have been considered by the government.

An hon. Member: Justice will be done.

Mr. Smallwood: Liberal justice.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, once more we see that the house is wasting valuable time that should be normally spent on the estimates of the various departments in order to discuss a matter which has been discussed since the beginning of the week.

[*Text*]

An hon. Member: Move over.

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): Just a minute and you will find out.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, what do we see today? Two political parties trying to make political capital for the forthcoming election, to the detriment of Canadians who have to witness relatively sterile debates.

Mr. Speaker, we are now discussing a motion by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) to ascertain whether the business of the house for today should be set aside in order to consider the motion of the Acting Prime Minister (Mr. Martin) to set up an inquiry commission to look into the case already mentioned.

I do not see any purpose in spending two hours today to reconsider that matter.

A commission will be set up and each and every hon. member of the house who wishes to do so can appear before that commission. If the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams) wish to appear before that commission in order to present new facts which have apparently not been drawn to the attention of the house, they will have an opportunity to do so, and I hope they can bring forward evidence to support the charges they have made.

You may hear this later if you so desire.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we will gain nothing if we spend two and one half hours today listening to discussions on this matter.

In closing, may I make this suggestion to the Acting Prime Minister (Mr. Martin) and to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau). Since, apparently, we must hear the remarks of some hon. members on this question, I suggest that the estimates of the Department of Justice be discussed today.

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to that.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker—

[*Text*]

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The Minister of Justice has said he will take his estimates today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I am wondering whether the house has taken official notice of the statement just made by the Minister of Justice, which might have some bearing on the decision of the Chair.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker—

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Minister of Justice.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I want that to be very clear. I have not turned down any suggestion that my estimates be examined immediately, if the Conservative opposition and the other opposition parties feel this could help the house.

[*Text*]

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Fairweather: I would like to ask the minister a question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Fairweather: I have a question for the Minister of Justice which is quite relevant.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Fairweather: It will determine how we vote, obviously.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. For the last 40 or 45 minutes the Chair, pursuant to the rules of the house and pursuant to the special order adopted during the current session of parliament, has given the opportunity to hon. members of the house to take part in the debate and express their views as to the question of urgency of debate. Without trying to go into the matter in great detail, perhaps for the record I should refer to the oft quoted ruling of Mr. Speaker Black, as recorded in the *Journals* of the house of March 31, 1931, at page 50:

> The reason for allowing such a motion for the adjournment is to afford members an opportunity of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance which they could do in no other way—

The matter raised by hon. members is, of course, of very serious importance. It is also urgent; but in view of the fact that the estimates of the Department of Justice will be called later on today, to my mind this ought to have an important and essential bearing on the question of urgency of debate. It is not for the Minister of Justice or the Acting Prime Minister to determine for the Chair in anticipation whether any subject matter, any question, is debatable. It is for the Chair to decide in due course whether a particular subject matter is relevant or irrelevant, and whether it can be debated under the rules.

In view of the fact that there will be a possibility for hon. members to discuss the matters referred to in the motion of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, I suggest that there is no urgency of debate as implied by standing order 26 and, with regret, that must be the decision of the Chair.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, there is just one question I think should be cleared up.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Bow River knows the rules. Perhaps he will have an opportunity later on to ask his question, but the point has been disposed of. If his question is allowed it may be very relevant and important, but I am sure he would agree it would not be conducive to the good order of the house if he pursued the debate, once a decision has been rendered by the Chair on the question of urgency. I think we should continue with the regular procedure of the house, which is now motions for the production of papers.

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. We have now had a return in connection with motion No. 186, in which there is no report of any cheques being found within the Department of Labour. Is there not a working paper left by Al Watson in the Department of Labour known as H-12 which shows that those cheques in question were handed over to the trustees?

Question No. 2, or a related question—you might as well answer both questions while you are on your feet—is this. In view of the admission of the Prime Minister on November 22 on the Pierre Berton show, found at page 33 of the script, and I quote; "There seems to be evidence that individual members of this union or the union itself have contributed to individual members of parliament in Montreal where the S.I.U. had its headquarters"—and the Prime Minister says "evidence"—would the minister be prepared now to give us the names of the members who received those cheques and the purpose for which those cheques were given, which are now in the hands of the trustees according to that working paper?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, of course the order that was passed by the house and for which I made a return with respect to the Department of Labour and the board of trustees had to do with cheques or photostats thereof. A diligent

search of our files revealed no such cheques or photostats, and the board of trustees advised me likewise with respect to their records. I would say that the perfectly accurate answer to the first question, as I understand it—it was a rather long question—is no, taking into account all aspects of the question.

Mr. Woolliams: Then I would like to ask a supplementary question. In view of the fact that the Prime Minister said there was evidence that cheques were paid to individual members of parliament by Banks or the S.I.U., would the minister now tell us to whom those cheques were paid and for what purpose they were paid?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge, nor has any information ever been drawn to my attention, identifying contributions made by the S.I.U. to any individual member of parliament either on this side or the other side of the house.

Mr. Woolliams: A further supplementary question. I wonder whether the Acting Prime Minister, in view of the fact that the Prime Minister said there was evidence, would take the question as notice and advise us—and this is the question again—to whom the cheques were paid and for what purpose.

Mr. Diefenbaker: And for what amount.

Mr. Woolliams: And for what amount. Also, whether there is a working paper known as H.12 in the labour department files showing that those cheques were forwarded to the trustees, and what has happened to them since the time they left the Department of Labour and were handed over to the trustees.

Mr. Diefenbaker: They must have gone with Banks.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Labour.

Could he tell us if document H-12 referred to by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams) mentions the documents handed to the board of trustees and also that cheques were handed to the board of trustees and to whom they were made payable?

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It is the understanding of the Chair that this is information that has been requested in a motion for the production of papers.

Mr. Grégoire: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Well, this is the type of information that could be requested or required in a motion for the production of papers, rather than sought at this time on the orders of the day.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, the minister wants to answer, with the greatest respect to you, and I think he should answer if he has this information. We would certainly like to have it on this side of the house.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I have no desire, wish or determination to conceal any information within the possession of my department with respect to the S.I.U.; but I suggest—and this is the perfectly regular way to do it—that my hon. friend place a motion on the order paper requesting this particular document which he has described as H-12, and we will deal with it in the normal way.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question—

[*Text*]

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Lapointe has already posed a supplementary question. The time is limited, and we will come back to the hon. member for Lapointe. The hon. member for Cape Breton South on a supplementary question.

Mr. MacInnis: A further supplementary question to the Minister of Labour. The Minister of Labour maintains that there is no evidence available. Why, then, did the Minister of Labour find it necessary to defend the idea of accepting cheques from Mr. Banks?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I did not understand the second part of the question. If it was repeated I would be glad to deal with it.

Mr. MacInnis: The second part of my question was why, then, did the Minister of Labour find it necessary to defend the idea of accepting cheques from this particular labour leader?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour made no such defence at any time or in any place.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

Since the estimates of the Department of Justice will be considered this afternoon, for the last time possibly, and since those cheques are directly related to other operations of the Department of Justice, namely the Banks case, could the Minister of Labour table this afternoon document H-12 which gave the names of those who received and those who signed the cheques handed to the board of trustees?

Could the minister produce that document this afternoon?

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. This question has already been answered by the minister—

Mr. Grégoire: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: —and it is the suggestion of the Chair that this is not a proper question on the orders of the day since the information sought by the hon. member for Lapointe and other hon. members would normally be sought and, I assume, obtained if available, through a motion for the production of papers. The hon. member for Halifax.

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question—

Mr. Grégoire: On a question of privilege—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

I understand that the production of that document may be asked for if a notice of motion for papers is presented, but then our work would be greatly alleviated, because when the document is tabled the estimates will have been adopted, and we will not have had the occasion of performing our duties thoroughly.

That is the reason why I believe that the tabling of this document constitutes a question of privilege and that we are entitled to ask for its production before the estimates of the Department of Justice are passed.

That is why I am asking the Minister of Labour if he can table that document before the estimates of the Department of Justice are carried.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member is merely repeating the question he has already asked, and it is the opinion of the Chair that this question cannot be asked at this moment.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

[*Text*]

[*Later:*]

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I have a question supplementary to the question asked by the hon. member for Bow River. I would like to direct this question to the Secretary of State; however, in his absence I shall direct it to his parliamentary secretary. In view of the fact that certain returns have now been made in relation to notice of motion for the production of papers No. 186, and that these returns come from just two government departments, the office of the Prime Minister and the privy council office and state there are no such cheques in the custody of these offices, can we expect that further returns will be made in relation to this order, or are we to understand that this is the completion of the returns?

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the return submitted yesterday, which is a nil return in its entirety, covers the Department of Labour, the maritime board of trustees, the Department of Justice and the office of the Prime Minister. It can be regarded as a partial return. It was submitted because of the urgent request of the hon. member for Churchill. To assure that the return is not only complete, as I believe it now is, but that it is also obviously complete, the order has been sent to all departments and agencies of the government, and just as soon as their returns to the order have been received those returns will be added to the papers that have already been filed.

Mr. Simpson: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question on the same subject. Possibly I have not looked over the return carefully enough, but I can see nothing about the board of trustees in these returns.

Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, this question was dealt with earlier by the Minister of Labour, who indicated that his return covered not only his department but also the trustees.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Terry Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice. In order that we may evaluate the seriousness of the situation, I wonder whether the minister can tell us how much money the government paid in fees to Mr. Lamontagne's firm in 1964; in other words, the amount of Liberal patronage that might be cut off if he insisted on doing his duty to his client?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, of course no minister of justice car-

ries in his head these figures as to fees paid out throughout the years. I think that is a question for the order paper.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, certainly this is a question that has been discussed by the minister and the personnel of his department. I am also sure that the happenings in regard to that firm have been discussed thoroughly, and if the minister's estimates are to come up later today I am sure this information is readily available so that he may give it later.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. member how he knows that I have discussed this matter, and with whom.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has pointed out that this is the type of question which could be asked during a consideration of the minister's estimates. I suggest that it is certainly not the type of question to be asked at this stage of our proceedings.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Yesterday the Prime Minister, answering a question asked, I think, by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, said that Mr. Joseph Sedgwick was a commissioner involved in examining certain aspects of the work of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and implied that he, that is Mr. Sedgwick, would be investigating the activities of Mr. Raymond Denis in the department.

The question I wish to ask the minister is this. Is it not a fact that Mr. Sedgwick is not a commissioner but simply a legal adviser to the department, and is it not also a fact that he has not been asked to inquire at all into the activities of Mr. Denis in the department?

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the setting up of a special inquiry commission under Chief Justice Dorion, as decided by the cabinet, leads us to hope that all the aspects of the problem raised in the house where the name of Mr. Raymond Denis was involved, will be considered and therefore there is no reason now to believe that Mr. Sedgwick would have to conduct an investigation with regard to Mr. Denis' activities since they will be covered by that inquiry.

[*Text*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, motion 189 is acceptable to the government. Motion 192 is acceptable subject to the usual reservation concerning the consent of the provincial government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Does the house agree to the passing of these motions subject to the restriction mentioned by the parliamentary secretary?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, motion 193 is acceptable on the assumption that it refers to the blank forms used by the department in the case of persons applying for the status of landed immigrant.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house agree to the passing of this motion subject to the limitation expressed by the parliamentary secretary?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Stewart: Will Your Honour please call motions 190, 191, 194, 195 and 196?

CORRESPONDENCE AND SUBMISSIONS ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Motion No. 187—**Mr. Brewin:**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house a copy of all correspondence exchanged during the past year between the Minister of Justice and the attorneys general or other provincial ministers regarding methods of amending the constitution of Canada; and also for other papers and documents prepared for and presented to the meeting held in October between the Minister of Justice and the attorneys general relating to the amendment of the constitution of Canada.

Mr. Favreau: Could this motion be stood for a week?

Mr. Brewin: Yes.

Motion stands.

MEDICAL SERVICE, MILLBROOK INDIAN RESERVE

Motion No. 189—**Mr. Howard:**

That an order of the house do issue for a list of the names and addresses of each medical doctor who attended Indians on the Millbrook Indian reserve in Nova Scotia since January 1, 1955 to whom payments were made for medical services, showing for each calendar year, by name of the doctor the amount so paid.

Motion agreed to.

Motions for Papers

SASKATOON AIRPORT PROPERTY—CORRESPONDENCE WITH CITY

Motion No. 190—**Mr. Douglas:**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the city of Saskatoon and any minister of the government regarding the federal property and housing units at the Saskatoon airport since January 1, 1964.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, there would be no objection to this motion on the understanding that the government would not produce any correspondence regarded by the city as confidential, if there is any such correspondence. So long as it is not confidential it is quite acceptable.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house agree to the passing of the motion subject to the reservation mentioned by the Minister of Transport?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

SASKATOON AIRPORT PROPERTY—CORRESPONDENCE WITH CORY MUNICIPALITY

Motion No. 191—**Mr. Douglas:**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the rural municipality of Cory and any minister of the government regarding the federal property and housing units at the Saskatoon airport since January 1, 1964.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, the same reservation would apply to this.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion subject to the reservation mentioned by the Minister of Transport?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

SASKATOON AIRPORT PROPERTY—CORRESPONDENCE WITH PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT

Motion No. 192—**Mr. Douglas:**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this house a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the government of Saskatchewan and any minister of the government regarding the federal property and housing units at the Saskatoon airport since January 1, 1964.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Howard.]

DOCUMENTATION PAPERS OF LANDED IMMIGRANTS

Motion No. 193—**Mr. Pascoe:**

That an order of the house do issue for a true copy of documentation papers of landed immigrants now in use by the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

Motion agreed to.

SASKATOON AIRPORT PROPERTY—OFFER BY CITY

Motion No. 194—**Mrs. Jones:**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before the house a copy of any bid, offer or tender received from the city of Saskatoon by any department of the federal government in connection with federal property at the Saskatoon airport.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the same exception could apply as in the case of the motions of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas), namely that any correspondence which the city has not treated as confidential would be produced, but if there is any that is confidential we would not feel we were entitled to produce it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion subject to the reservations and limitations prescribed by the minister?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

SASKATOON AIRPORT PROPERTY—OFFER FROM McNAB CORPORATION

Motion No. 195—**Mrs. Jones:**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all letters, telegrams, offers or bids received by any department or agency of the federal government from McNab Park Development Corp. Ltd., in connection with property owned by the federal government at the Saskatoon airport.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could make the same reservation in respect of this matter, that anything that is public correspondence we would be happy to produce, but should there be any confidential correspondence we think that should not be done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion subject to the reservation prescribed by the minister?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

SASKATOON AIRPORT PROPERTY—CONTRACT WITH McNAB CORPORATION

Motion No. 196—**Mrs. Jones:**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of any agreement or contract entered into between McNab Park Development Corp. Ltd., and any department or agency of the federal government relating to federal property at the Saskatoon airport.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, before you call this motion perhaps I could save a little time by assuring the hon. lady that there is no correspondence relating to this motion, and perhaps the motion could therefore be dropped.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the motion withdrawn?

Mrs. Jones: Yes.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CONGO—PENSION FOR WIDOW OF MURDERED MISSIONARY

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Secretary of State for External Affairs and all members of the house will want to extend their sympathy to those who were so wantonly murdered in the Congo, and in particular our sympathy to the family of the Rev. Hector McMillan of Avonmore, Ontario. I would ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether, having regard to the circumstances under which this missionary met his death, the government would give consideration toward a grant or pension or ex gratia payment to the widow and six sons?

I think generally there would be acceptance by Canadians of this, because certainly the reverend gentleman stayed on in order to help, in order to succor and in order to bring about peace—his divine mission.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman says that all of us in the house regret very much the incidents at Stanleyville, and in particular those that now seem to apply with finality to the Rev. Mr. McMillan. I need not emphasize that we on this side of the house have been greatly concerned about this problem, as was made known by us during the past week. I simply wish to point out that we are not yet sure of the situation as it applies to some of the other Canadians. The suggestion made by the right hon. gentleman is one which I shall be glad to discuss with my colleagues.

I will only add that the report about Reverend J. Hector McMillan, who was stated to have been slain, appears unfortunately to be true. He represents those fine individuals in our country who are prepared to dedicate themselves to their religious beliefs in their effort to impress on others in other parts of the world the validity of those beliefs. It is also reported that two of his sons were slightly wounded. We have not as yet received any information that any other Canadians were killed or wounded.

A number of Canadians have been safely evacuated to Leopoldville. They include Mrs. J. Hector McMillan and six children; Mrs. Marshal-Southard and child; Miss Grete Bjerkseth; Miss Viola Walker; Mr. and Mrs. D. L. Grant; Dr. and Mrs. Melvin Loewen and five children; Sister Suzanne de Notre Dame; Sister Stanislas; Sister Anne de Ste. Marie; Sister Montfort de la Croix. By this morning it appeared that more than 800 hostages had been evacuated by air from Stanleyville to Leopoldville. I hope that within the next day or so I shall be able to report on the welfare and the whereabouts of all the remaining Canadians. I am sure I express on behalf of all members of the house our gratification with regard to those who have been liberated and our sincere regret at the passing of Mr. McMillan.

COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS

TRADE PROPOSALS FOR DISCUSSION WITH U.K. PRIME MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I underline the word "specific" when I ask now whether the Canadian government is preparing specific proposals relating to commonwealth trade to present to Prime Minister Wilson and his colleagues at the time of their visit to Ottawa next month.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I understand that Mr. Wilson will be here for a very short time only. I expect that during this time we shall have an opportunity of talking about many matters relating to commonwealth trade. I am satisfied Mr. Wilson will raise with us certain complaints which the British government has against the treatment of British exports to Canada. We, in turn, will raise with the British government the question of the duration and

application of the 15 per cent tax. I have no doubt that we shall also be talking about the whole problem of stimulating commonwealth trade. But in the short time available I do not think there will be an opportunity to open up any broad issues for lengthy examination.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

QUEBEC—DELAY IN PAYMENTS UNDER WINTER WORKS PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Labour a question.

As this year's winter works program has already started and as I understand that the federal government still owes the Quebec government over $2 million with regard to last year's contribution to winter works, which creates hardship in some municipalities, which were unable to receive their share of that federal contribution, can the minister tell the house whether his department has not yet paid its contribution and is keeping back this amount due to the Quebec provincial government for last year's work?

If the government has not already done so, when is it hoped that the amount can be paid?

[*Text*]

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): I shall be glad to inquire and give an authentic answer tomorrow. I understand we make payments just as soon as the applications come forward in regular form from the province. But I will make inquiries and satisfy the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question. I hope the minister can make a full inquiry, because it appears that the province of Quebec government has sent in its applications to the federal government and the latter is delaying its payments.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Labour.

[*Text*]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR EARLY PAYMENT OF INCREASED BENEFITS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, and in his absence I would direct it to his parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Grégoire: Where is the minister?

Mr. Regan: In view of the fact that the increase in veterans pensions has now been approved, will the minister make every effort to see to it that the increase, including the retroactivity—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Regan: —is in the hands of pensioners in time for Christmas, because of the need of pensioners in that regard?

Mr. C. W. Carter (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, every effort is being made to have these cheques in the mail before Christmas.

FINANCE

RESULT OF INCREASE IN BANK OF CANADA INTEREST RATES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Finance a question related to the increase of the interest rate to 4¼ per cent announced yesterday by the Bank of Canada.

Does not the Minister of Finance think that this move will result in a tighter money situation, a tight monetary and credit policy in general and an economic paralysis more serious than the present one, contrary to what the president of the Bank of Canada, Mr. Louis Rasminsky, stated yesterday?

[*Text*]

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Certainly not, Mr. Speaker.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. S. Smallwood (Battle River-Camrose): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister with reference to a statement by the Minister of Agriculture, in which he said:

> I understand far better now than I used to what Prime Minister Pearson means when he says Canada needs some new politics.

My question is this. Would the Acting Prime Minister say that the actions of the government in the last few days represent the new politics referred to by the Minister of Agriculture?

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would say this. It is incumbent on all of us in this house to act in a manner conducive to the high traditions of this house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That applies to the government, but let me remind my hon. friend that it applies in equal measure to hon. gentlemen who sit opposite.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, after that pious ejaculation all I can say is "Physician, heal thyself".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

DISCIPLINARY MEASURES RESPECTING APPLICATION OF FUNDS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice whether he is now in a position to advise the house regarding the conviction of two members of the R.C.M. Police. As far back as July 15 or 16 last they were convicted of an offence concerning the misapplication of funds, and their sentences were under review. Is the minister in a position now to give the house an answer to a question that has been asked several times in this regard? If he has no answer to give at this time, will he explain the very long delay that has taken place in his department?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, my estimates will be before the house in a few minutes, and I think that is a good question to ask at that time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

COMPENSATION FOR STAFF WITH REGARD TO LATE SITTINGS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the President of the Privy Council and relates to some of our proceedings during the last few days when we have, by tacit consent, extended the sitting hours. I should like to know whether the staff—the protective staff, pages, interpreters and all others affected by this action on our part—are to receive extra pay for the extra hours they have been obliged to put in.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I understand they are. The system involving compensatory leave and extra pay is rather involved, and applies in a different way to different parts of the House of Commons staff. I will obtain full information in this regard and provide my hon. friend with the information.

As far as the protective staff are concerned, for example, if they put in up to two hours of overtime this is covered by an internal arrangement, but if the overtime is more than two hours the employees are credited with a full half day extra pay. I will give complete details to my hon. friend.

INDUSTRY

SALE OF EUROPEAN GASOLINE AT DISTRESS PRICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I believe the minister has received a telegram from an association representing a very large number of service station operators, informing him of a price war resulting from the dumping of European gasoline at distress prices, which is being sold at 9 cents per gallon under the normal price. Has the minister been able to take any steps to meet the requests of these operators and other interested parties?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman has said I have received representations from the Ontario retail gasoline association, and today I replied as follows:

> Thank you for your telegram November 20. I already have the situation referred to in your telegram under active investigation with a view to relieving the present hardship being experienced by members of your association in the metropolitan Toronto area.

The course of this investigation, Mr. Speaker, has been this. I have been meeting with representatives of all the companies engaged in the petroleum business in Canada, and I have informed them that the government continues to support the national oil policy and will, if necessary, take steps to prevent the disruption of that policy by imports of gasoline from Europe at distress prices.

EDUCATION

STUDENT LOANS—DESIGNATION OF CREDIT UNIONS TO OPERATE AS BANKS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance whether he has the answer today to my question in relation to the student loans plan and credit unions, which he said he would obtain.

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I must apologize to my hon. friend for not having answered this question yesterday, but I was very busy and concerned with a number of things, particularly with the financial situation in the world.

The answer is that 47 credit unions have been designated to operate as banks under the Canada Student Loans Act so far. Two of them are in Nova Scotia, four in Ontario, four in Manitoba, 26 in Saskatchewan and 11 in British Columbia.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, last night when we were dealing with the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs one item was carried, and I should like to draw the committee's attention to it. In the supplementary estimates (C) at page 5, item 10c under the heading "Schedule B" in the third column the word "annual" is used. The word should be "monthly". This is a rather obvious typographical error which does not affect the amount of the item itself. However, I wanted to mention this fact so the appropriation bill itself will be completely accurate. I have inquired and I am informed that no action is needed other than to be sure it is correct in the appropriation bill when it comes forward.

The Chairman: Order. Vote No. 1—

Mr. McIlraith: Order.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Howe's arrogance but none of his brains.

Mr. McIlraith: I think the assessment of brain power will be made by hon. members of the committee on the strength of the remark of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Grafftey: I regret I said that. I am very sorry.

Mr. McIlraith: In any event, I want to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that when I announced the business of the house last night I indicated we would call first the estimates of the Minister of Forestry, the unemployment insurance item, public works and national revenue. Today at the motion stage of proceedings suggestions were made about proceeding with the Department of Justice immediately. I must admit frankly that I did not hear all that was said on that point, but I am in the hands of the committee with regard to whether they wish to proceed with justice or forestry.

Mr. Fairweather: I wonder whether the minister could answer this question. This is going to be a very short day and we have many matters to discuss in justice. Will we go on with justice tomorrow too? It is important to know now.

Mr. McIlraith: I do not know. That is up to the committee.

Mr Fairweather: We want to know now.

Mr. McIlraith: All I can say to the committee is that certain arrangements were made and the understanding last night and up until the proceedings on motions today was that justice would be called tomorrow instead of today, because today is a short day. I do not know what those who asked to have the forestry and national revenue items brought forward will say about this. It is a matter purely for the opposition groups.

Mr. Churchill: On the point that the government house leader has raised, Mr. Chairman, may I say it is not up to the committee. The government calls the business of the house. We have had good co-operation this week in respect of the business of the house, and under the circumstances I think the government house leader should say that the estimates of the Department of Justice will continue as the first item tomorrow. In view of what we achieved yesterday we might be able to complete justice and deal with forestry and the other items tomorrow evening.

Mr. McIlraith: I am quite agreeable to that as long as none of the other opposition groups raises any question about proceeding with ARDA and national revenue.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed any further, it has been drawn to my attention by a colleague that in the last question I put to the Minister of Justice there may have been an imputation in my words that

I certainly did not intend. What I meant by my words was that when the Minister of Justice heard of this affair I was sure he would have ascertained that Mr. Lamontagne was indeed a crown agent and that it would have been natural for the minister to find out whether the department had made use of his services only once or had been using him for some time. I intended to imply nothing further in my remarks.

The Chairman: Order. Vote No. 1 of the estimates of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1965.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal and other services—

1. Administration including the office of the superintendent of bankruptcy, grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, gratuities to the widows or other dependants of judges who die while in office and authority to make recoverable advances for the administration of justice on behalf of the governments of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory, $2,109,600.

The Chairman: When this vote was being considered on November 23 an amendment by the hon. member for Yukon was before the committee. Shall I dispense?

Some hon. Members: Dispense.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, since the announcement by the Minister of Justice yesterday that there would be a judicial inquiry into the matters which I raised on November 23 I have been considering very carefully whether or not my responsibility should be to continue with the matters I raised on November 23 and to expand upon them. I have come to the conclusion that that is precisely my responsibility and that is my intention today.

On November 23 the minister made certain replies to the matters which I raised and I think these replies are deserving of careful examination and criticism. I am very sorry that the hon. member for Dollard is not in his seat. He was here this afternoon but he is not here now. Obviously the remarks affected the hon. member in view of his subsequent action. In view of the remarks which the minister has made publicly over national television networks I say to him again and I assure all members of the house it is not my intention in raising these matters to cast innuendo or smear on anyone.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: The minister laughs. He made such an accusation last evening on national television and he made it on Monday. I say to the minister that instead of launching upon personal attacks against me he would be following a more proper and prudent course if he would make the explanations which this house and the country demand of him.

Several questions have arisen in the minds of a good many, I am sure, with respect to this whole affair that must be explained. The Minister of Justice is under obligation to explain them and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration is also under such an obligation. I would put some of these questions to the minister arising out of his remarks. I see the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration is in his seat.

I am sure members of the committee will be interested to know that there are others involved in this affair. The minister knows this, as a matter of fact, because it is in the police report. I believe the minister knows full well that a certain Mr. Gignac has been arrested in Montreal on a charge of capital murder and I give the minister this opportunity to explain to the committee, if he will, what connection Mr. Gignac has with this whole affair. These remarks should not be taken as carrying any inferences at all.

I think the minister should explain to the house what, if any, connection Mr. Gignac has with the bribe offer itself, what appears to be a bribe offer particularly in view of the remarks by the solicitor, Mr. Lamontagne, to whom I referred. The minister is quite aware now that Mr. Lamontagne has substantially supported what I had to say on November 23. He has said indeed that a bribe was offered to him and he has also said that he had received telephone calls from others. The press reports I have read contain some conflicting quotations from Mr. Lamontagne. Some of these refer to Mr. Lamontagne as having stated that he did not recognize Mr. Lord's voice on the telephone and others express the contrary view.

I believe that either the minister or the Prime Minister is under obligation to explain fully to members of the house now the connection that the hon. member for Dollard has with the whole affair. The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration has several questions to answer. He should explain whether or not he had any part at all, and I do not suggest from that remark that he did have any part at all to play in this matter.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

An hon. Member: You would not know much about that over there.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friend is a lawyer, and he will appreciate this. This royal commission is going into this matter—

Some hon. Members: Here it comes.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The Leader of the Opposition, who has had a lot of experience in the law, knows quite well that what I am saying now is on the soundest ground. It is absolutely wrong to discuss now the kind of action—

Mr. Fairweather: It is a trick.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The hon. member says it is a trick. He was a distinguished attorney general and knows, in his heart, it is no trick.

Mr. Fairweather: Let us discuss the whole thing.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friend asked for the investigation, the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam asked for this investigation and the government has acceded to this investigation. Now, under our system, once a judicial function has been created the legislative does not interfere within the areas assigned to the judicial function. It would make a mockery of the bill of rights.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): It would make a mockery of our judicial system, I am sure, inasmuch as the implications refer to persons alleged to be involved in these matters that now can be reviewed only by a judge. Surely that is clear, Mr. Chairman, otherwise our system of justice means nothing; otherwise the rule of law means nothing; otherwise the bill of rights means nothing. Surely this is clear. I know that the hon. gentleman, who is a good lawyer himself, and who was on his feet before I rose, will find it difficult to take issue with what I have said, unless he can explain that what he is dealing with now is outside the context of the inquiry established today by the governor in council.

Mr. Douglas: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman, and it will only take two sentences. I cannot allow the Acting Prime Minister to use me as a refuge behind which to hide when he says that I asked for this inquiry.

An hon. Member: You did.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

Mr. Douglas: It is true, I asked for a judicial inquiry, but I also urged first that there be the widest possible terms of reference. I also supported the contention of the Leader of the Opposition that this inquiry should be established immediately after we had disposed of the justice estimates.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): May I just say to the hon. gentleman, what could be wider than the terms of reference that are before us now?

Mr. Nugent: Let us debate that.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Let us debate that. Let us see what could be wider than the terms of reference before us.

First of all, my hon. friend asked for an inquiry and we instituted an inquiry. Then, we outlined the terms of reference that we had in mind and we are told that they are too circumscribed. We bring forward terms of reference that provide for the fullest inquiry.

Mr. Brewin: You know they are restricted terms.

Mr. Fairweather: It is a shocking cover-up.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friend says it is a shocking cover-up. I would remind him that this kind of observation is designed to create an impression.

I should like to remind this house what the Leader of the Opposition said when he was dealing with a matter—

Some hon. Members: Order.

The Chairman: Order; my understanding is that the Acting Prime Minister is on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: I think a question of privilege can be raised—

The Chairman: No. The hon. member is wrong on that point. The point of order must be heard first and the question of privilege will then be studied when the minister resumes his seat.

[*Text*]

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to take to heart the words of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition, words which he uttered in the house in connection with matters of this sort.

An hon. Member: You did not take them to heart half an hour ago.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I refer hon. members to page 4410 of *Hansard,* volume IV, 1959, where the present Leader of the Opposition is reported as saying:

> Mr. Speaker, I know of no contradictions such as are suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. I may say a committee is not set up for the purpose of resolving contradictions. The circumstances under which a committee is set up are very clearly shown to be based upon a charge or charges made by a member of this house. All of us know what happens when charges are made.

I would ask my hon. friend who intervened a moment ago to recall that.

> If charges are made, the house has the opportunity of determining whether they should be submitted to a committee. And if any hon. member makes a charge he, of course, has to substantiate that charge and if he fails to substantiate the charge the parliamentary tradition, indeed all the experience of the past, indicates that such a member having made a charge unconfirmed and unsupported may be himself adjudged guilty of a breach of the privileges of the house.

Then, the right hon. gentleman quoted from Sir Wilfrid Laurier as follows:

> The house, I hope will not depart from the sound traditions which have come to us from England and according to which there could be no inquisition into any man's conduct or standing except on charges made specifically.

Now, there were charges made with regard to one aspect of this matter and those charges have now gone before a judicial commission. I say that in the name of justice now, for us, having asked for this inquisition to take place, to indulge in an inquiry of our own with regard to these matters, is not following the rules of this house or the sense of justice under which we operate.

The Chairman: Is the right hon. Leader of the Opposition rising on a point of order? Perhaps I should mention that the hon. member for Lapointe wanted to raise a question of privilege.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I should like first of all to refer you to standing order 17 which states:

> Whenever any matter of privilege arises, it shall be taken into consideration immediately.

The standing order applies even if the question of privilege is raised during consideration of a point of order. I think that has always been the practice in the house except in the ruling you have just given.

This is my question of privilege, Mr. Chairman. I feel the house leader, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. McIlraith) misled some hon. members when he asked that a time limit be set for consideration of remaining estimates, because he stated that we would have full opportunity of examining those estimates.

And now, we have a week, seven full days to consider the estimates.

As house leader, the President of the Privy Council had told us that we would have full opportunity to do so, but at the same time other members of the government, including the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin), raise points of order without any reason.

The day before yesterday the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) rose twice on questions of privilege which were not in order. The house leader had promised us that we would have full opportunity to consider the estimates, but since his colleagues of the cabinet unduly delay the discussion of the estimates, we are being prevented from dealing with those matters.

That is why I say that the house leader misguided the members of the house, that he had us concur in a motion to restrict the discussion of estimates under false pretences.

And today, because of the deceit of the house leader, we will no longer be in a position to discuss the estimates as we would have liked, especially those of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau), following the doings of other members of the cabinet.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, it required no particular precision to realize earlier today that what the government intended to do was go through the pretence of calling the estimates of the Department of Justice this afternoon, and then endeavour to cover up and conceal the facts and deny parliament the right of discussion. As a matter of fact the members of the government knew that the attitude of the opposition was that the government should refrain from passing the order in council until we had a full opportunity of discussing these matters in the house.

This morning my office got in touch with the privy council office and found that no order in council had been passed as at ten thirty o'clock. It is obvious, as evidenced by the quotation brought in by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, that the government rushed on with the appointment of the commission so as to be able, not to make a mockery of the bill of rights, but to make a mockery of parliament. The hon. gentleman talks about making a mockery of the bill of rights. He used to ridicule it, but now the heresy he ridiculed becomes the cornerstone of his argument.

This is an obvious attempt to conceal and to cover up because the other day the Minister of Justice made statements in the house regarding this matter, while the hon. member for Yukon was speaking, that were not true, period; and I am going to quote from the minister's statements.

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: If it had not been—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have the floor.

The Chairman: When the right hon. gentleman began, the Chair thought he was rising on a point of order. Before he rose the hon. member for Yukon had the floor. It may very well be that he has relinquished it—

Mr. Diefenbaker: No, he has not relinquished it.

The Chairman: Is the Leader of the Opposition speaking to a point of order?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Surely.

The Chairman: Then the Chair would like to know what the point of order is.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am pointing out what is behind the objection that is raised—the desire on the part of the government to get it swept away, to cover it up.

Only the day before yesterday, when the hon. member for Yukon was speaking he used these words, as recorded at page 10380 of *Hansard*:

> The minister knows as well as I do that the offenders in this case, and I do not hesitate to name them, were actually employees, one of the minister's office and one of the office of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Both of these employees have now left.

What did the minister say? He told what was untrue. He would have deceived the house—

The Chairman: Order. The comments of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition may be relevant to the substance of the debate but it does seem to the Chair that he is going beyond the terms of the point of order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I was trying so hard to keep within the rules—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —but the interruptions, and the facial expressions and the contortions opposite induced me to make that observation, and everybody will be able to identify the source of the contortions. The Minister of Transport was the first to do so.

We submit we have every right to make an examination of this question. We have an order in council before us. It is one that pretends to be general but is in fact so restrictive that many of the things which will come out, in the event that we have the opportunity of presenting them, cannot be brought before the commission. Yesterday the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam reasonably argued that the government should wait until the house had an opportunity of suggesting what might be included in the terms of reference.

What are the terms of reference? The order in council says, and I do not read it all:

> —to inquire fully into allegations about any improper inducements having been offered to or improper pressures having been brought to bear on counsel acting upon an application for the extradition of one Lucien Rivard and all the relevant circumstances connected therewith, and in particular but without limiting the generality of the foregoing to consider fully the reports submitted to the Minister of Justice by the R.C.M.P. and the evidence laid before him in connection therewith and any further evidence elicited by or laid before the commissioner—

And there is this limitation:

> —to consider such other matters as may appear to the commissioner to be relevant—

If the commissioner says those other matters are not relevant that is the end of it. In other words, it is restrictive. Why was the power not given to inquire into any further matters?

The Chairman: Again it seems to me that the right hon. gentleman is going beyond the limits of the point of order. The argument he is making now may be a very good one and quite relevant in the course of the discussion, but I suggest to him that he is going beyond the terms of the point of order raised earlier.

Mr. Martineau: On this point of order, it has been stated by the Acting Prime Minister that the hon. member for Yukon could not discuss or bring forth any further revelations because of the order in council passed today.

Mr. McIlraith: No, no.

Mr. Martineau: Well that is the whole point raised by the Acting Prime Minister. Beauchesne, in citation 48(c) says that we must not discuss or refer to any matter where a judicial decision is pending. In this case no judicial decision is pending. The commissioner has not yet been seized with the matter.

I have gone into this question a little further and May, at page 358, paragraph 6, says there is a prohibition on discussing matters reflecting on the decision of a court of law or likely to prejudice a case which is under trial. That is not the situation here. Then at page 400 he says that it is against the rule—

Mr. Favreau: What edition?

Mr. Martineau: The sixteenth edition. He says it is against the rule to bring up a matter while it is under adjudication in a court of law. Again, at page 547, it is stated that matters awaiting the adjudication of a court must not be discussed.

The situation which faces the committee is that there is an order in council the terms of which have been announced. What the hon. member for Yukon is trying to do is to bring to the attention of the committee, and also to the attention of the commisioner, matters that should be considered by him in his investigation. He is not in any way reflecting on a decision that is going to be rendered by the commissioner, but is endeavouring to bring to the attention of the commissioner and the committee matters that should properly be the object of his investigation. Therefore he is strictly in order in bringing them up.

Mr. Brewin: I wish to make a brief contribution to this discussion on the point of order. As I understood the Acting Prime Minister he was saying that the remarks made on these estimates by the hon. member for Yukon should not be made and were out of order because the judicial inquiry directed by the order in council covered these matters, which were therefore to some extent sub judice and should not be discussed.

I will say frankly that I think there is nothing in that argument. It is completely specious. The fact of the matter is this: If one takes a careful look at this order in council, which no doubt has been drafted with a fair amount of care, although in haste, we find that its terms are strictly limited. On the face of them they go no further than to permit inquiries about improper pressure brought to bear upon counsel. I have been engaged in enough cases to know that any judicial officer looking at these terms of reference would be bound to give them a careful and narrow interpretation.

I am not responsible for what the hon. member for Yukon intends to say, but there is no excuse for trying to prevent his speaking on the grounds which have been mentioned. The Acting Prime Minister spoke very eloquently, using such terms as "justice" "the bill of rights" and so on. I suggest these have nothing at all to do with the issue. There is nothing in this order in council which could prevent the hon. member for Yukon from developing other matters which are not covered by the order. I suggest we have the right to hear what he has to say. I have no doubt he will speak responsibly. If he makes smears and innuendos without substance, then of course all the proper means will be available to try to prevent his addressing the committee on these matters. But he should not be silenced on the fraudulent pretext that these matters are covered by the order in council, and to attempt to do so is not worthy of the Acting Prime Minister.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): There was no exception taken to the introduction of matters not covered in the order.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): There was not. The objection I took was taken because the hon. gentleman was discussing the hon. member for Dollard.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That has not been revealed up to now.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The right hon. gentleman knows it was—

Mr. Diefenbaker: The hon. gentleman panicked and rushed in and made a statement.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I do not believe that the hon. member for Greenwood, for whom I have great professional regard, wishes to leave the impression that what was said here was that we could not discuss matters which were not encompassed by the order, because that was never said.

Mr. Fairweather: I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister. Has the chief justice of Quebec received a copy of this order in council.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The terms of the order in council have been discussed and read to him.

Mr. Woolliams: The member for Greenwood put his finger on the crux of the matter. Until the court has interpreted the meaning of these terms of reference we are not to interpret what the order in council means. That is for the judiciary to interpret. I should like to support what was said by the

hon. member for Greenwood. These are new matters which are not covered by the order in council. If the Secretary of State for External Affairs takes a different position, it is obvious he wants to sweep under the carpet the things we want to bring out into the open. Why the secrecy? If you want justice, why the secrecy? What are you trying to do? I will coin a phrase. It is a new kind of judicial closure applied to the House of Commons. Members opposite want the judiciary to run the House of Commons because they cannot do the job themselves.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say just a few words about the order in council—

The Chairman: I take it that the hon. member for Villeneuve wishes to speak to the point of order—

Mr. Caouette: Yes, on the point of order.

The Chairman: Does the hon. member wish to make a contribution to the discussion on the point of order?

Mr. Caouette: I wish to speak to the point of order raised a few minutes ago to the effect that the question cannot be discussed at this time because it is to be referred to a royal commission of inquiry.

If the government decided to pass orders in council concerning just about anything, would it mean that parliament would have to bow before the government and refrain from discussing an issue while it would be referred to a judge of the superior court?

Might the way suggested by the government today not create a precedent?

I feel, in fact, that the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen)—regardless of whether we share or not the same political ideas—is perfectly entitled to discuss new developments with regard to some members of parliament.

It is interesting to note at this time that there are several ministers in their seats. We do not usually see many of them in the house at ten minutes to five in the afternoon.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Caouette: This afternoon there are more of them. Why? Because things are getting hot and because irregularities have been discovered.

The Chairman: Order. It seems to me the hon. member should limit his remarks to the point of order raised by other members who preceded him in the debate.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, in order to comply with your suggestion to restrict myself to the point of order, I will say, like the previous speakers, that the hon. member for Yukon, in my opinion, is perfectly right in raising those points, as he did a while ago, when he was interrupted by the Acting Prime Minister (Mr. Martin).

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, I must say that I completely agree with the claim of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), to the effect that as far as a discussion, allegation or accusation was made, such as the one expressed by the hon. member for Yukon, that is outside the terms of reference of the commission which has been set up and that there is nothing irregular or abnormal in discussing it in this house.

However, now that the commission is set up—and it has to be admitted that the establishment of that commission was made following the immediate reaction to the suggestion of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas)—I think that each and every member of the house, under his responsibility, must explain that what he wants to discuss is not one of the questions respecting the evidence, testimonies, interviews or reports contained in the R.C.M.P. file which the hon. member for Yukon knows so well. In each case where, under his own responsibility, an hon. member can assert it, well the decision can obviously deal with something that is foreign to the facts under which the charges were laid.

You see, Mr. Chairman, the responsibility for discussing further the kind of charges laid by the hon. member for Yukon.

[*Text*]

A few minutes ago the Leader of the Opposition suggested that we had things to hide and that the order in council was a device to hide the truth.

Mr. Diefenbaker: You hid the facts from one another and hid them from the Prime Minister.

Mr. Favreau: I say, Mr. Chairman, that had the Leader of the Opposition been in power, never would he have acted so quickly as we have.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Ricard: It did not happen in our day.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Favreau: My assertion in this house was that the allegations to be found on page 10380 of *Hansard,* of the hon. member for Yukon, were untrue as being out of order or as being an attempt to circumvent the truth or otherwise. My reaction was against the allegation made in the matter concerned with a criminal offence made by the hon. member for Yukon and to the fact that the hon. member said:

> The minister knows as well as I do that the offenders in this case—

It is the word "offenders" that I was rising against in this case.

Mr. Woolliams: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Favreau: No, no. I am on a point of order at the moment.

Mr. Woolliams: On a question of privilege arising out of the point of order—

The Chairman: Order. In spite of the obiter dictum of the hon. member for Lapointe, who suggested a moment ago that a question of privilege can be raised on a point of order, I understand that the Minister of Justice is still on a point of order.

An hon. Member: He is out of order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He is trying to establish an alibi.

The Chairman: Order. The Minister of Justice should be heard out, and the hon. member who wants to raise a question of privilege can raise it afterwards.

Mr. Woolliams: We just want the facts.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman—

[*Text*]

The Chairman: Order. I bring to the attention of hon. members standing order 12, paragraph 3, which says:

> When a member is speaking, no member shall pass between him and the Chair, nor interrupt him, except to raise a point of order.

This standing order says nothing about a question of privilege.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I can therefore think that standing order 17—

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Lapointe will kindly resume his seat. The Minister of Justice had the floor on a point of order. The hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams) wants to rise on a question of privilege and he is ready to do so when the Minister of Justice finishes his remarks.

[*Text*]

Mr. Grégoire: That is supposed to come first.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, I think I rightly and fairly objected to the assertion that offenders were in my office, especially when the hon. member gave the name of young Guy Lord, who is now a student at Oxford.

Mr. Martineau: Mr. Chairman, we are no longer on a point of order.

Mr. Favreau: Yes, we are. I want to point out the gravity of this assertion.

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

The Chairman: Order. It seems to the Chair that the minister is now raising a point of debate, a contribution which might be made in the course of the debate. If he is still on the point of order, I would ask him to come to the point as quickly as possible.

Mr. Favreau: I have one sentence more, Mr. Chairman.

An hon. Member: Break the rules.

Mr. Favreau: At noon today I received a phone call from London, and there today, at Oxford, is a young man who is married, has a child—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Favreau: —and who in the headlines of London papers stands charged that he offered a bribe to somebody. This is the result of the smearing attack—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: Resign.

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Justice went far and beyond any question of order. His own deceitfulness caused him to make statements that are not well based. I rise on a question of privilege respecting the remarks he read a moment ago; the minister started to read from the remarks of the hon. member for Yukon:

> The minister knows as well as I do that the offenders in this case, and I do not hesitate to name them, were actually employees, one of the minister's office and one of the office of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Both of these employees have now left.

Now, listen to the answer:

> Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, that is an absolute lie, because nobody involved in this case, implicated

as an offender by the hon. member, is a member of my department or has ever been a member of my department.

Some hon. Members: Who lied?

Mr. Diefenbaker: I ask, who told the truth? No amount of equivocation and endeavour to stifle this thing on the part of the Minister of Justice can conceal the fact that he deceived parliament with that answer. Indeed, he deceived the Prime Minister by concealing the facts from him, as did the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. They would not even let their Prime Minister know what they allowed in their departments.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Is the Minister of Justice rising on the question of privilege?

Mr. Fairweather: He has had another telephone call.

Mr. Favreau: I hope I do not receive another one which is as tragic, due to the words of the hon. member for Yukon.

An hon. Member: Is this a point of order?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the allegations made yesterday by the hon. member for Yukon, there is no doubt that the commission's terms of reference are as wide and as broad as any that could be laid down.

One does not have to try very hard to understand. It is said, first, that the commissioner:

—is empowered to inquire fully—

—let us not forget those words—

—into allegations about any improper inducements having been offered to or improper pressures having been brought to bear on counsel acting upon an application for the extradition of one Lucien Rivard and all the relevant circumstances connected therewith—

Especially, we add:

—without limiting the generality of the foregoing to consider the reports submitted to the Minister of Justice by the R.C.M.P. and the evidence laid before him in connection therewith and any further evidence elicited by or laid before the commissioner, to consider such other matters as may appear other questions which might seem relevant—

In this regard, we have to rely upon the sound judgment of the chief justice of the Quebec superior court not to place any limitations upon himself in the consideration of a question once so deferred. What I do know, Mr. Chairman, is that if the investigation is conducted by the chief justice of the superior court, the very next day a young man in London will not be tragically and wrongly accused of libel in the newspapers.

[*Text*]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, I must rise in protest of these phony points of order that seem to be designed for nothing else than to prevent the hon. member for Yukon going ahead with his speech. I have been waiting to discuss the terms of reference, and I am prepared to do so as soon as the hon. member for Yukon has completed his remarks, but one member after another has risen on points of order which are not really points of order at all, but obvious attempts to make speeches. I think they should refrain from doing so.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

The Chairman: A point of order is not to be used to delay procedure in any way. My conclusion as to the several contributions which have been made to the discussion is that there seems to be substantial agreement among members about what can and cannot be discussed. My understanding of the main objection taken in the point of order, as raised originally by the Acting Prime Minister, is that it was related to the reference to the hon. member for Dollard, and that point might have been well taken. For the time being I would suggest that as far as the Chair is concerned, the only point at issue at this stage of the discussion is whether the hon. member's remarks are relevant to the matter now before us, namely item 1 of the estimates of the Department of Justice. The hon. member must conform to standing order 59(2) as to relevancy.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, I take it that I must be careful to be relevant in view of the fact I am discussing matters of a similar nature to those originally raised on November 23. Again, I must say that I do not know why the hon. member for Dollard is not in his seat. He should be there. It is not the customary practice in this house to discuss an hon. member or his activities when he is not in his place. Surely he knew the estimates of the Department of Justice were coming up this afternoon.

Mr. Favreau: He did not.

An hon. Member: Tell us another one.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He was here this afternoon.

An hon. Member: Send for him.

Mr. Nielsen: The minister has told us that he did not know these estimates were coming before the house this afternoon. My information is that the hon. member for Dollard was sitting up in the gallery to my left a few moments ago but that he has now left.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Nielsen: I think he should be in his seat to hear what I have to say. Before I proceed I want first to deal with the matter raised on a spurious point of order by the minister. He may search the record of November 23, and for subsequent days, as he will, but he will find that at no time—I was very careful to avoid making such a reference—did I charge that Mr. Lord offered any bribe to anyone. I never once made that charge and I still do not make that charge. I still refer to Mr. Lord as an innocent dupe of the others involved.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I may be allowed to ask the hon. gentleman a question?

An hon. Member: No, sit down.

Mr. Pickersgill: I just want to draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that he referred to him as an offender, which is a term meaning someone convicted.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: I did not say that the gentleman—

An hon. Member: You had better go back to your law books, Jack. You are an offender of the rules.

Mr. Nielsen: In the studies of the law, which the Minister of Transport has made, there must have been a gap at some time or other, because that has never been my understanding of the term "offender". I think the minister is suffering from a high degree of lack of self-control in this matter, because if he wanted to state the facts accurately he would not suggest for a moment—the Minister of Justice laughs when I refer to an accurate statement of the facts.

Mr. Favreau: I did not laugh.

Mr. Nielsen: I challenge him to rise now and challenge the accuracy of any of the facts I placed before the house on November 23.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He did the other day, and had to swallow it.

Mr. Favreau: I did not.

Mr. Nielsen: In reference to the young lawyer in Montreal, I paid the highest tribute to this young member of the bar.

Mr. Pickersgill: By calling him an offender?

Mr. Bigg: You are all mixed up.

Mr. Nielsen: The Minister of Transport interjected the words "by calling him an offender" immediately after I had made reference to a young lawyer in Montreal. If the Minister of Transport would contain himself and listen for a moment or two he will realize that the reference I made was to Mr. Lamontagne.

Mr. Pickersgill: Was he an offender?

Mr. Nielsen: I cannot praise that gentleman too highly. Perhaps in the eyes of the Minister of Transport he is an offender because he stuck by his guns and backed up what was said in the house on November 23. I suggest to the Minister of Transport that he ought to exercise a little more self-control, prudence and discretion before he makes reference to remarks I have made in this house, because I have not overstated them.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of personal privilege. The hon. gentleman has contradicted what I said, and to support my point of privilege I should like to read precisely what the hon. gentleman said, as recorded at page 10380 of *Hansard*. He said:

> The minister knows as well as I do that the offenders in this case, and I do not hesitate to name them, were actually employees, one of the minister's office and one of the office of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Both of these employees have now left.

In other words he was referring to Mr. Lord and Mr. Denis, and he called them offenders. They have not been convicted in any court so I would called them accused—accused by innuendo. According to my understanding of British justice—

Some hon. Members: Order.

The Chairman: Order, please.

An hon. Member: Sit down, Jack.

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Pickersgill: You do not want to listen to the truth.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Chairman: Order.

An hon. Member: Nonsense.

The Chairman: Order, please. The minister has risen on a question of privilege. I do not consider that there is really a question of privilege, but judge that he is correcting a statement which has been made or attributed to him. Surely that cannot be considered a question of privilege.

Mr. Pickersgill: I suggest it is a question of privilege, sir, because in one of the leading newspapers of this country I have been accused of an untruth, based on this particular passage, because I agreed with the Minister of Justice. I have said it was untrue, and for exactly the same reason the Minister of Justice said it was untrue.

Mr. Diefenbaker: You did not know anything about it.

Mr. Pickersgill: In other words, these men are not offenders, and no one in a British country with British justice is an offender until he has been convicted.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: Do not become hysterical.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, after that lesson in the law may I ask the hon. gentleman whether the minister of immigration, or the Minister of Justice told him anything about these things between August and November 23?

Mr. Pickersgill: I shall be glad to answer the right hon. gentleman's question if I am allowed to do so. They did not tell me anything about this, and I see no reason why they should have done so.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: They did tell me that under the bill of rights in this country a man is innocent until he is proved guilty in the courts.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

The Chairman: Order, please.

An hon. Member: You are going to blow a gasket.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, I intended to ask the Minister of Transport that very question, as to how he would know whether or not the individuals were offenders. Has he seen and read the complete police report?

Mr. Grafftey: Perhaps he has read the Anglican prayer book.

Mr. Pickersgill: I think I can answer that question very easily, sir. I am quite sure there would be a series of newspaper articles about these young men if they had been convicted in any court of law. In view of the fact there have been none, I assume they have not been convicted in a court of law. Therefore they are not offenders, and the hon. gentleman was not telling the truth when he called them that.

[The Chairman.]

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be sidetracked here by the fictitious and hysterical arguments of the Minister of Transport.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He has a guilty conscience.

Mr. Nielsen: I should like to make one other point regarding the reference to the presence of individuals in this house, made by the Minister of Justice and others who have participated in these spurious points of order. They say they have acted quickly on the matter, and the imputation was that they acted much more swiftly than the Leader of the Opposition would have acted when he was prime minister. I ask the Minister of Justice and those opposite: Why is the Prime Minister not in his seat today when a question of such seriousness is being discussed?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: He is campaigning.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago they complained there were too many ministers and now they complain that the Prime Minister is not here.

Mr. Nielsen: I do not think the minister will ever find anybody on this side of the house complaining about the presence of ministers of the crown in the house. They should be here to answer questions. The Minister of Justice has dozens of questions to answer, and he cannot allow the judicial inquiry to go further until he has made further explanations to the house. These explanations must be forthcoming from the minister and certainly in the interests of justice, in the interests—

Mr. Byrne: You are not interested in justice.

Mr. Nielsen: The hon. member for Kootenay East has interjected that I am not interested in justice.

Mr. Byrne: Just smears.

Mr. Nielsen: I suggest to the hon. member that such interjections should not be made. I have attempted throughout to place the facts on the record in a very dispassionate way.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacEwan: Listen to the monkeys chatter.

Mr. Nielsen: I have exercised the utmost care as to accuracy, and this is evident not only from the confirmation of the counsel involved in the narcotics case but also from the fact that Minister of Justice himself has not denied the allegations that have been made. The minister cannot deny them because he knows that all of these facts are in the police report which he has studied at length, according to the expression he used himself, and he also knows that there are additional facts—

Mr. MacEachen: Could I ask the hon. member a question? Would the hon. member tell us whether he has seen the police report and, if so, how it was made available to him?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would the minister say what he did with the cheques of Banks?

Mr. Nielsen: The Minister of Labour surely is not asking that question—

Mr. MacEachen: Can you state you have not seen the report? Obviously you cannot.

Mr. Nielsen: The minister would dearly love to know the answer to that question, I am sure, just as the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Justice would like to know where I obtained a photostatic copy of a letter advocating patronage which I read into the records of the house.

Mr. MacEachen: Maybe Chief Justice Dorion will ask you before the inquiry. Will you tell Chief Justice Dorion?

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, is there not a much more appropriate question, namely, why is it that none of the ministers across the way knew the contents of that R.C.M.P. report?

Mr. MacEwan: The minister had better stick with the Banks case.

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Nielsen: The Prime Minister apparently was late in being advised, to say the least, because at 3.10 p.m.—I think the minister should explain this—almost immediately after the matter was raised in the house, radio station CHUM in Toronto reported the matter in this fashion, and may I say I obtained a copy of the report over CHUM. The report was in these words:

Rumours are alive in Montreal, Ottawa and Toronto concerning interference in an important judicial proceeding, rumours that so far have failed to be squelched by the federal government.

They have still failed to squelch them.

From what is going around as fact, these questions are waiting for answers from the government. Was there a $20,000 bribe offered in a recent judicial proceeding? What was the result of that bribe offer? Who was offered the bribe and who offered the bribe? Following this, were there threats made to a crown official involved in the proceeding? Was the government aware of any such bribe offer or threat?

This is the type of questions the minister should be answering instead of dragging a red herring across the trail with his spurious questions of order, privilege and the like. Here we have this radio broadcast being released at 3.10 a.m.

Mr. Pickersgill: A.M.?

Mr. Nielsen: I am sorry—3.10 p.m. Here we have the Prime Minister not knowing what a Toronto radio station already knew, obviously not knowing what a particular member of the press gallery, Mr. Akehurst, who works for radio station CHUM, knew. This might give the Minister of Labour some idea as to how information comes to opposition members. You have all sorts of people visit you when matters of this kind arise, people in the press gallery, people from other cities, all sorts of people.

Mr. MacEachen: Did you see the R.C.M.P. report?

Mr. Churchill: You look for your cheques.

Mr. Nielsen: I am in a position—

Mr. MacEachen: May I say to my hon. friend—

The Chairman: Order. Unless the hon. member for Yukon relinquishes the floor he should not be interrupted.

Mr. Nielsen: I am in a position to be able to say that the minister cannot deny my facts. The Minister of Labour can draw his own conclusions because the Minister of Justice has not risen once to deny the substance of the charges I have made, not at all.

Mr. Woolliams: He does not dare.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Churchill: What are you up on?

The Chairman: Is the minister rising on a question of privilege or a point of order?

Mr. Favreau: The member for Yukon said I had not denied the facts—this is a question of privilege.

The Chairman: Order, please. The minister says he is rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Favreau: I said that the assessment of the evidence did not justify a prosecution in the circumstances, and for the rest I am not going either to confirm or deny whatever the member for Yukon may say because I am not going to be responsible for and guilty of smear and innuendo.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Chairman: Order, please. The point made by the minister is debate, not a question of privilege.

Mr. Nielsen: The minister seeks refuge in personal charges instead of making the explanations he should be making. This has been his favourite pastime throughout this whole sordid affair. He has not made a clean breast of it to the house and he should do so. He should make a clean breast of the whole thing to the Canadian people, all of whom are wondering about the minister and the procedure he has followed in this case. Likewise the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration should rise and tell the committee what he knows. I challenge him to rise now and tell the house where he was when the bribe was offered. I challenge him to rise now and tell us where he was when the bribe was offered.

Mr. Cashin: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, the question has been asked of a minister of the crown where he was when the bribe was offered. It has not been proven in a court of law that that is the fact. What is in fact happening here is McCarthyism and extremism, it is attack by innuendo. He is subverting British justice. In other words—

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Cashin: Let him make charges.

The Chairman: Order; I ask for the co-operation of all hon. members of the committee. I ask them to resume their seats when the Chair attempts to make a contribution.

Mr. Cashin: I challenge him to make charges.

An hon. Member: Go change your diapers.

[The Chairman.]

The Chairman: Order; I do not believe that the hon. member for St. John's West had a legitimate question of privilege. It was again a point of debate. He may be dissatisfied with what has been said by the hon. member or he may disagree with him, but that is not a question of privilege.

Mr. Nielsen: I think—

The Chairman: A question of privilege.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Chairman, I rise on the question of privilege.

The hon. member for Yukon, in his question put to me, made an innuendo in trying to know where I was at the time that supposed offer was made to Mr. Lamontagne.

I want to tell the hon. member and the whole house that at no time before the occurrence of those supposed events, have I been aware of anything with regard to that matter. Therefore I could not, on any account, have taken part in that supposed bribery offer.

[*Text*]

Mr. Nielsen: That still does not answer the question I put to the minister.

An hon. Member: Where were you?

Mr. Nielsen: If the Minister of Fisheries, who I understand is very fond of interjecting just loud enough so I cannot hear, has some threatening charges of his own he wishes to make, why does he not have the courage to get up on his feet and make the charges that he wants to hurl across the floor?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: May I suggest that we revert to a discussion of the item now before us, vote No. 1 of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Pilon: Get on with the facts.

An hon. Member: Here is the new leader.

Mr. Greene: Perhaps the hon. member can tell us where he was when the R.C.M.P. report, that he has apparently seen and is familiar with, was either stolen or illegally copied.

Mr. Nielsen: I can tell the hon. member immediately that I am surprised that thus far I have not been asked one single question by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. I have not been telephoned, in my office, by the Minister of Justice. Is he not interested in the security of these matters? I should think he

should be interested enough to give me a call on the telephone.

Mr. Pickersgill: Answer in the open; you do not have the courage to tell us.

Mr. Nielsen: I do not think the Minister of Transport can make any charge about my lack of courage.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. gentleman has not got the courage to tell us how he got that document.

An hon. Member: Sit down.

The Chairman: May I suggest to hon. members that we are obviously straying away from the matter which should be of concern at this stage? Now, I ask the co-operation of all hon. members to give the hon. member for the Yukon an opportunity to continue his remarks.

Mr. Nielsen: I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Justice must rise and make these explanations to the house. The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, and I intend no innuendo in asking this question—

An hon. Member: Oh no; throw some more mud.

Mr. Nielsen: I ask the Minister of Justice to deny that it is not in the police report that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration was in his office at the time.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. Members: Answer the question, yes or no.

Mr. Favreau: These will be things—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, I think that perhaps the worst possible practice to follow in the House of Commons is to proceed by way of such insinuations against a minister of the crown whom the hon. member for Yukon knows to be honest.

The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Tremblay) told us a moment ago that he never had the remotest opportunity of knowing that such an offer had ever been made. I believe that it is up to the hon. member for Yukon to stop his insinuations and to accept the minister's word.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Text*]

An hon. Member: Answer the question.

Mr. Nielsen: The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration has said what he has had to say and I accept it completely, as a member of this house is required to do. I have no hesitation in doing that.

An hon. Member: Stand up and say that.

The Chairman: Order; I think it is the duty of the Chair to bring to the attention of the committee the fact that the hon. member for the Yukon started speaking at 2.45. I realize there have been many points of order, questions of privilege and so on and the hon. member for the Yukon should be given the opportunity to say what he wants to say. However, the fact is that he has had the floor for an hour and five minutes—

Some hon. Members: Oh, no.

The Chairman: I am saying this with the full knowledge that he has not taken anywhere near that time. However, it is impossible for the Chair to keep track of the exact time used by an hon. member. It is my duty to bring this to the attention of the committee and ask for unanimous consent if the hon. member is to continue.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Chairman: There is the fact that even if hon. members object, he may not have used his full 30 minutes. I suggest the hon. member keep that in mind and continue his remarks.

Mr. Nielsen: I will yield the floor to the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, but I am going to make this last appeal to the Minister of Justice. Tell us the circumstances, give us your explanations and make a clean breast of the whole thing now. He cannot deny—I do not impute anything to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration—that what I have said is a fact. There is contained in the police report a reference to the fact the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration was in his office at the time the bribe was offered.

Mr. Pickersgill: In whose office?

Mr. Nielsen: In his own office in Ottawa. Now, I ask the minister to make this explanation. I will agree to sit down and allow the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam to participate now because I do not think I have taken up a lot of time. I hope that the Minister of Justice will make these disclosures. Do not let us drag them out of him, and do not place me in the position where I have to make these.

Mr. Pickersgill: Make a charge.

Mr. Nielsen: Do not place me in the position where I have to state these matters.

Mr. Grégoire: State them or stop making innuendos.

Mr. Favreau: I tell the hon. member for Yukon: make a charge. The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration was not involved. I again tell the hon. member for Yukon if there is anything in what he says which, in his opinion and under his accusation, is connected with the alleged bribe, make the charge. Otherwise he is infringing a basic rule of the house besides infringing fairness and any sense of justice.

Mr. Speaker Michener, as reported at page 493 of *Hansard* for June 19, 1959, stated the point thus:

> In my view, simple justice requires that no hon. member should have to submit to investigation of his conduct by the house or a committee until he has been charged with an offence. Must this charge be made by another hon. member on his responsibility? The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pearson) raised this same issue in the question which he put to me in the following words—

It was there the principle was formulated, as it was again a few minutes ago, and it seems to me the hon. member for Yukon just cannot understand that type of principle and of justice.

Mr. Nielsen: On the question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, obviously the Minister of Justice did not hear me when I said I accept the word of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. I did that, as is the practice in the house, and he knows it. I am sure he heard me. But what I say to him is, instead of again dragging a red herring across the trail by his spurious points of order and privilege, produce the report and we will see who is telling the truth. I leave the minister with that and I leave him with the appeal that he should get up and make a full breast of all the circumstances, because it is true.

Mr. Greene: On the point of privilege raised by the hon. member for Yukon—

Mr. Nielsen: I did not raise it.

Mr. Greene: Yes you did. You don't even remember.

Mr. Nielsen: On a point of order, the Minister of Justice raised the question of privilege.

The Chairman: Whether raised by the Minister of Justice or the hon. member there is a question of privilege raised, but I might say there is some doubt in the mind of the Chair whether it is a question of privilege or not. However, the hon. member for Renfrew South should be given an opportunity to make his comments.

Mr. Greene: On the point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the rules are quite clear as enunciated by Mr. Speaker Michener and referred to by the Minister of Justice. The hon. member raising these innuendos must make a charge and have the courage to stand behind them, or any further remarks on the same point are out of order.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, I have never seen hon. members opposite so jumpy as they appear to be today, and I have never seen so many red herrings dragged across the trail. They keep asking the hon. member for Yukon how he got access to a report of the R.C.M.P. What they should really be asking is how a report like this was apparently kept under wraps so that members of the government did not have access to it, and the Prime Minister apparently was not aware of its contents, despite the fact that senior civil servants and a parliamentary secretary were named in it. That is what they should be asking themselves.

The first point I want to make is that I do not propose to be a bomb proof shelter for the government. Members of the government have said several times today that I asked for a judicial inquiry, that they are complying with that request and everybody should be happy. This is true; I did ask for a judicial inquiry because I do not think parliament is the place to try a case, and I think that condemnation by declamation is always a dangerous business.

I am anxious to see this judicial inquiry, and I welcome the fact that the government is prepared to have it, but I raise two points. The first is that I feel very strongly the government should have waited until these justice estimates were disposed of, because there may be other matters that ought to come before this inquiry. We as members of the House of Commons have a right to know a great deal more, not about this particular case so much as about the procedures that were followed by the Department of Justice in handling it.

There is information which I would like to have about this matter, but if I may judge from the statement of the Acting Prime Minister this afternoon, this order in council is to be used as a muzzle, to muzzle parliament and keep us from asking questions and getting information. I am not talking about any of

the people implicated; I am talking about the procedures of government.

For instance, I would like to know what was the date upon which the counsel in Montreal is alleged to have been offered a bribe. I would like to know the date when he reported this fact to the R.C.M.P. I would like to know something about the reason for the gap between those dates. I would like to know something about what happened between the period September 18 up to the present time.

An hon. member across the way says we want to have the trial here. I am not proposing a trial. I am not proposing to try the people who are implicated, but I am proposing to ask whether or not the Department of Justice carries out the administration of justice in a proper manner.

I would like to know why this whole thing came up to the Minister of Justice in the first place. I have a suspicion that if I had a complaint laid against me back in Burnaby the chances are that the R.C.M.P. would take it to the crown prosecutor for the area and he would decide whether or not he had a prima facie case to lay a charge against me. I doubt very much if it would be sent up to the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. and he and the Minister of Justice would have a secret conclave to see whether or not they would prosecute.

Are there two sets of laws? Does the process of the administration of justice travel one route when one group of people are involved and a different route when an ordinary group of citizens are involved, those who are not within the hierarchy of the Liberal party? That is the kind of question I want to see dealt with, and I think this order in council should have been held up until after the estimates of the Department of Justice were passed. For instance, one of the reasons is that I understand, if I recall correctly, the hon. member for Yukon had moved what is virtually a motion of no confidence in the Minister of Justice. The only way in which members can decide whether or not to support such a motion is by giving the Minister of Justice every opportunity to discuss fully his handling of the matter. For this reason I do not believe the committee of the whole when it is discussing the estimates of the department should be precluded in any way from discussing this question—not the persons involved; that aspect will be dealt with by the commission, but the whole procedure of the administration of justice in this country and whether it has been carried out in a fitting and proper manner.

The second proviso I put when asking for a judicial inquiry was that it should have the widest possible terms of reference. And this is what the Prime Minister promised as recorded at page 10427 of *Hansard*. My question was:

> May I ask the Prime Minister if he is prepared to see that in the order in council containing the terms of reference there is provision for an investigation into the propriety of the procedure followed by the Department of Justice following the reception of the R.C.M.P. report on September 18.

To which the Prime Minister replied—I will read the latter part of his answer:

> The evidence that has been referred to will be before the commission. Any other evidence bearing on what was mentioned and alleged yesterday will be before the commissioner. I am perfectly certain that the commissioner will undoubtedly, in considering the evidence, inquire into the propriety of any action which has been taken.

And, as reported on the next page, when I asked the Prime Minister again whether he would undertake to widen the terms of reference, the right hon. gentleman said:

> I believe the terms of reference are wide enough to deal with the matter referred to by my hon. friend but of course there is no desire on the part of the government to hold back anything from this inquiry. We want to make this inquiry both full and fair and I will look at the terms of reference with that in mind.

Well, let us consider these terms of reference. Both the Minister of Justice and the Secretary of State for External Affairs have told us they are in the widest possible terms. As the Prime Minister said, there is to be a judicial inquiry. The recommendation is that a commissioner be appointed under part I of the Inquiries Act—

> —to inquire fully into allegations about any improper inducements having been offered to or improper pressures having been brought to bear on counsel acting upon an application for the extradition of one Lucien Rivard and all the relevant circumstances connected therewith—

May I pause here to point out that so far this has to do only with improper inducements offered to counsel or improper pressure on counsel. Now, may I go on:

> —and in particular but without limiting the generality of the foregoing to consider fully the reports submitted to the Minister of Justice by the R.C.M.P. and the evidence laid before him in connection therewith and any further evidence elicited by or laid before the commissioner—

Let me pause at this point. The commissioner may look at any information contained

in the R.C.M.P. report or at any other information laid before him as a commissioner. It goes on:

—to consider such other matters as may appear to the commissioner to be relevant, and—

Here is the real power which is given to the commission:

—to report whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant any prosecution for offences that may be involved.

I submit there is nothing in these terms of reference which specifically authorizes the commissioner to look into the propriety of the procedures which were followed so as to ascertain whether or not the department behaved properly in not taking action on the basis of the report it had received; whether the minister was derelict in his duty in not notifying the ministers whose staffs were involved; or the Prime Minister, whose parliamentary secretary was mentioned in the report. There is no specific authority given to the commissioner to do this, though this is exactly what we asked for. There is nothing here to follow up the suggestion made yesterday by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, I believe, that the commissioner be allowed to look into the operations of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration inasmuch as they might be affected by the fact that one who had been employed there for a considerable period of time was mentioned in the report.

What did the Prime Minister say about this yesterday? On page 10429 of *Hansard,* the following exchange took place:

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question I should like to direct to the Prime Minister. Will the Prime Minister include in the terms of reference of this judicial inquiry, authority for the judge or commissioner to thoroughly examine the affairs of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration during the employment of Mr. Raymond Denis, in view of the fact that Mr. Denis served in that office for a rather lengthy period of time?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, there is now a commissioner inquiring into certain aspects of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration; I refer to Mr. Sedgwick. The particular man in question who worked in the department of immigration most certainly will be under investigation by the commissioner.

Today, when my hon. friend from Greenwood asked the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration whether Mr. Sedgwick was indeed a commissioner and whether he had any authority to investigate the activities of Mr. Denis, the minister had to admit, of course, that he was not a commissioner; that he was brought in as an adviser to advise on the overhaul of the immigration regulations. He was never a commissioner. There has been an attempt to evade the question completely. The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration told us today that Mr. Justice Dorion, the commissioner, would be able to look into this matter. I ask the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration where under these terms of reference Mr. Justice Dorion has any authority whatever to look into the activities of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration or into the activities of Mr. Raymond Denis during the period when he held high office in that department.

This whole attempt to evade questions and sweep these things under the rug arouses suspicions in my mind which were not there when this business began. Criticism was directed toward the hon. member for Yukon. Members opposite said: Produce charges. But if he had not pursued the matter the other day and if I had not asked the minister whether an R.C.M.P. report was in his possession regarding the allegations of Mr. Pierre Lamontagne, this house and the country would still be in complete ignorance of what has transpired.

It is all very well to say: "Make charges". Members of parliament do not have investigative facilities or powers. We have to rely on the good sense and devotion to duty of the Department of Justice. But, so far, everything we have been able to gather we have had to dig up; we have had to dig it up in spite of every conceivable kind of evasion. Today a minister stands up and tells us: "My department will be investigated by Mr. Justice Dorion." I say an examination of these terms of reference completely refutes that statement. Mr. Justice Dorion will have no power other than the power to look into the allegations about improper inducement and improper practices, to look at the material contained in the R.C.M.P. report, and to consider any subsequent material, and to report whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant prosecution for any offence which may be involved. That is all.

I will not be satisfied until there is placed in the terms of reference a specific instruction to the chief justice to ascertain whether or not the due processes of law were followed and the proper practices respected with reference to the handling of this whole case. I would think that for the sake of the government itself it would have made these terms as wide and sweeping as possible so as to remove any shadow of doubt that may linger in any person's mind to the effect that there

is something amiss in the higher echelons of government administration.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Chairman, will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Douglas: Yes, surely.

Mr. Greene: Does the hon. member not feel that in making terms of reference for a judicial inquiry too broad there is the danger of bringing in names of innocent persons who may have no guilt whatsoever but whose names can be brought in if the terms are too broad, and this will do the very harm that too broad inquiries of this nature have done in the past, namely impugn the good names of persons who cannot defend themselves, are guilty of nothing, but by the very broad terms of the commission may be brought in? Does the hon. member not think that narrowing the commission to this extent will preclude that very real danger, that has occurred in particular in the land to the south in their broad commissions of inquiry?

Mr. Douglas: No, Mr. Chairman, I do not have that fear, because I am not asking that a great net be cast to deal with every insinuation or innuendo that may be tossed out. I am asking that in addition to these narrow, specific terms of reference which will cover the allegations about improper inducements and improper pressure and will look into the contents of the R.C.M.P. report, there be an investigation into departmental administration. That is not going to deal with innocent persons; that is going to deal with ministers and senior civil servants and the people who are responsible for administering departments, and whether or not they have discharged their duties with propriety, uprightness and proper dispatch. That is all I am asking. That need not bring in any innocent persons.

I just want to close, Mr. Chairman, by saying that I hope that even though the order in council has been passed—and I have the uneasy feeling that it was passed in some unseemly haste in order to, if possible, curtail any further discussion on this matter—the government will give some consideration to widening the terms of reference as to the propriety of the procedures that have been followed, and also with reference to the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, particularly during the period that one of the gentlemen under discussion was employed in that department. As far as I am concerned, I get no pleasure whatsoever in pointing any finger at any person, and least of all people who cannot defend themselves.

I have been, until this matter came to the fore, scrupulously careful not to mention names, although I was in possession of these names when I raised this matter on the orders of the day on Monday. But as a member of this house I have a responsibility, as has every other member, to make sure that the due processes of law are carried through and that when the police report regarding allegations made and complaints submitted concerning certain people in high places, that there shall be no suspicion whatsoever that those persons are being protected and that the charges are being swept under the rug; because it seems to me that any minister of the crown who gets an R.C.M.P. report in which a reputable legal counsel alleges that he was offered a bribe and was subjected to intimidation must know that the person who makes those allegations must have very serious reason for doing so. He had nothing to gain personally by making the allegations, except to protect his good name, and he must have known that this would involve him in publicity and investigation.

Therefore it is a serious matter and I am not convinced that proper attention was given to it and that the proper haste was shown in prosecuting the matter in the manner in which it should have been prosecuted. It is an old saying, Mr. Chairman, and it is still true, that not only must justice be done, but it must appear to be done. For that reason the government would be well advised to widen these terms of reference in order that we may have a full and uninhibited investigation into this whole affair.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) has just made a most eloquent appeal, when he asked the government to extend the terms of reference of the commission, whose purpose will be to get at the truth of the matter.

Of course, when we consider the number of ministers present now in the house and who stayed here all afternoon—we are not complaining about it, on the contrary—and the number of Liberal members who sat here all afternoon, which is unusual for them, when we consider the number—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Grégoire: —when we consider the repeated interjections of the kind they are trying

to make now, we cannot but wonder what nigger is in the woodpile, what is happening in that whole business.

An hon. Member: More insinuations.

Mr. Grégoire: Personally, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I think—

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes is raising a point of order.

Mr. Drouin: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member for Lapointe attributes unspeakable feelings to most other members, which is entirely unacceptable. He may have such feelings himself, but no honest and sincere member could possibly have them.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Order. I suggest to the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes that his intervention perhaps exceeded the remarks he intended to make. I do not think it in order for an hon. member to mention or suggest that another member is dishonest, and I am asking the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes for a rectification.

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Chairman, I maintain what I said, namely that it was a despicable feeling that the hon. member might be having. I did not say that he was dishonest and that he had that feeling but that he might.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order raised by the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes.

In my opinion, that hon. member's intervention is completely illogical; it is dishonest.

This afternoon we listened, in what I feel is a democratic and civilized way, to Conservative members and to the leader of the New Democratic party (Mr. Douglas). And now when a member of our party rises to speak, French Canadian members from the province of Quebec—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Caouette: —try to prevent him from expressing his views.

Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to that fact and ask you to get hon. members like the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes to remain seated and listen, as they should, to the hon. member for Lapointe who has the floor now.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that I was not bothered at all by the remarks

[Mr. Grégoire.]

of the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes.

Yet, there is something which is remarkable. I have never seen—if the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes wishes to deny it, he can stand up and do so, I will allow him to do so—12 ministers in the house at the same time to consider the estimates of a department—

The Chairman: May I ask the hon. member for Lapointe to limit his remarks to the resolution now before us?

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I only want—

[*Text*]

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. You have just made a ruling and asked the hon. member from the other side of the house to withdraw a statement he made in reference to the hon. member for Lapointe. You asked him to withdraw his remarks because he had gone beyond what the rules of this house permit. In his remarks he suggested that what the hon. member for Lapointe was saying was something that the hon. member for Lapointe could accept, but that honest members of this house would not accept it. That cannot be interpreted in any other way than as a reference to the hon. member's remarks being dishonest, and he certainly should be made to withdraw that reference. I think he should be made to do so now.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Drouin: Would the hon. member tell me exactly what words he would like me to withdraw?

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: May I point out to the hon. member that the Chair took the liberty to call to the attention of the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes that he had probably not meant to go that far. He put the record straight by making a distinction a little subtle, no doubt, but which seems to satisfy the hon. member for Lapointe.

I suggest that we resume the debate.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied. I was going to prove that honesty is lacking in that hon. memeber's mind.

The hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes should be honest enough to recognize that since we started considering the estimates this year there has never been twelve ministers here at the same time in the House of Commons.

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. I wish to point out where resides true honesty and dishonesty—

The Chairman: The hon. member rose on a question of privilege, but in my opinion he was not justified in doing so.

The hon. member for Lapointe has had the floor for approximately ten minutes, and I would ask him to take into consideration the question we are now discussing, that is, item No. 1 of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, respecting my question of privilege, the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes made a charge. You asked him to withdraw it, and he did not do so. I am proving that he is the dishonest member.

In my opinion, this is a question of privilege.

The Chairman: Order. When the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes used a word which was unparliamentary, in the opinion of the Chair, he was asked to withdraw it.

Mr. Grégoire: He did not withdraw.

The Chairman: I realize that but I had the impression that his explanations were considered satisfactory. If they were not, then I will ask him to withdraw the implication that the hon. member for Lapointe is dishonest. At the same time, I would ask the latter to do likewise concerning the word he used with respect to the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes.

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Chairman, I accept your ruling with pleasure and, in accordance with standing orders, I am glad to say that I do not consider the hon. member for Lapointe dishonest.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. In my opinion, this is the best speech the hon. member has ever given.

Mr. Drouin: I say as much for you.

Mr. Grégoire: At any rate, Mr. Chairman, the circumstances and the atmosphere which have surrounded the debate oblige us to examine more closely the estimates of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Drouin: If my memory serves me right, Mr. Chairman, your observations had a double objective and concerned two members. In my opinion, one complied with your decision and the other still has to do so, namely the member for Lapointe, whom you asked to withdraw the disobliging words he spoke against me.

The Chairman: Unfortunately, I do not recall the exact words used by the hon. member for Lapointe, but I am sure that if they were unkind, the rules of the house would not have permitted him to use them in this debate and that, in such a case, he should withdraw them.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, you may very well not be sure about my uttering unkind words because, as a matter of fact, I did not utter any.

I think the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes is somewhat touchy. Indeed, it is noticeable today that some hon. members' nerves are on edge, that they are excited. Look at the nervous hands; we can notice the tension on the Liberal side, the members are uneasy in their seats—

The Chairman: Order. May I remind the hon. member that we are sitting after six o'clock for the purpose, I presume, of considering item No. 1 of the estimates of the Department of Justice.

I, therefore, invite the hon. member for Lapointe to restrict himself to the subject matter.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that if we want light to be shed on the attitude of the Department of Justice and if we are to have a commission look into a problem such as the one now being discussed by the committee, we ought to change the terms of reference that have been decided upon when the privy council met in November 25, 1964

What strikes me in these terms of reference is—

[*Text*]

Mr. Winch: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. In view of the present atmosphere of this house there is only one thing to do, and that is draw your attention to the fact that it is now past six o'clock.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, tomorrow we propose to call the estimates of the Department of Justice first, and if they are completed perhaps hon. members would then be ready to deal with other estimates.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In view of the fact that there have been many questions of privilege raised during our discussion this afternoon, and I am sure there have been abuses, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice whether he will consider establishing a small committee comprised of himself and three or four of the outstanding lawyers of international repute in our midst, to attempt to decide upon some change to the order in council under discussion, so as to satisfy the many objections raised this afternoon. I would suggest the members of that committee might be the Minister of Justice, the hon. member for Brant-Haldimand, the hon. member for Royal, the hon. member for Greenwood and the hon. member for Lapointe.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, I suggest the name of the hon. member for Lapointe for the simple reason that he does represent the province of Quebec.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Peters: I make this suggestion, Mr. Speaker, because some of the members of this House of Commons are involved in this serious situation, and certain reputations may be at stake. Many of the questions raised have personally involved a number of people, and I think a thorough but careful investigation should be undertaken. I think such a committee could perhaps resolve the difficulties members have outlined. The members of that committee could be those members of this house who are outstanding lawyers, capable of assisting the minister in working out some solution so as to relieve some of the tensions and problems which have been so eloquently outlined this afternoon by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas). Will the minister consider that suggestion?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice has asked me, as the senior minister in the house at the moment, to say what must be said about this suggestion. All I can say is that this is something the government as a whole would have to consider. I could not be expected to commit the government at this time. I will undertake, however to bring the hon. gentleman's suggestion to the attention of my colleagues early tomorrow morning.

It being ten minutes after six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, November 26, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

FOOD AND DRUGS

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN FOURTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. H. C. Harley (Halton) presented the fourth report of the special committee on food and drugs, and asked for unanimous consent to move that the report be concurred in.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question. Did I hear right that there is a request to reduce the quorum of the committee from eight to five?

Mr. Speaker: The report was as follows:

Your committee recommends that its quorum be further reduced from eight to five members.

Mr. Winch: Then personally, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that any time a committee of this major importance has to request a reduction in its quorum from eight to five it is a disgust to democracy and a disgrace to the House of Commons, and I oppose it.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by Mr. Harley, seconded by Mr. Mackasey, by unanimous consent, that the fourth report of the special committee on food and drugs presented this day be now concurred in. Is it the pleasure—

Mr. Winch: No, sir, I do not give unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker: It is moved that the fourth report of the special committee on food and drugs be now concurred in. Is it the pleasure of the house—

Mr. Grégoire: No.

Mr. McIlraith: I want to raise a question—

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed with the report this day?

Mr. Grégoire: No.

Mr. Speaker: Stand.

Motion stands.

FINANCE

WITHDRAWAL OF OFFERING OF N.H.A. MORTGAGES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. The day before yesterday the president of C.M.H.C. announced the withdrawal from the market of the twelfth offering of N.H.A. insured mortgages on the ground that the market was unsettled. Would the minister please advise the house what were the unsettling conditions in the market to warrant the withdrawal of this purely domestic issue of Canadian mortgages?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): I would be glad to take this question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

SUGGESTED EXPANSION OF REFERENCE TO INQUIRY COMMISSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Acting Prime Minister and ask whether he has had time to consider the suggestion made last night by the hon. member for Timiskaming about an all party committee of lawyers to consider a draft of expanded terms of reference. May I also ask whether the government is prepared at this time to give any consideration to expanding the terms of reference for the judicial inquiry which was announced yesterday.

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have talked to my colleagues about certain features of this proposal. We have carefully examined the terms of reference which were passed yesterday by the governor in council, and while I appreciate the arguments that were made yesterday I feel, and so do my colleagues, that the terms of reference are wide enough to comprehend the matters that it is felt should come before the inquiry.

Mr. Douglas: May I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Labour and ask him whether his department or the board of

trustees, who have in their possession the documents and exhibits of the Norris commission, have found the voucher to which I referred the other day, namely the voucher signed by Hal C. Banks and made out to one Raymond Denis?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): No. As I understood the hon. member's question the other day it was to the effect that if any such voucher existed it should be turned over to the commission of inquiry. If such a voucher exists, that request will be carried out. But I have no knowledge at the moment that such a voucher does exist. As a matter of fact the presumption is that no such voucher exists—

Some hon. Members: Whose?

Mr. MacEachen: —because of the order of the house asking for cheques or photostats thereof. If such a voucher had been in existence it would likely have been drawn to my attention. However, I will be glad to make a special effort to satisfy the hon. member on this point.

Mr. Douglas: Certain press men have been told, I am informed, by those in charge of the documents that such a voucher has been found. I should therefore like the minister to inform the house on this point, because if it is true this would give the government a serious reason for reconsidering the terms of reference of the commission and extending them to permit an investigation of the activities of Mr. Denis during the time he was in the employ of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

Mr. MacEachen: Certainly no official of the Department of Labour and no representative of the board of trustees has indicated to me in any way that such a voucher exists.

Mr. Churchill: Did you ask them?

Mr. MacEachen: It was on the understanding that if it existed it would be transferred to the commission that I made my reply the other day. But I will have no hesitation about asking immediately that if this voucher is available it be turned up.

Mr. Douglas: Am I to take it from the minister's answer that the hon. gentleman has not made any inquiry?

Mr. MacEachen: I undertook the other day to forward this voucher, if it did exist, to the commissioner, and I will carry out that undertaking. I will now make an inquiry, if the hon. member asks me this as an independent question, to see whether the voucher does exist. If it does, and if he wishes to have it produced, I will be glad to do it.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I wonder whether in the course of his researches to find the unfindable, though known to exist, he would communicate with Alan Watson of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Company of King street, Toronto. It was Mr. Watson who examined all the papers which were brought before the Norris commission. I have not been in communication with him either indirectly or directly but I think this would be the best source, because he kept a record, apparently, of all the documents which came before the Norris commission or which were desired to be brought before the commission but which the commission decided did not come within the ambit of its authority. I am sure the minister will immediately and with alacrity make a request to ascertain this information, because everybody seems to know of the existence of these things except the government.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask the Acting Prime Minister this. In view of the statement of the Minister of Labour that he is prepared, if this voucher exists, to turn it over to the commission, are the terms of reference sufficiently wide to enable the commissioner to take cognizance of this voucher and investigate the activities of Mr. Denis during the period he was employed by the Department of Citizenship and Immigration?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The commissioner, who is a judge, will have to determine—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Well, it is a fact. But there is no doubt in my mind about the comprehensive character of the terms of reference for the particular purpose mentioned by the hon. gentleman. All one has to do is to look at the terms of reference and see.

The committee of the privy council on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, advises that the Honourable Frédéric Dorion, chief justice of the superior court of the province of Quebec be appointed a commissioner under part I of the Inquiries Act to inquire fully into allegations—

Then it says:

—and in particular but without limiting the generality of the foregoing to consider fully the reports submitted to the Minister of Justice by the R.C.M.P. and the evidence laid before him in connection therewith and any further evidence elicited by or laid before the commissioner, to

consider such other matters as may appear to the commissioner to be relevant—

And only he can determine this in the final analysis:

—and to report whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant any prosecution—

And so on. I would think there is not any doubt.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I would say this further—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): —that if in the course of the inquiry it should appear that there are limitations, counsel who will be acting for the commissioner and with the commissioner has the powers to fulfil and carry out the purposes of the order in council.

Mr. Diefenbaker: And the government passed the order in council.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Acting Prime Minister whether he did not receive from me this morning a specific request that the terms of reference should include the power of the commissioner to inquire into and report on the activities in the Department of Citizenship and Immigration of Mr. Raymond Denis, and whether he did not reply a few moments ago saying definitely no, that there was not intended to be any change.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend did not understand what I was saying.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacEwan: Did you?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Let me read the reply I made. My hon. friend wrote to me under today's date, as Acting Prime Minister:

Dear Mr. Martin:

During the debate on the estimates yesterday Mr. Douglas, the leader of the New Democratic party, expressed the view that the terms of order in council P.C. 1964-1819 were unduly restrictive and in fact would confine the commissioner to the allegations relating to the inducements offered or pressures to be put upon counsel acting on behalf of Rivard.

I have accordingly redrafted the order in council in such a way as to clarify beyond doubt two further matters:

1. That the commissioner should inquire and report on the way in which the allegations when brought to the attention of the R.C.M.P. and the Minister of Justice were dealt with;

2. That the commissioner should inquire into and report on the activities in the Department of Citizenship and Immigraton of Mr. Raymond Denis.

You will recall that the—

I take it that when my hon. friend was asking me a question a few moments ago he was not referring to the person that we are talking about in this letter, Mr. Denis. The question my hon. friend put a few moments ago, I take it, did not have reference to Mr. Denis:

You will recall that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration indicated that this latter matter would be within the purview of the inquiry, but I see nothing in the terms of reference as presently drafted which would permit this.

It is our belief with these expanded terms of reference a full and adequate inquiry would be possible and that no suspicion could arise that there was any intent or desire on the part of the government to limit the inquiry unduly.

And there is no intention on the part of the government to limit the inquiry. Now here is my answer of November 26:

Dear Mr. Brewin:

I have carefully considered your letter expressing the view that the terms of the order in council P.C. 1964-1819 are unduly restrictive and suggesting two amendments thereto.

Your first suggestion is "that the commissioner should inquire and report on the way in which the allegations when brought to the attention of the R.C.M.P. and the Minister of Justice were dealt with". The incorporation of this suggestion in the order in council would be a specific direction to a commissioner who is not a member of parliament to pass a judgment upon a minister of the crown whose responsibility under our system of government is to the House of Commons. After careful consideration, therefore, we felt that we should ask the commissioner to inquire into all the facts and all the relevant circumstances connected therewith and to consider such other matters as may appear to the commissioner to be relevant, to present a report upon these facts and his conclusions to the government and to leave to parliament the responsibility of deciding, as is its right and duty, whether the Minister of Justice had acted reasonably in the matter.

We cannot think that adding to the terms of reference "and into the manner in which the R.C.M.P. and any officer thereof and the Department of Justice and the minister thereof dealt with the said allegations when brought to their attention" would in any way increase the scope of the inquiry, and we would feel that the exclusion of a specific direction to the commissioner to report "whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant any prosecution for offences which may be involved" would be to ignore the original allegations made in the House of Commons respecting the Minister of Justice.

Your second suggestion "that the commissioner should inquire into and report on the activities... of Mr. Raymond Denis" brings in a matter that is not connected in any way with the allegations that have been made.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin (Essex East):

I can assure you—

This is the real point, and I am sure my hon. friend, as a devoted upholder of civil rights, will subscribe to this.

—that if any member of the House of Commons, or anyone else, is willing to take the responsibility of making any specific charge of wrongdoing against Mr. Denis, the government will not hesitate to have such charge inquired into fully, but we do not feel that we should set aside the ordinary rules for the protection of the civil rights of an individual and authorize any general inquisition into his conduct when no specific charges or even allegations have been made respecting it, apart, of course, from the one matter which is specifically referred to in the order in council.

And I would add in a parenthesis of my own "based on a charge that was made". The letter continues:

It is our opinion that the order in council is drawn broadly enough to enable the commissioner to inquire and report fully upon all the circumstances relating to the only allegations which have been made in this matter.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that this is not the time to comment on the correspondence which the minister has read; nevertheless I do want to ask him one question arising out of it. I understand he has made it perfectly clear that under the present terms of reference the commissioner is not required to consider the conduct, or indeed even permitted to consider the wisdom or the conduct, of the Minister of Justice after he received the allegations in question.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I have said all I can.

Some hon. Members: Answer.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I think I have answered in a way which recognizes that if anyone has a charge to make there is a way of dealing with it.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question. The Acting Prime Minister wants a charge to be laid. May I point out that a charge has already been laid by Mr. Pierre Lamontagne of the city of Montreal, and that is exactly what we are complaining about. I am asking whether the document the minister has just read does not clearly eliminate any opportunity for, or any authority to, the chief justice to investigate the voucher which the Minister of Labour says, when he finds it, will be turned over for his perusal.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friend puts a question, couples several things with it and then jumps from one quickly to another. There is no doubt that the charges made by Mr. Lamontagne with regard to Mr. Denis are encompassed by the order in council.

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

Mr. Douglas: Then may I ask the minister my second question, and I will not jump about but will put a separate question. Is the minister now saying to the house, as a result of the statement he has just read, that this voucher when it is presented to the commissioner cannot be considered by the commissioner, and cannot be part of the question before him?

Mr. Byrne: That is a hypothetical question.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I do not know how one can deal with it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Labour.

Could the minister tell us whether he had an inquiry made within his department to find out if there was a document bearing No. H-12 indicating that cheques signed by Mr. Hal Banks and payable to the order of some federal members had been handed over to the board of trustees?

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, this question was raised yesterday and I agreed that if the regular course were followed and a motion for the production of this alleged document were put on the order paper it would be dealt with in the ordinary way and I would be glad to do that, as enjoined by the Deputy Speaker yesterday.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: A further question, Mr. Speaker.

Could the Minister of Labour tell us whether such a document exists or if a certain document bearing No. H-12 is used in his department?

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEachen: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker; but when the question was asked yesterday it was the first time I had been aware that a document, H-12, was alleged to exist in my department. I have no knowledge that it does exist, and I have instituted inquiries.

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Chapdelaine (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Justice.

On page 10384 of *Hansard* for Monday, November 23, 1964, we see that the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) stated that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police took statements from Mr. Lord and his new executive assistant, Mr. Letendre, as well as from Mr. Denis.

This morning, the newspapers reported from London that Mr. Lord stated:

[*Text*]

"I certainly did not do this and I do not know anything about this business," said Lord, now a student at Nuffield college, Oxford.

[*Translation*]

I should like to ask the Minister of Justice about the part played by Mr. Letendre, inasmuch as he was mentioned in the statement made by Mr. Nielsen, as recorded in *Hansard* of Monday, November 23.

Could the Minister of Justice tell us about the part played by Mr. Letendre, his present executive assistant, in this matter?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): This, Mr. Speaker, is a very fair question and I wish to thank the hon. member for Sherbrooke for asking it.

It is quite clear that Mr. Letendre played exactly the same part as Mr. Lord did, and by that I mean that he is not referred to directly or indirectly in the statement made by Mr. Lamontagne in connection with this bribe offer.

What Mr. Lord has said on his own behalf also applies to Mr. Letendre, with regard to the statements that have been made.

[*Text*]

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): As a supplementary question, is the minister prepared to assure the house that Mr. Letendre did not telephone Mr. Lamontagne in Montreal and exercise any influence in any manner whatsoever to influence the bail proceedings then pending?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, this is another of these questions, another of these smear questions. I said that Mr. Letendre was not mentioned directly—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh.

Mr. Favreau: —or indirectly, nor involved by Mr. Lamontagne in his allegations, directly or indirectly, in relation to the allegation of a bribe which has been mentioned. But as in the case of Mr. Lord—and I learned this when the report was made to me by the commissioner of the R.C.M.P.—subsequently Mr. Letendre did in fact call Mr. Lamontagne in relation to the possibility of setting a bond in the case of Rivard. So far as passing judgment on the acts of any individual is concerned, I will leave that to the commission.

Mr. Nielsen: As a supplementary question I ask the minister now whether Mr. Letendre phoned Mr. Lamontagne as the executive assistant to the Minister of Justice?

Mr. Favreau: Yes. The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker, and I just said it was in the same context as the reference I made to Mr. Lord.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

Since the Minister of Justice referred to the report from the R.C.M.P. commissioner, should he not table it in the house?

[*Text*]

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I just said I would not pass judgment on an individual and that this would be for the commissioner to do.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martineau: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

I did not suggest that the minister pass judgment on anyone. I only asked whether, in view of the numerous references he made to this document, he should not produce it before the house.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I did not mention this document. However, I said that Mr. Letendre was not involved directly or indirectly in the statement made by Mr. Lamontagne, which was mentioned by the hon. member for Yukon.

In view of the insinuations made against whomever it may be, it was my duty to say what I said.

It will be up to the committee to study, examine and report upon the circumstances mentioned in that report.

[*Text*]

Mr. Nielsen: Will the minister answer this supplementary question? Does he think—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is certainly not the purpose of the Chair to stop proper proceedings in the house, of all places, but it seems to me this type of question, if it should be asked at all, should be asked at the proper time on the estimates of the minister, which I understand will be up for consideration in a few minutes.

Inquiries of the Ministry

In view of the importance of the whole question the Chair has been as lenient as possible, but I would call two citations to the attention of hon. members. The first is a ruling of Mr. Speaker Michener which is to be found in the *Journals of the House of Commons*, Canada, 1959, at page 583, and the second is a statement I made myself on October 30, 1964, following along the same line as Mr. Speaker Michener, to the effect that if a charge is to be made against a member in the house, a member should take his own responsibility, should stand in his place and make that charge rather than by making miscellaneous remarks which tend to inculpate an hon. member. It is the only fair and proper way or, putting it in another way, in the words of Mr. Speaker Michener at page 584:

> In my view, simple justice requires that no hon. member should have to submit to investigation of his conduct by the house or a committee until he has been charged with an offence.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nielsen: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I have not levelled accusations at any hon. member of the house. The question upon which Your Honour just delivered a rather lengthy opinion had nothing to do with any accusations which may or may not be made. I do not intend to make them against any hon. member in the house. The question upon which Your Honour was giving a decision was a supplementary question being asked of the Minister of Justice not regarding the conduct of an hon. member of the house, but rather the conduct of one of his executive assistants, and I see no connection between the two.

Mr. Speaker: I would just like to clear up one point. I was making a suggestion for the consideration of the house, not rendering an opinion.

Mr. Nielsen: May I put the supplementary question, sir, and I won't go into the matter any further on orders of the day. This is my supplementary question, if the minister will answer it. Will he rise in his place and tell the house that he handed the question that was asked by the hon. member for Sherbrooke to him and asked him to ask it?

Mr. Favreau: Is the question whether I asked the hon. member for Sherbrooke to rise in the house and put that question?

Mr. Nielsen: Yes.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Favreau: To that assertion I say no. I did not ask him; only his sense of justice directed him to do that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chapdelaine: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I simply want to say to the house that the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) is not the only one in the house with new ideas who can, at the given moment, provoke the anger of the whole country by making assertions for which he does not assume responsibility and which he does not have the courage to make in public, because he could be personally charged for making such charges.

I simply wish to say to the house that the question I asked a short while ago was only prompted by a sense of justice, since the hon. member for Yukon mentioned the name of Mr. Letendre, another person he wants to smear, but without taking legal action, for he will not make those accusations publicly, outside the house.

Furthermore, I am informed that he was invited to appear on television but refused to be questioned by newspapermen, because he does not want to say outside the house what he has been saying in the house. If he is going to continue to sully reputations without taking any responsibility, then members of the house must rise to intervene and put an end to such activities which, for my part, I qualify as dishonest.

[*Text*]

Mr. Nielsen: On the matter which has been raised by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, a member who has not attended the debates in this house—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: Despite all the noise on the other side they will hear what I have to say. Let me say to the hon. member for Sherbrooke and to all hon. members in this house that not once, until the hon. member for Sherbrooke himself introduced it into the proceedings this afternoon, have I mentioned the name of Mr. Letendre.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. May I suggest we proceed with the business before the house.

Mr. MacInnis: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. There is one question of privilege before us now.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chapdelaine: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the question of privilege I raised earlier, I have correctly quoted *Hansard* of Monday, November 23, 1964.

Earlier, in putting my question to the Minister of Justice, I quoted from page 10384 of *Hansard* of that date the exact words of the hon. member for Yukon which can be found at the top of the left hand column. If he would care to look up his copy of *Hansard,* he will clearly see the name which he himself mentioned and I quote:

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police took statements from Mr. Lord. They took a statement from his new executive assistant, Mr. Letendre.

It is perfectly clear that this man was mentioned by the hon. member for Yukon. Even if he suggests that I am not often present in the house, he might realize that I still can read *Hansard* and the newspapers, because this whole story is now all over the country. I am still able to read and I can assure him that I am clever enough to realize that the tactics he is using now tend only to promote his activities and his personal aspirations.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I suggest to all hon. members that we go on to the other matters before the house.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Nielsen: Perhaps I might be allowed to conclude, since this matter affects me.

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Nielsen: No. I have nothing to withdraw but I have a mistake to admit. I have been at all times meticulous and scrupulously careful—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: I did not recall having mentioned Mr. Letendre's name. I still have not checked *Hansard,* but I accept the hon. member's reading of *Hansard* in this regard.

The circumstance still remains that Mr. Letendre's name in connection with this particular case and the replies of the minister was introduced in the house today by the hon. member. All I said apparently, according to the quotation which was read from *Hansard,* which I have not yet read because of the pressure of work in my office, was that a statement had been taken by the R.C.M.P. I did not implicate him in any way—

An hon. Member: The minister did.

Mr. Nielsen: —in the circumstances surrounding these rather shocking charges.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think all hon. members have had sufficient opportunity to—well, I was searching for a polite word. May I suggest we go on to the business before the house.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

SHIPS LAID UP THROUGH LACK OF TECHNICAL PERSONNEL

On the orders of the day:

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Is it true that six fighting ships of the Royal Canadian Navy are laid up in Halifax and are likely to be laid up there indefinitely because of a shortage of technical personnel which would enable them to be kept at sea?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the report appearing in this morning's *Globe and Mail* is essentially correct. The action taken does not reflect an over-all shortage of men in the Royal Canadian Navy but rather the lack of sufficient numbers of personnel in certain skilled trades resulting from the introduction into service of new ships and new equipment in ships already built which would require both a higher level of skill in tradesmen and more of them.

This problem has been building up over a period of several years, and a solution would be to increase the number of personnel signing on for re-engagement. Some success has been achieved in this area but not sufficient to fill the gap, and with the requirement for crews for H.M.C.S. *Annapolis* and *Ottawa* plus the fact that H.M.C.S. *Bonaventure* has completed a minor refit, action was taken to tie up six older ships in order to release necessary manpower.

These ships, which are about 20 years old and nearing the end of their usefulness, are nevertheless being maintained in a constant state of operational readiness, and should an emergency arise the crews would be immediately augmented with trained personnel now employed in naval training schools ashore.

We realize that this is by no means a satisfactory state of affairs, and every effort is being made to retain in the navy the necessary number of highly skilled tradesmen. If we are to do this, career opportunities and conditions of service, including living accommodation, must be made more attractive. This

is being given serious consideration within the department.

Mr. Harkness: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that during the past year a considerable number of naval vessels have been taken out of commission altogether, is this shortage not in fact due to the departure of technical personnel because of a decline in morale and a general lack of confidence on the part of these people with regard to their future in the navy because of the way in which the present government has so drastically reduced the navy, has failed to institute a building program and has generally indicated that it is not prepared to see the navy maintained in the way it has been for many years past?

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, this is not a new problem. The hon. gentleman will recall that when he was minister there were allegations that some of the ships were not kept in a satisfactory state of repair because of insufficient technical personnel in order to do so.

A new system of rotating crews on a cyclical basis is being put into operation and it is hoped that this step, along with others which are being taken, will overcome the problem. But the problem is not new. It is not going to be solved overnight, but I can assure the hon. gentleman and other members of the house that every step necessary will be taken to man the ships of the Royal Canadian Navy and to keep them operationally ready.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If an emergency should arise within the next few days or in the reasonably near future, would these ships be able to put to sea in a state of top fighting efficiency?

Mr. Hellyer: They would be in as top a state of efficiency as ships of that age and capability can be.

Mr. Nesbitt: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister then saying that in fact right at this moment there are trained personnel to fill the gaps on these ships?

Mr. Hellyer: I have already said that the crews could be augmented from personnel serving ashore.

Mr. Nesbitt: A further supplementary question. Unless I am mistaken the minister said a moment ago that the crews would be augmented from trained personnel ashore who are learning their trades in training schools. Surely there is some discrepancy here.

[Mr. Hellyer.]

Mr. Hellyer: I said "who were serving as instructors". I think the hon. gentleman will find that to be so when he has a chance to check the record.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Vancouver East.

Mr. Regan: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have recognized the hon. member for Vancouver East twice on a supplementary, and following that the hon. member for Halifax will have his turn.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of what I am certain I heard the minister say a few moments ago about the lack of certain technical staff or technicians for all the new ships, may I ask him what new ships there are except *Provider*? Will he give us the names of the other new ships and their class?

Mr. Hellyer: There were two ships of the Nipigon class that came into service this year. One of them is being commissioned next month.

Mr. Winch: And are you still short of technical staff?

Mr. Hellyer: We are just getting the crew ready for the second one.

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): A supplementary question to the Minister of National Defence. Inasmuch as the minister has indicated that one of the problems in retaining trained men in the navy has been housing, will the minister make every effort to see that a policy is brought into force whereby housing facilities—

An hon. Member: Order paper.

Mr. Regan: —are provided for naval personnel scattered throughout the civilian population so they will not have to live in a ghetto, or in an area where there are only military people?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This is a question for the order paper.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Speaker, I should like to debate the matter at ten o'clock.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I have a follow-up question for the Minister of National Defence with regard to his report on the Halifax situation to the effect that this does not affect the over-all strength of

the navy. What kind of rotation program has the minister in mind—

Mr. Regan: Order.

Mr. MacInnis: I do not know about the other members in the house, but I am getting sick and tired of the noise from the member representing Halifax.

An hon. Member: So is everybody else.

Mr. MacInnis: What kind of rotation program has the Minister of National Defence in mind in order to make up for the 700 technicians we will be short in a complement of 1,000 men?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This is a question requiring considerable detail, research and explanation, and it should be put on the order paper.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. In view of the fact that the minister's tinkering with the naval service has apparently brought the emergency effectiveness of that service to at least partial paralysis, will the minister undertake to this house to give immediate priority to a review of and a remedy for the regrettable circumstances that have created this alarming state of affairs?

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, I not only categorically deny the statement implicit in that question as it was put, which was completely contrary to the rules of the house, but I make the categorical statement that the Royal Canadian Navy has a more effective surveillance, antisubmarine and kill capability today than it has ever had before in history.

Mr. Harkness: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the minister how this can possibly be true when there is a total of something between 12 and 15 fewer vessels available to do the work than was the case a little over a year ago.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, perhaps more than anyone else in the house, should be familiar with the surveillance and kill capability of those particular vessels, and it should not be necessary for me to explain to him why this is so.

REQUEST FOR POLICY STATEMENT ON NAVAL SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence, now that the late fall is here, when he expects to make an announcement regarding a new naval shipbuilding program.

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Quite shortly, Mr. Speaker.

IMMIGRATION

REPORTED PRESENCE IN CANADA OF U.S. NAZI LEADER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Can the minister advise if the leader of the nazi party of the United States, Mr. Lincoln Rockwell, has again entered this country and, if so, would he indicate just how such an obvious persona non grata qualified for admission to Canada?

Mr. Fairweather: He is appearing on the C.B.C.

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I have seen a news report from the Vancouver office of the Canadian Press according to which Mr. Rockwell would have entered Canada at Windsor to proceed to Vancouver and then left the country. Following that report, I asked the officials of my department to make the necessary investigation to find out if Mr. Rockwell did come to Canada and if he did enter in the alleged way.

[*Text*]

Mr. William Skoreyko (Edmonton East): A supplementary question on this point, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration whether he can assure the Canadian people that he is going to keep Mr. Rockwell out of the country, in view of the fact he was not able to keep Mr. Banks in?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I already stated that every officer in the department of immigration in this country was informed that Mr. Rockwell should not be admitted in Canada. Consequently, I do not know what happened, but we must take into consideration the fact that over 60 million persons cross the borders between Canada and the United States every year, and it is quite possible that Mr. Rockwell came to Canada.

However, I have no information on this matter at the present time.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a supplementary question to the minister.

Did he inquire if the person who claimed to be George Lincoln Rockwell and who was heard over the Douglas radio station in British Columbia was held for violating the Immigration Act?

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, it was only after Mr. Rockwell left Vancouver that we learned that he had been there, that he had appeared on a program and that he had returned to the United States.

Therefore, no proceedings were instituted against Mr. Rockwell, since he had returned to the United States.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Justice a question on a matter which was raised a while ago respecting the fact that Mr. Rockwell, who is considered as undesirable in this country, apparently, last night or on the previous day, gave an interview over a Vancouver radio station? I would like to ask the minister if he intends to instruct the R.C.M.P. to arrest Mr. Rockwell, if he is still in this country, and have him charged before the courts on a count of illegal entry into this country?

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I might perhaps answer that question, since it concerns two departments.

Instructions have been issued to all our immigration offices, and we also have the R.C.M.P's help, to arrest Mr. Rockwell as soon as he sets foot again in Canada, should he ever do so.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, may I put a supplementary question?

Should Mr. Rockwell be in Canada at the present time, would the Department of Citizenship and Immigration propose to arrest and imprison him on the charge of having entered into the country illegally?

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, according to the information I have, Mr. Rockwell is said to have returned to the United States immediately after.

[*Text*]

LABOUR RELATIONS

S.I.U. ELECTIONS—APPEARANCE OF MARITIME TRUSTEES BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eldon Woolliams (Bow River): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. In view of the fact that the Norris commission recommended that the newly elected president of the S.I.U., Mr. McLaughlin, be charged with an offence, is it the government's intention to do so now and to attempt to put an end to Hal Banks' control of the union in question and its influence over the trustees?

Mr. Speaker: Well, in my opinion this question is not in order.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Perhaps I can ask one that will be. In view of the fact that apparently McLaughlin has been elected president of the S.I.U., does the minister agree that such a man should be president, especially in view of the findings by Mr. Justice Norris who stated that the abuses by Banks in connection with the handling of union funds were never checked by McLaughlin, and that from the evidence he collaborated with Banks? He further stated:

> McLaughlin gave evidence for 16 days and proved himself to be throughout a clever, resourceful and untruthful witness on any matters in controversy...

Is this man, who is to be charged with an offence and who was found to be untruthful and unworthy of holding any position in labour circles, now to receive the approval of the board of trustees and of the government?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, if the house wishes to pass the motion on the order paper at once, we can meet the board of trustees and some of these questions can be asked directly.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Well, when are you going to bring the board of trustees here? We have been looking for them for weeks. When are we going to see them?

Mr. MacEachen: There is a motion on the order paper empowering the committee on industrial relations to meet the board. If the house will agree to pass the motion now, then we will.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The opposition agrees, because we do want to see McLaughlin. We want as well to see Mr. Hall and find out what agreements were made regarding McLaughlin in connection with Banks.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, may I ask leave to revert to motions so that we can deal with this motion?

Mr. Speaker: Does the house agree to revert to motion No. 82 on the order paper?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour) moved:

That the standing committee on industrial relations be empowered to hear and to examine members of the board of trustees of the maritime transportation unions concerning the acts performed and the facts found in carrying out the duties entrusted to them by the Maritime Transportation Unions Trustees Act and to report to the house from time to time.

Motion agreed to.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REPORTED REPAIR OF LOCOMOTIVE CRANKCASES IN U.S.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Jack A. Irvine (London): I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Has the minister received representations from local 22, U.A.W., London, Ontario, dealing with the fact that Canadian locomotive crankcases are being shipped to the United States for repair?

Mr. Speaker: Surely this is a question for the order paper.

CROWN ASSETS

LONGUEUIL, QUE.—DISPOSAL OF JACQUES CARTIER RESERVE PROPERTY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): On Friday last the hon. member for Bow River made an inquiry concerning the sale of some 20 acres of land in the city of Longueuil and suggested I had been dealing with an individual instead of the city.

The lands concerned have been under the administration of my department for an extended period, but were reserved for use by national defence since 1939. In 1960 the municipal officials made application to purchase the property through their member of parliament, Hon. Pierre Sévigny, who was then associate minister of national defence. The military authorities finally agreed to relinquish their interest in the lands, subject to certain conditions, on the express understanding that they would be made available to the national harbours board and the municipality, in that order.

Pursuant to established policy, various agencies were contacted to determine if there were any continuing federal, provincial or municipal requirements for portions of the site, and the public works department selected about 100,000 square feet for an unemployment insurance commission office. The national harbours board waived all further interest in the property, and the only outstanding application was the one filed by the city of Longueuil, formerly the town of Montreal South. In accordance with the principles which were later advocated by the royal commission on government organization, my department undertook to fulfil the commitments made to the civic administrators by national defence in 1960.

However, in view of the fact that the lands were to be used for commercial development, rather than public purposes such as parks, etc., no special concessions were made, and the sale price was established on the basis of recommendations by several accredited appraisers of the soldier settlement and Veterans' Land Act administration. Two offers were rejected because the bids from the city were not commensurate with our equity in the lands, until the municipal council finally agreed to pay the full appraised value of $870,000, which was arrived at by an exhaustive analysis of sales of comparable lots in Longueuil over an extended period. This transaction was formally authorized by order in council P.C. 1964-406, of the 19th March, 1964, and, as soon as a resurvey of our property is completed the sale will be finalized.

Our negotiations have been carried out direct with the municipal council and the city manager and, if successful, it is our intention to convey title in fee simple to the city of Longueuil. Once the lands have been alienated from the crown, resale will be subject to the discretion of the elected representatives of Longueuil and we will have no jurisdiction whatsoever. Neither I nor any officer of my department has been contacted by Mr. Jean-Paul Auclair, as mentioned by the member for Bow River, and it is apparent that any interest which he might wish to acquire must be secured from the city of Longueuil.

SYDNEY, N.S.—SALE OF CABLE IN HARBOUR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Does the minister think it proper that the Department of National Defence, through Crown Assets Disposal Corporation, should try to sell equipment of which they have no record?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the question is beyond me. I wonder if the hon. member would mind repeating it.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. MacInnis: I asked the minister whether he thought it proper that the Department of National Defence, through Crown Assets Disposal Corporation, should be trying to sell equipment of which they have no record.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the hon. gentleman is referring to, unless he means some old cable line across the harbour down there. If he would be a little more specific and put his question on the order paper I would be pleased to answer it or refer it to my colleague the Minister of Industry.

Mr. MacInnis: The minister hit the nail on the head, but it took a couple of questions to do it. I would ask, then, why was it necessary for him to write me a letter inquiring as to the exact location of that cable; and then he wants to sell it?

Mr. Hellyer: Because I have a high regard for the taxpayers' money, and if the hon. gentleman can tell us where it is without spending further public funds we will be very grateful.

Mr. MacInnis: A further supplementary question. What was the government's regard for the taxpayers' money when this cable was allowed to lie under Sydney harbour from the end of the war right up to the time they went out of office in 1957?

Mr. Hellyer: I will have to refer this matter to some previous generation, Mr. Speaker, and see if we can find the answer.

Mr. MacInnis: A further supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Surely the hon. member has made his point.

Mr. MacInnis: A further supplementary question. My question referred to the fact that this cable has been lying under the harbour since the war. The minister says he will have to refer the matter to another generation. Is this another way in which the minister calls attention to his war record?

INDIAN AFFAIRS

PROTECTION OF HUNTING RIGHTS GRANTED BY TREATY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): I should like to bring to the attention of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration a question I asked him on November 12 with regard to the hunting rights granted to our Indian people under treaty. At that time I asked him the following question:

> Owing to the increasing number of treaty Indians being required to stand trial for alleged hunting infractions, would the minister assure the house that the hunting rights granted our Indian people by treaty will be protected?

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, last week I had a number of statements to make about the fishing and hunting rights of the Indians. I hoped to use this document when my estimates came up, but unfortunately I did not have time to tell the house about it.

I would be most happy to outline the main points concerning the attitude of the government and of my department on Indian rights from the point of view of hunting and fishing.

[*Text*]

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): As a supplementary question, when does the minister intend to give this summary?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Tomorrow.

[*Text*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CONGO—REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON CANADIAN NATIONALS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): My question concerns an area of confusion in the world other than the one in which we find ourselves just now. It is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Due to conflicting reports in the press that further Canadians held as hostages in the Congo have reached safety, and in view of the fact that further rescue operations have taken place, together with the fact that a senior Canadian foreign service officer is now in Stanleyville, can the minister bring us up to date on this situation and tell us whatever definite information he may have about Canadian nationals who may have reached safety from the rebel areas, or who may be known to be dead, other than those whose names appeared on yesterday's confirmed list.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): The embassy in Leopoldville has been handling reception arrangements for those Canadian citizens being flown in from Stanleyville. As the hon. member knows because of his recent and valuable services in this area, Mr. Michel Gauvin who participated in the recent talks in Nairobi

arrived in Stanleyville yesterday. He attempted to recover the remains of Reverend Hector McMillan, but found that the village where this missionary was killed was still in rebel hands.

Six Canadians who were believed to be in the Stanleyville area have not yet been accounted for. In addition, three Canadians were last reported in August to be in Ulele province, including one in the town of Paulis and 13 may be in Kibali-Ituri province, both of which, as the hon. member knows lie to the northeast of Stanleyville. We have not yet received any information about these people, but every endeavour is being made through every source to obtain it.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

OFFER BY PRODUCER TO PURCHASE FILM "MR. PEARSON"

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I might have asked my question as a supplementary question half an hour ago but the Conservative members took almost all the time of the house.

In the absence of the Secretary of State, I wish to direct my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs or the Acting Prime Minister.

Has the government received representations or a request from Mr. Richard Ballantyne about the film "Mr. Pearson" which was not shown by the C.B.C. and for which Mr. Ballantyne or his organization have offered to pay the C.B.C. $35,000, what the film had cost, provided that the C.B.C. would allow them to show that film over a private network throughout the country?

Has the Acting Prime Minister any knowledge of that letter, which would be dated November 19, just a few days ago?

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know anything about this matter, but I shall inquire and give an answer later.

[*Text*]

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): A supplementary question. In connection with the C.B.C.'s second attempt to produce a government endorsed "Mr. Pearson" film, can the house be informed who the Prime Minister was referring to when he stated "We cannot live crooked and think straight"?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I did not hear the hon. member's question but if I judge it right I do not think it really matters.

Mr. Coates: It is most important that we as Canadians should know—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I just did not hear the question. If it had to do with what I thought, my answer was a correct one.

COMBINES

ACTION ON REPORT RESPECTING AUTOMOBILE PARTS AND ACCESSORIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I wish to ask the Minister of Justice; it is not controversial. Two or three weeks ago I asked the minister whether he could tell us when he was going to act on the report of the restrictive trade practices commission with regard to the alleged tied sales of tires, batteries and accessories. He said he had recommended a policy to the cabinet and expected an early decision. I may have missed it, but I have heard no announcement since then. I wonder if the minister is in a position to report today what is the cabinet decision.

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is too regular an attendant in the house to have missed such an important announcement. My submission is still before one of the committees of cabinet.

TRANSPORT

PROTESTS RESPECTING U.S. CHARGES ON CANADIAN TRUCKING COMPANIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs, or perhaps the Minister of Transport, what if any representations the government have made to the United States authorities in support of the protests of Canadian trucking companies over the various tariffs and charges now being levied on them by United States authorities and which they feel are unfair.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this question is being looked into by the departments concerned, with regard to the representations which may be made in the matter.

Mr. Fisher: A supplementary question. I wonder whether the minister could keep us informed and give us some kind of information within the next few days about the justice or the fairness of the position of the truckers and the American position.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friend may be assured that we will.

TRADE

WHEAT—SUBSIDY ON EXPORTS BY UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a short question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce; it is in reference to a question I asked him the other day about the dumping of United States wheat. At that time the minister stated that he would get in contact with the Canadian wheat board and the United States authorities and would report back to the house. Can he do that now?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, in answer to a series of questions either yesterday or the day before I gave a report on my conversations with the under secretary of agriculture of the United States. If the hon. gentleman will look at *Hansard* he will find it there.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal and other services—

1. Administration including the office of the superintendent of bankruptcy, grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, gratuities to the widows or other dependants of judges who die while in office and authority to make recoverable advances for the administration of justice on behalf of the governments of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory, $2,109,600.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman,—

[*Text*]

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the hon. member would permit me just to say that the minister was called out of the chamber very suddenly about an absolutely personal matter. He will be back in a minute or two. He asked me to make his excuses.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, even though I have no personal knowledge of this thing and did not have the opportunity to consult a thick file on the matter we have now been discussing for a week, I feel that the announcement of a judicial inquiry would have been welcomed if the terms of reference had been adequate.

In appointing Hon. Frédéric Dorion, the chief justice of the Quebec superior court, to preside over the inquiry, I think the government made a very good choice. Because of his reputation, the appointment of Mr. Justice Dorion will surely be well received and guarantee that this inquiry will be conducted conscientiously and honestly.

However, Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the terms of reference that have been laid down and under which the inquiry will be held.

A summary of those terms of reference is found in the last three lines of the order in council setting up a commission of inquiry which read as follows:

—to report whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant any prosecution for offences that may be involved.

Well, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) stated many times that sufficient evidence was lacking until now. The inquiring commissioner will therefore have to decide, in other words, whether or not the minister was right in stating that sufficient evidence was lacking. What will then be the minister's role in that connection? As I said the other day, the officials of the Department of Justice will try to prove that there was not enough evidence.

Then, the Minister of Justice puts himself in an extremely weak position because he takes it upon himself to prove that there is not sufficient evidence, whereas he should try to supply sufficient evidence, if possible. But, as he assumes the position that he was right, that there is a lack of evidence, he, therefore, sides with those who might be implicated, if there was sufficient evidence.

Mr. Chairman, you will admit that such an attitude is not normal, that it even means depriving justice of the impartiality which it should have. Under the circumstances, the crown attorney, and the officials of the Department of Justice take it upon themselves to defend those who might be implicated, whereas the opposite should be the case.

Mr. Chairman, we do not want to lay charges. However, some have been laid, explanations have been asked for, and there has been a request that the terms of reference of this commission should be broad

enough to allow a full study of the facts in this affair.

For instance, two days ago, the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister (Mr. Rouleau) resigned as parliamentary secretary. We would not have asked him to resign, since he is innocent until he is proved guilty and since to this date, no charge has been laid against him. What amazes me most in this matter is that his resignation was accepted by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson). If the Prime Minister had trusted his parliamentary secretary, if he had been convinced that he had nothing to do with that matter, it was his responsibility to turn down his resignation. That is how we would have conceived the role of a leader who has confidence in his parliamentary secretary. But his resignation was accepted. On the other hand, why such haste in resigning?

What amazes me also in this matter is that everything is connected with fairly serious problems. All this is related to an investigation on narcotics smuggling and all those things are brought together.

At the same time, the same individuals on the Liberal side can all be suspected, because it was suggested that six hon. members from the city of Montreal had received $1,000 cheques from Hal Banks, another tie with the criminals and the acts of violence in the Montreal region. But when the 22 hon. members from the island of Montreal are placed under suspicion, we do not approve of such an attitude. Why not name the individuals who are said to have received cheques in an attempt to clear up the situation for the 16 other members? We are told that six of them are supposed to have received cheques, but no names are given and then 22 hon. members are suspected.

We find that it is always the group of hon. members from the island of Montreal who are implicated in such things. Why is it always the same group who get cheques and payments? And, at a certain time you do some people favours contrary to the administration of justice; perhaps too many Montreal members are exerting undue pressure on officials of the Department of Justice in order to allow favours to some of their friends or to people who have rendered them certain services.

When a Liberal member or candidate receives $1,000 from an individual such as Hal Banks, toward his election, that person surely has a claim on him for having paid him that amount and when we find, later on, one year later, that this same Hal Banks gets special consideration allowing him to elude Canadian justice, then we cannot help but relate the two things.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege.

Since I know the state of mind and the fairness of my friend, the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), I want him to assure me that he is not suggesting, I hope, that in any case, any member of this house, on whatever side of the house he is sitting, intervened with me with respect to the Banks case.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, if one will consult the shorthand takes, one will see that I did not name the Minister of Justice, but what I did say: "the department". And that is precisely because I wanted the insinuations to stop and the facts to be given. But if a commission is set up which is limited in its terms of reference and cannot investigate all those matters, then it cannot be satisfactory. There is only one possible conclusion: efforts are made to hide the truth.

When we have been asking for the names of those who received $1,000 cheques from Mr. Hal Banks for more than three weeks already and they have not been given, then we have to wonder what is going on, because it is well known that the consideration of the estimates will end tomorrow night and that we will have no subsequent opportunity to obtain the names we want; we will have no other opportunity to discuss the way the Department of Justice is administered. That is the problem. It is all those facts which create bitterness and lead us to entertain some doubts.

Why keep secret the names of those who received $1,000 cheques?

An hon. Member: Why give them?

Mr. Grégoire: Because if they are given, then the commissioner will be able to investigate the corruption which may exist—I repeat, which may exist—within the department.

Then an inquiry could be made, but if they do not give the names, how can you conduct such an inquiry, since it would be restricted by the terms of reference as set forth?

They refuse to provide the names and that gives us some doubts.

It is just like some Liberal members who declined to disclose the source of their election funds. If I were asked where my election funds come from, I would be ready to answer

at any time, and the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) is ready to do the same thing.

I made a statement in connection with my election expenses and the treasurer of the riding organization can vouch for this; we are not embarrassed in doing so.

Is it so embarrassing for the Liberal members? If it is so embarrassing that they will not divulge any names, what does that mean? What lies hidden behind all that?

I will not blame the Minister of Justice himself, far from that. Nor will I accept the kind of innuendoes made yesterday by the hon. member for Yukon; for a while I was disgusted myself by this type of innuendo.

However, there is one thing which is imperative. What we are asking—these are not innuendoes—is two clear and precise things:

1. Who are the six members from the island of Montreal who received $1,000 cheques from Hal Banks?

2. Would the Minister of Justice object to broadening the terms of reference of the commission investigating those matters, so the investigating judge would be free to inquire into the interventions by certain hon. members with the Department of Justice concerning the narcotics case and the flight of Hal Banks? Let them broaden the terms of reference of that commission and divulge the names of the members of parliament involved, and we will be satisfied. Those are not insinuations; they are definite facts we are asking for.

See the form I received yesterday, stating that there are no photostatic copies of such cheques with the Department of Justice.

We never said anything like that. We never said either that they could be found in the offices of the privy council. We are told what does not exist but not what does.

That is the set of circumstances which raises grave doubts in the minds of the Canadian people.

The only way to clear those doubts is to produce the documents requested and give names. The judicial inquiry commission must be given terms of reference broad enough to enable it to study any representations made by some members to the Department of Justice, and which might have thwarted the course of justice, if there were any.

Mr. Choquette: Are you stating that some members interfere, yes or no?

Mr. Grégoire: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I contend that members do intervene; I have done it myself but certainly not in the case of drug traffic or in a matter involving Hal Banks.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege.

Is the hon. member for Lapointe contending that members have intervened in matters dealing with narcotics?

Are you laying a charge against members of the House of Commons who might have intervened in drug matters?

We are not asking you if you have received money yourselves.

Mr. Grégoire: Please note, Mr. Chairman, how clever is this interruption. This is an innuendo—

Mr. Choquette: This is no innuendo, it is the truth.

Mr. Grégoire: —just as dishonest as the one he made yesterday to blame me.

Liberal members are the ones who are making dishonest insinuations and giving a bad example to the House of Commons. Speaking of those who are dishonest, the one I would put at the top of the list, way ahead of the hon. member for Yukon, would be the hon. member for Lotbinière; he would be ahead of everybody.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege.

The hon. member for Lapointe has, in no uncertain terms, just accused me of being dishonest. I ask that he withdraw his statement and I would ask him, while doing so, to deny that he has received money from the Union Nationale.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege.

Three days ago I told the hon. member for Lotbinière that he had royally lied on two occasions.

Mr. Choquette: On a point of order.

Mr. Grégoire: I am speaking on a question of privilege and I cannot be interrupted.

At that time the hon. member for Lotbinière did not rise to ask that I withdraw my statement. The day before yesterday while I was away to give a talk at Sherbrooke university he rose on a question of privilege. He did it in a cowardly way when I was not in the house. But the first time I told him that he was royally lying, he did not ask for any withdrawal. But he was cowardly enough to repeat his accusation when I was away.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Lapointe said that I have royally lied and I demand that he withdraw his statement because:

1. To tell a member that he has royally lied is unparliamentary. 2. To deny that he was given money by the Union Nationale and Jos. Bégin, as was the case, is contrary to the truth for he did in fact receive money from the Union Nationale and Jos. Bégin.

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, I am sure you will allow me to give some explanations in connection with the last sentence spoken by the hon. member for Lotbinière.

The Chairman: Does the hon. member for Lapointe wish to comment further on the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Lotbinière?

Mr. Grégoire: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I notice one thing: that in rising on a question of privilege the hon. member for Lotbinière tries to attract attention in order to see his name as often as possible in the newspapers.

The other day he put some accusations on the record. As *Hansard* will also show, I told him that he royally lied. He neither protested nor demanded that I withdraw that remark.

Today, he is trying to provoke me and I shall repeat what I said to him once before. I know very well that the expression is unparliamentary even though it is well deserved. Consequently, you would have been justified to ask me to withdraw my remarks, not because I was wrong but because, the expression used is unparliamentary. However, I shall not fall into the trap laid for me by the hon. member for Lotbinière. He repeated the same accusation while I was absent. That is cowardly, in my opinion, and I will not follow his example.

Members who make innuendos through cowardice, in the house, are people like the hon. member for Lotbinière—

The Chairman: Order. The chairman feels that the two hon. members, the hon. member for Lotbinière and the hon. member for Lapointe, have both used language which goes beyond parliamentary usages.

In my opinion, both hon. members should be respectful of our usages in the committee of the house and avoid using the terms they have used.

The hon. member for Lapointe will certainly admit with me that it is not customary in our debates to tell another hon. member that he was lying. This is a term which the standing orders of this parliament do not accept.

The hon. member for Lotbinière has also used terms and made suggestions absolutely out of order in the committee.

The fairest and most equitable way of settling the dispute between the two hon. members would certainly be to set aside this question and to invite my hon. friend from Lapointe to revert to item No. 1 of the estimates of the Department of Justice now before us.

Mr. Grégoire: You will agree, Mr. Chairman, that I was speaking on item No. 1, but a not too clever interruption led us astray.

However, I want to say this. These words I have said and which are unparliamentary, I did not say them today. Therefore, if the hon. member for Lotbinière had some complaint to make, he should have made it then. But today, it is the hon. member himself who has used antiparliamentary language, and I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to have him withdraw his remark.

Personally, I used none of those words and I only repeated those I had used two days ago. If the hon. member for Lotbinière thought that I should withdraw them, he should have asked me to do so at that time. But he did not. However, the words he used himself are unparliamentary and I am taking this first opportunity to ask him to withdraw them. You agreed yourself, Mr. Chairman, that they were unparliamentary.

The Chairman: I also said that the words used by the hon. member for Lapointe were unparliamentary. He cannot, today, in this indirect way, use words which are not recognized by the customs of the house.

I might remind the hon. member that one cannot say that another hon. member has lied.

One may suggest to an hon. member that his allegations are inaccurate or untrue, but not that he has lied, because that would mean that he did so wittingly.

I think that if the hon. member for Lapointe wishes to co-operate with the Chair and the other members of the committee, he should forget the incident and come back to the matter we should be dealing with at this time.

Mr. Grégoire: Very well, Mr. Chairman, I shall forget that incident because I will ignore the hon. member who intervened. But I point out that we were given an example of

how one can be impolite in this house and make ridiculous assertions. Therefore, the members of the cabinet should not be surprised if we proceed exactly as the Liberal members do sometimes and as the hon. member for Lotbinière proceeds quite often.

Mr. Choquette: What I said is true.

Mr. Grégoire: I will ignore the hon. member for Lotbinière; he is not worth any consideration. I will forget him.

Mr. Choquette: What I said is true.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, will you call the hon. member for Lotbinière to order or will you let him repeat himself like a parrot?

The Chairman: I would suggest to the hon. member for Lotbinière to co-operate with the committee and respect the rules which prescribe that an hon. member who has the floor must not be interrupted.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, I wish to say something on the point of order.

The hon. member for Lapointe has all the required latitude to insult and abuse us, but we are not entitled to reply. Now, he received money from Jos. Bégin and he does not want to admit it.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, you have heard the last sentence of the hon. member for Lotbinière. He is merely looking for publicity. He is a publicity maniac.

But I will not be caught by his tricks. I told him once as recorded in *Hansard*—and if I quote *Hansard,* then it is not I who speaks—that he had royally lied, and he did not object—

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, if it is recorded in *Hansard* that I had royally lied, that should be withdrawn, because to link royalty with a lie is a crime against Her Majesty. On the other hand, I am not a royalist—

The Chairman: Order.

[*Text*]

Mr. McIlraith: I wonder if the committee could not get back to the item before it. You have given a ruling, Mr. Chairman, which I am sure meets the consensus of the committee. I would ask that it be obeyed and we get back to the item before us.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, that suits me perfectly. If the house leader will only introduce a little measure of discipline into his party, we shall revert to item No. 1. Even if it hurts, we can put questions and request particulars regarding those facts.

We will not be bothered too much by some people's touchiness.

As I said, we want to know the names of the six persons who received $6,000 from Hal Banks, even if the confession may hurt. We insist that the terms of reference of the investigating commissioner be broad enough to enable him to learn the whole truth.

We want to know whether those terms of reference are broad enough for the commissioner to examine all aspects of the case and to determine whether Liberal members of parliament intervened with the Department of Justice, in that connection, and I say department not minister.

If the people concerned feel completely innocent, they will not fear a full investigation. I say once again, that if we are refused a full investigation, it will mean that some people have a guilty conscience and are afraid of having the true facts made public.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, I wish to deal in a general way with the matters that are particularly before the committee. The hon. member for Lapointe has just made a request regarding these cheques that allegedly were given by Hal Banks to various Liberal members or, I presume, their official agents. These elusive cheques which were available a few short weeks ago have suddenly found themselves absent without leave. It would be an interesting thing to speculate as to what happened to them, why they disappeared; and whether they went on their own. There is no limit to the speculation in which one could indulge while attempting to trace these cheques, which some hon. members must realize would not be particularly beneficial to them were they located.

I am surprised that the Minister of Labour, who is usually a most assiduous and dedicated member of the treasury benches, as yet has not found anything relating to these cheques. It is a strange thing, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wonder if the right hon. gentleman would permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, sure.

Mr. Pickersgill: Has the right hon. gentleman any knowledge whatever that any such cheques exist?

Mr. Diefenbaker: The hon. gentleman knows of course, Mr. Chairman, that they do exist. When he asks me, I say to him, inquire

amongst the treasury benches. Let us bring a little more communication between ministers and the Prime Minister than the silence of recent days. Just make some inquiries in that area.

Mr. Pickersgill: I asked the right hon. gentleman if he knew whether these cheques existed or if he is just engaging in the speculation about which he was talking?

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am not going to be led down alleys. We know that the cheques were there.

Miss LaMarsh: The same old bunch.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, the truth squad speaks up. All I have to say in this regard is that the truth squad functioned for two days and then it disappeared, just like the cheques. It is very clear, and the judge has so stated, that there were matters brought before him—

Mr. Pickersgill: I am rising on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. My point of order is this: the Secretary of State for External Affairs pointed out to us yesterday an eloquent passage from a speech by the right hon. gentleman concerning a rule of the house that if any assertions are made about hon. members which reflect upon their conduct, a specific charge must be made. I suggest to the right hon. gentleman that he name names and make his charges or that he desist from this smear campaign.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I will deal shortly with the question of smear, but at the moment I am pointing out that Mr. Justice Norris said these matters had been before him.

Mr. Pickersgill: Can the right hon. gentleman show—

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am not going to be interfered with by this—

Mr. Pickersgill: On a point of order, sir, I should like to ask the right hon. gentleman precisely where Mr. Justice Norris said that because I read the clipping and there was no such statement in it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, I would ask also that the hon. gentleman communicate with the Prime Minister. When he spoke the other night on t.v., he said that these things existed. Perhaps somebody could slip out and get that speech. He said they existed, and he was speaking with that bland friendliness which revealed itself then. I have not taken the trouble to bring down his speech, but I think it can be secured and I will be able to quote from it in due course if there is any further reference thereto by any minister.

It is a strange thing, this government of silence. They do not communicate with one another. They do not tell one another what is going on. The Prime Minister has not told the Minister of Transport that he knows the cheques exist. Neither did the Minister of Transport nor the minister of immigration let the Prime Minister know regarding the matters in that statement made by the hon. member for Yukon. Is this not a strange thing? A conspiracy of silence exists amongst the ministers of this government to hide from the Prime Minister the facts. It is a most unjust thing that only the day before the matter was raised in the house, the Prime Minister was informed. They never thought of saying anything to the Prime Minister. After all, these were only allegations. There were statements made. There was evidence taken and it was of such importance that the commissioner of the mounted police came into it. This is how important it was. Yet, nothing was said to the Prime Minister.

Just imagine his feelings when the other day he learned, for the first time, that his parliamentary secretary had some knowledge of these matters. Is it not a strange thing that the minister said nothing to the Prime Minister regarding the fact that his parliamentary secretary had given a statement to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police? Why all this silence? Why all the contriving that has been going on? I am going to deal one by one with the explanations given by the Minister of Justice. After all, as I re-read, as I did this morning, the course taken by the Minister of Justice and the minister of immigration in connection with this matter, I am surprised they have not resigned. I am surprised that in the face of a situation which embarrasses the Prime Minister and the government, these ministers, instead of following the course that would be followed under the British constitutional practice in similar circumstances, continue to try to explain and, with some of their minions, to howl down those who would bring out the truth.

I do not often quote from newspapers but I think the best summary I have seen is in a paper that for years has never seen anything right in the Conservative party, the Montreal *Star*. What does it say?

This smells—

"This" being the events in connection with the peregrinations of ministerial assistants in connection with this matter.

Attempted bribery and attempted subversion are serious criminal charges. When those alleged to be involved are close to the centre of power in politics the charges are doubly serious.

Members of the government think that by raising the cry of smear this can erase the points the hon. member for Yukon brought before the house. It is the old story. They talk about McCarthyism and they practise it themselves. They try to smear the hon. member for Yukon. They ridiculed him the other day.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I will be glad to have any of your interruptions from a standing position today, and possibly some who interrupt will get answers they will appreciate.

Mr. Cashin: Would the right hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh no.

Mr. Munro: You said to get up.

Mr. Diefenbaker: When a big hunter is after big game, he does not allow himself to be diverted by rabbit tracks.

If the hon. member for Yukon had been a weakling and had a kind of resilient backbone when he was laughed at, when he first spoke, he might have felt ridiculed. But following the look which appeared on the faces of hon. members opposite, including cabinet ministers, I began to wonder what was the reason for this. Did the Minister of Justice know anything about it? Did the minister of immigration know anything about it?

They finally had to admit by their own conduct that the statements he made were well founded. Now they try to smear him and I want to answer that smear business by referring to the Montreal *Star*. I may say I can quote other papers across Canada as well. The Montreal *Star* said:

Mr. Nielsen has proved the value of an opposition. If he had not raised the matter there would never have been an inquiry When all the facts are out the Conservative member for the Yukon may merit even greater praise. Those Liberals in the house who raised the cry of "smear" and "McCarthyism" against him had better think again and, this time, think straight.

To suggest Mr. Nielsen was guilty of McCarthyism is to distort the meaning of the word. He was guilty of no such thing. The guilty ones—

Do you know who they are? Can some of you guess?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Somebody hissed over there. Mr. Chairman, there are only a few animals that hiss—snakes, geese and fools. Would the hon. gentleman step up and be identified? I am ready for all interruptions today. The Montreal *Star* continued:

The guilty ones were those who, aware of the facts,—

Possibly the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration can identify themselves in that picture.

—proceeded to sit in judgment on the case and decide in private that there was no case to answer.

I do not hear much applause from over there on that observation. Then it goes on to say:

Mr. Favreau's motives may have been of the highest—it would be proper to say they were—

Mr. Greene: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: You have still got one applauder, the hon. member for Renfrew South.

—but what he did was wrong and cannot be written off to naïveté.

Petty chiseling, squalid acts—in this case criminal acts?—and sleazy excuses are intolerable anywhere, and particularly they are intolerable in public life.

It goes on to say:

It is not too much to ask of politicians that they refuse to tolerate a rotten smell or even the suggestion of a rotten smell.

Why all the secrecy? Nobody would have ever known about this if an hon. member had not stood in his place, and because he dared to do so he is execrated and condemned. The statements made by the Minister of Justice indicate that the real issue before parliament is the manner in which these matters have been shrouded in secrecy from August 14, when the minister first heard of them, until November 23 when they were brought out in the open by the hon. member for Yukon.

I am not going to say anything about the Prime Minister in this connection because he is absent. But I say this, the Prime Minister of Canada should be in his place today and he should not have left while a matter such as this is before the House of Commons. I know he has capable assistance in the Secretary of State for External Affairs, but this was a matter that demanded his presence after the extraordinary action taken by the hon. member for Dollard. No mention had been made of him. There had been some questions but no mention had been made of

him. He has not chosen to speak in the house and make an explanation—

Mr. Munro: He did.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —other than just a perfunctory explanation—exculpation would be better. But he did give an interview to *Le Soleil* and he set out the facts in detail. He said:

> Like all my colleagues in the chamber, I am frequently called upon in my capacity as member of parliament to make representations to the justice department in cases involving persons who claim to be victims of unjust treatment by the crown.
>
> It is thus that a few months ago I received a telephone call from the chairman of the school board at Mille Isles asking me to intervene with the Department of Justice in order to obtain bail for a certain Mr. Rivard.

Who was the chairman of the school board? —a brother of the hon. member for Dollard. Reviewing the statements of the minister on Monday and Tuesday—

An hon. Member: That is what he said.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I did not hear that observation.

Mr. Sharp: That is what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, yes. I am glad to see the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who hopes to be Prime Minister soon, interrupting me; this is one subject he does not know anything about. When he smiles that way he has the same expression as he had the other night on T.V. when he was asked "Have you ever said you would make a better Prime Minister than Mr. Pearson?" And he smiled—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: As a matter of fact, the past tense of "smile" according to the best etymological consideration, is "smole". That is what he did.

Anyway, in reviewing the statements of the Minister of Justice on Tuesday one is led irresistibly to the conclusion that all these events would have remained in the dark. That is where hon. members opposite wanted them to be. Hide it. Conceal it. Cover it up. Don't tell the Prime Minister.

An hon. Member: Like Courtemanche.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, I want to tell you that the hon. gentleman could learn something from Courtemanche, because as soon as a finding was made he resigned his position.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am glad of that suggestion, of that fine advice to the Minister of Justice and to the minister of immigration. I tell hon. members opposite that I welcome their participation in my speech today. That was a very helpful suggestion.

This was an affair involving trafficking in narcotics. It was a serious affair. Yet we have the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister—

An hon. Member: That was Pallett.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —making representations. He did not let the Prime Minister know. He just used his office in regard to a man, Mr. Rivard, who had a good reputation, he said. It involved conversations, both personal and by telephone, by members of ministerial staffs and the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister. All this is now admitted. Is it not strange how, after my hon. friend from Yukon had spoken, though the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister was never mentioned, either indirectly or at all, the next morning that gentleman should suddenly have found it necessary to advise the Prime Minister that he wanted to be relieved of his post? Why did not the Minister of Justice speak to the Prime Minister about it? Was he afraid the right hon. gentleman would act? The minister of immigration is usually a very voluble person in both languages. Why did he not speak to the Prime Minister and tell him the situation? Why? We never had an explanation. I will be glad if the Minister of Justice will tell us why. Was it because they were afraid the investigation might be interfered with if they were to reveal the facts?

An attempt was made to bring in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, that great force, and the Minister of Justice tries to use the commissioner of that force as a crutch to explain his failures. Let that be very clear and definite. He is trying to use the man occupying the position of commissioner. All parliament is concerned with is this: Why are these things being hidden? If there was nothing to hide, why did you keep these facts from the Prime Minister? It is not a question of legality; that is a matter for judicial inquiry. I do not agree with the Secretary of State for External Affairs that the terms of reference are wide enough. I think they were deliberately made narrow so that it would be impossible for a presiding judge to look into some of these other hidden channels. I think that is the reason.

Remember this, Mr. Chairman. I asked: why the rush? There was all that time between August 14 and November 23 during which nothing was done. I knew that after the order was passed immediate objection would be raised if we dealt with facts in connection with this matter; I knew arguments would be advanced that the question was sub judice. That is why I raised it. Those sitting on the benches opposite knew that. They rushed in and had the order in council passed and they have been able, as a result, to throttle the House of Commons, to prevent its discussing various matters which are part and parcel of this transaction.

Mr. Favreau: On a point of order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would the hon. gentleman sit down?

Mr. Favreau: I will speak.

An hon. Member: Arrogant.

An hon. Member: You can't take it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege and on a point of order.

I have the right to ask the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) whether he is saying that, at some time, I even suggested to the R.C.M.P. that that file be concealed or put away in any way. I stated that the file in question was not closed and that, should any additional evidence be uncovered, the appropriate charges would be made.

I asked, and I have the right to ask the right hon. Leader of the Opposition whether he is insinuating that, even indirectly, I suggested to the R.C.M.P. that they conceal the file?

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is neither a point of order nor a question; it is just evasive nonsense. I intend to review what the minister said. I wish to follow the minister in the devious paths that he took because they reveal that he set out to hide, to conceal, to cover up. It was only after he found he could not do so that, finally, we were given bits and pieces. As I said a moment ago, this is not a question of legality; that is a matter for the judicial inquiry. The question we are considering is not one as to guilt in the judicial sense, which is a matter for inquiry. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, what is at issue is the propriety of the means taken by this government to play with parliament—the propriety, and I repeat this, of two ministers concealing from parliament and, as I have already said, from the Prime Minister—I do not blame him for being out of here—if he has chosen the easiest way out—

Miss LaMarsh: Smear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: This is a matter which, quite possibly, involves interference with the course of justice by two men with highly placed connections and it also involves, as I say, the propriety of the Minister of Justice sitting on a report from September 18 to November 23. We do not yet know why this was done.

An hon. Member: Sixty days.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We have not been told. We may be able to infer. The Prime Minister would never have known about what went on if it had not been that it was wrenched—the information was wrenched from ministers opposite when their consciences were exacerbated by the statements made by the hon. member for Yukon. Their attitude was, parliament must not enter here; it must not discuss these things; it is a smear if it is done; parliament should not be concerned. Mr. Chairman, the newspapers of this country, without exception, reveal that parliament should have been concerned. They cannot understand the subterfuge, concealment and evasion. They cannot understand a government with ministers in it who believe that they have a right not to place the facts before parliament.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the right hon. gentleman would let me ask him a question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Sure.

Mr. Pickersgill: I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman whether he thinks that parliament should be informed by the government of allegations and accusations with regard to which there is no justification, or hope of making any kind of charge. I ask the right hon. gentleman if that kind of thing should be made public in parliament, and if he, as the responsible prime minister of this country, when he was prime minister did not try to safeguard the reputations of people until they could be accused and tried in the courts.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, those pious platitudes—

Mr. Pickersgill: That is a question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —are almost on a par with the expression of the Secretary of State for External Affairs yesterday when he wrapped his arms around the bill of rights. They are almost on a par with the stand taken by the Minister of Justice when he spoke in those touching words and compared himself to a modern Pilate. He said, "I wash my hands of this. I did not do it." I have never heard so much scriptural allusion on that side of the house. They talk of reputations. Certainly I agree; but I now ask the minister this question: Did Denis deny that he had been in touch with Mr. Lamontagne? Did he deny that?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, again somebody is trying somebody by insinuation; again although the matter is going to a commission. Denis denied his guilt, of course.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, Mr. Chairman, that answer indicates he did not deny—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —and if he did not deny, they had a complete case. Corroboration is not needed in this case.

An hon. Member: Make a charge.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is my understanding of the law. I have not looked it up. I used to practise law.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Does anybody say corroboration is needed under the law?

Mr. Ryan: When you have two men and neither has any record of any kind against him whom are you going to believe; and have you any hope of making a charge stick, whether it is before a jury or before a judge alone?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Knowing Mr. Lamontagne's reputation, on the basis of how he acted here, there is not a jury in this country that would not believe the representations that he made.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He had no axe to grind. Hanging over him was the sword of Damocles. The loss of possible legal retainers; that was the suggestion to him. He was a man of principle; a man who was not going to be pushed around.

Mr. Ryan: Are you now sitting in judgment? I will ask you this question—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the Minister of Justice interrupted, because he made that very clear. Let us follow him now on Monday and Tuesday. On Monday, before the orders of the day the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam asked the minister a specific question, as reported at page 10366 of *Hansard*:

> I want to ask the Minister of Justice whether any complaints have come to him that persons in high positions in Ottawa have sought to bring influence to bear by calling on Mr. Pierre Lamontagne, who is a lawyer acting for the United States government, in order to grant these men bail.

The minister knew the answer to that question. What answer did he give parliament? He said, "I will report in my estimates in half an hour".

An hon. Member: He did.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why didn't he come clean on this? Was this part of the course of concealment? The hon. member for Yukon therefore asked for a full statement regarding all the circumstances connected with the allegations.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, will the right hon. gentleman allow a question? Is the right hon. gentleman ready to assure this house that when he leaves the house he will accuse me outside of having tried to conceal the facts?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: Make your charge.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, I am dealing with parliament and what is dealt with in parliament.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am pointing out the deception practised on parliament by the Minister of Justice; and I am going to say more. Let me point out this—

An hon. Member: Make your charge.

Mr. Churchill: Your turn will come later.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I do not know how the reporters have the capability of taking down all the noises from the opposite side of the chamber that have all the appearance of coming from a menagerie. What did the minister say? Let me read from *Hansard* at page 10390. The minister deals with seeing the commissioner of the R.C.M.P., and says:

> I must say that when the matter was referred to me very confidentially by the commissioner of the R.C.M.P.—

Why very confidentially? Other matters are not referred very confidentially. They are all confidential that pass between the minister and the commissioner; but this was very confidential. He went on:

—around the 15th of August—it was the 14th of August—one of the persons involved was in Ottawa—

The minister referred to one of the persons named and then said:

After the commissioner had explained to me the seriousness of the allegations made, it did not take two minutes for me to tell him that he should have the people involved interviewed that day—

What speed regarding very confidential matters. Why was there less speed thereafter? Why was there less care thereafter? Why was there so much concealment thereafter? I am going to go on, Mr. Chairman. He said:

When I say "interim reports" I mean transcripts of interviews which had been had, and a full report was made to me and discussed with the commissioner on September 18 of this year. I do not want to mislead the house and give the impression that the commissioner has made a decision. It was not up to the commissioner to decide. We discussed his views on the matter from the standpoint of police investigation and fact finding as a result of the investigation. With regard to any decision respecting the lodging of a complaint in the light of the report and that conversation, I, of course, must take responsibility because under the statute the legal adviser to the crown is the Minister of Justice, and not the commissioner of the R.C.M.P.—

With regard to the third question, was anybody higher up in the government involved in the declaration made to the police either by the counsel who made the complaint or the person directly involved in the allegation of bribery, I must say that the allegation was violently denied by Mr. Denis, and nobody else in the government was involved by him in so far as the allegation of bribery or attempted bribery was concerned.

Then an hon. member asked:

Were members of parliament involved?

I want to be fair to the minister in this, Mr. Chairman. There are interruptions from time to time that you do not hear and they are uttered at a level that cannot be heard; but certainly as of that date, November 23, when he was pretending to tell the story of what happened, he did not mention the hon. member for Dollard; he did not mention the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister. I cannot understand that.

An hon. Member: Because he was not involved.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Certainly the hon. member had been interviewed.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Are you suggesting the hon. member for Dollard is involved in the bribery case?

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have never seen so many straw men put up. The hon. member for Dollard said that out of the goodness of his heart, and moved by the desire to see justice was done—

An hon. Member: Innuendo.

Mr. Starr: No, that is what he said.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —the chairman of the school board got in touch with him and said that this man Rivard was a man of fine reputation. Why did the hon. member not say something about it if there was nothing in it? If that is all that happened—I am not suggesting it was not because we do not know —then why did the minister not tell us about it? The further one goes into this the more it becomes clear that there was reason for concealment. We are now beginning to understand something of the concealment in the case of the notorious Hal Banks.

I did not intend to come back to this but one of the ministers in the cabinet asked me what I knew about this. I said the Prime Minister had dealt with it, but apparently this minister had not listened to the Prime Minister or fully apprehended what he said. Here is what Mr. Berton said:

Let me ask you another contentious question about Hal Banks and the S.I.U. It is true that Canadian corporations and unions and other organizations contribute campaign funds to political parties. Is there anything unusual in the fact that Mr. Banks and his S.I.U. appear to have contributed only to the Liberal party?

Then the Prime Minister replied:

But who says they contributed only to the Liberal party?

Mr. Berton said:

Well, the newspapers, which are pretty good at unearthing things, have only been able to discover that they contributed to the Liberal party. Are you suggesting that they contributed to the Conservatives?

The Prime Minister replied:

Well, I am suggesting that you should not say they contributed only to the Liberal party because that may or may not be the case, but there seems to be evidence that individual members of this union or the union itself have contributed to individual members of parliament in Montreal where the S.I.U. has its headquarters.

When the Minister of Transport asks me "What knowledge have you of this?" I simply place before him the words of the Prime Minister.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I know the right hon. gentleman never likes to denature my words.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Really, Mr. Chairman, these interruptions.

The Chairman: Order. Is the minister rising on a point of order?

Mr. Pickersgill: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I know the right hon. gentleman does not want to denature my words. I did not ask the right hon. gentleman what he knew indirectly. I asked him whether he had any knowledge of any cheques sent to members of parliament, and I ask him that question again.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I do have the knowledge, Mr. Chairman, because the Prime Minister told the Canadian people.

Mr. Pickersgill: He did not.

Mr. Diefenbaker: After all, I am not going to join with the minister and cast doubts on the integrity of the Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, there is a question of personal privilege there. So that the record will be straight—and I am not going to interrupt the hon. gentleman further—

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am always glad to have interruptions from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Pickersgill: —the Prime Minister made no assertion at all. All he said was "there seems to be evidence". The right hon. gentleman referred to Mr. Justice Norris. There had been stories about this in the Toronto *Star*, and the Prime Minister said there seems to be evidence that individual members of this union or the union itself had contributed to individual members of parliament in Montreal where the S.I.U. had its headquarters. The Prime Minister did not profess to have any personal knowledge of this, as the right hon. gentleman seems to claim, and I would now suggest that he tell the committee what he knows and make some charges.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, that is a strange thing—"there seems to be evidence". What does the Prime Minister mean by that? Is that to be denatured by the hon. gentleman? Will he ask the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard about what I read in the press where—

Mr. Pickersgill: Is the right hon. gentleman making a charge?

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Will the hon. gentleman please sit down.

The Chairman: Order. The Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, they do not believe their own members. The hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard was quoted as saying he was one of the recipients, and I am sure there are others. There may or may not be others who were the voluntary recipients of help from a man whose reputation was known to all Canadians. But I simply ask them: Where are the cheques?

Mr. Macaluso: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard stated he received from individuals who were union members who worked for him in his campaign; but he was not the recipient of funds or help from the man referred to, Mr. Banks.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Help from the members of the S.I.U. is help of value, no matter whether in cash or nuts. I do not see why there should be any necessity to get excited about this. All we ask is: Where did the cheques go? Where are they? Is it not a strange thing that they are gone with the wind? A government which will conceal the facts as it has in the case we are now discussing, Mr. Chairman, would not be too surprised if cheques such as those given, according to responsible press sources, to Liberal members were to disappear. It is just part of a picture.

Now I think I ought to trace for a moment the course taken by the minister. I have already mentioned that the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam had raised this question, and then the minister mentioned that the minute details and names of individuals just formed part of the report, as he put it. As reported at page 10379 of *Hansard* he said that it would be a betrayal of his position as minister to reveal more details. What details did he reveal? He did not tell us anything excepting that which was already known to the hon. member for Yukon. Everything was to be very confidential.

The course of action taken toward the mounted police is beyond me. The minister said he discussed with the mounted police commissioner the question whether or not a prosecution should take place. Why were the law officers not consulted? Was it because the minister feared that they would say there was enough evidence? Or was it because he knew that as soon as the law officers got it

the whole story would be out and that he would not be able to cover it up?

Mr. Favreau: That is not so.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Diefenbaker: If the hon. gentleman sit down; he is a valued member of the back benches. The question of whether or not prosecution should be taken is decided on the basis of consideration by the law officers. In this case the Minister of Justice acted as a grand jury. And I can only ask, if he was activated differently then than now, why was it that he kept this to himself? He considered the evidence and he decided not to proceed. Hon. members opposite say you cannot lay a charge unless you are sure of a conviction. Mr. Chairman, that is what the courts are for—the preliminary hearing, the enquête, the grand jury —to ensure that anyone who is charged wrongly shall not be brought to trial. No doubt the doubt in the mind of the Minister of Justice was given added importance by the view of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and the view of the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister. Was he consulted on this matter? Was he asked what he thought with regard to whether there was any evidence? He would have certainly given an entirely unprejudiced opinion had he had the opportunity. It happens all the time that charges are made and those who are so charged are entitled to have competent authorities, and I mentioned the competent authorities a moment ago, study the facts and act on them.

What happened here is that the Minister of Justice shortcircuited the procedure that should be followed, and then had to shortcircuit parliament with half the story instead of the full story.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): May I ask a question?

Mr. Diefenbaker: If the hon. gentleman has some questions I suggest he pass them on to the Minister of Justice. He may get answers that we have never been able to get. I am going to paraphrase the minister's words but I will quote if it is desired. The minister said that the commissioner and himself did not believe there was sufficient evidence to justify the laying of an information. Why only those two, Mr. Chairman? Why? As found on page 10380 the minister went on to say, and this is a most unusual answer:

> However, as the matter involves—I do not say implicates but involves—certain persons who were at the time in the employ of the government of Canada, I think I have the right to disagree with the suggestion which has just been made by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam. If he has in mind that, because of the delicate nature of the facts and the possibility that certain people may be judged in a way which would be tantamount to making useless smears or innuendos or insinuations—

The Chairman: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the right hon. gentleman but there are members making remarks on both sides of the aisle which makes it very difficult for the Chair to follow the right hon. gentleman, and I would ask the co-operation of all hon. members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, there is silence on this side. I was just quoting one of the reasons why the minister said that even if there was an investigation it should be in camera. He said it should be in camera because it would implicate persons who were at the time in the employ of the government of Canada. That is a very good reason why it should be public, so that the people of Canada will find out what is going on.

The minister said that it would not be fair to lay charges where there was not sufficient evidence, that this would involve smears, a lack of charity, and injustice. Over the years I have been counsel in numbers of cases where charges laid by the mounted police died at the preliminary hearing. That did not smear anyone. These are the kind of explanations that one wonders about. Everything was to be very confidential. Sir, what about Denis?

An hon. Member: "Denis the menace."

Mr. Diefenbaker: I did not hear that squawk. I thought it was the hon. member from Hamilton but he indicates it was not. I want everybody who makes sounds like that identified. What about Denis? The members of the government have a lot of compartments where they sit, and none of them lets the others know about anything. The Prime Minister sits in his office and they never think of shocking his finer sensibilities by revealing the fact there is evidence that an executive assistant has acted in a way that is contrary to the criminal law of Canada. That was on the 18th of August. He was still there in October and finally he resigned. Is not the solicitude for Mr. Denis an amazing thing?

Here is a case where the commissioner of the mounted police and the Minister of Justice had before them, I am informed, a police report in which it was indicated that Mr. Denis had offered $20,000. That is a lot of money for an executive assistant to be able to offer. This was a big money business. This was the great narcotics gang. They had money. I wonder

what Mr. Denis' explanation was? He stayed there for six weeks. What happened around October 1? When we asked the Minister of Justice, "Why did you not tell the Prime Minister", he said, "I did not feel I should advise the Prime Minister". Why?

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is speaking as though Mr. Denis had been found guilty already, and I do not think he is allowed to do so.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Sir, I am beginning to wonder about the tremendous interest of the hon. gentleman. I say, why the long delay? Denis was informed of the charges made against him.

An hon. Member: The smears against him.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why the delay? As you look into the whole picture it becomes even more difficult to understand. Sir, no matter how hard they try they cannot eradicate the condemnation of the house with regard to these two ministers for their conduct in this connection. That is why I am going to ask a little later that the amendment before the committee to reduce the salary of the Minister of Justice be accepted. Why? Listen to this. I do not understand why the minister made this statement. The hon. member for Yukon said, as found on page 10380 of *Hansard*:

> What the minister should have done as soon as he received that report was refer it to his criminal law section and obtain their independent opinion. The minister knows as well as I do that the offenders in this case, and I do not hesitate to name them—

What does the word "offender" mean? Not a person convicted but a person who allegedly has done wrong. These men had allegedly done wrong and it was clear on the record.

> —were actually employees, one of the minister's office and one of the office of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Both of these employees have now left.

Then the minister said:

> Mr. Chairman, that is an absolute lie, because nobody involved in this case, implicated as an offender by the hon. member, is a member of my department or has ever been a member of my department.

I am not going to say anything more about that. That statement stands and no amount of equivocation can remove it from *Hansard*. Then the minister went on to say:

> Unless the hon. member for the Yukon is ready to repeat what he said outside to the newspapermen, under his responsibility as a citizen, and not under the screen of parliamentary immunity, I ask him to withdraw what he just said.

Mr. Favreau: On a question of privilege, I have a right to put a question. Do I understand the right hon. gentleman to mean—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Favreau: —that whenever a report is made by the R.C.M.P. to the Minister of Justice involving the possibility or the allegation of a criminal offence it is the duty of the Minister of Justice to submit the report to the law officers of the crown?

An hon. Member: In this case, yes.

Mr. Favreau: Is it the duty?

The Chairman: That is not a question of privilege, but I suppose it is a question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I can understand the feelings of the minister. I am willing to sit down any time he raises any question of privilege or semi-privilege or assumed or specious privilege. This does not answer the statement made by the minister on Monday last, a statement that to say the least did not indicate on his part a desire to have the facts brought before the house. He wanted to smear the hon. member for Yukon, as I understand he set out to do. He said that it was an absolute lie and he asked the hon. member for Yukon to withdraw what he had just said.

I am not going to deal with the rest. Sir, it was not a lie, it was the truth and the minister knew it when he made this statement to the house. What else was there? As reported on page 10392 of *Hansard*, the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam said:

> I had not finished my question. The minister stated that there was no statement by either of these gentlemen, the two executive assistants, involving any person higher up. I wonder if the minister would tell the committee, was there anything in the statement of counsel who was alleging attempted bribery and intimidation—

I emphasize that "intimidation".

> —which involved any person other than the two persons whose names have already been mentioned?
>
> Mr. Favreau: I shall attempt to refresh my memory by asking the commissioner. The commissioner tells me he will have to check on that, and at the resumption of the sitting at eight o'clock I undertake to answer this. My recollection is not, but I would not care to make that as a firm statement.

Does the minister want the house to believe—

Mr. Favreau: Yes, sir.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am glad to hear he does. He has a higher regard for the credibility of an incredulous statement than I have. Let

me say at once that he did not remember the parliamentary secretary, he did not remember the hon. member for Dollard. He says, I shall attempt to refresh my memory. Is that not a wonderful memory, one that can forget that the parliamentary secretary had had statements made about him for having interfered. He had forgotten. I should like to know what the Minister of Justice would say in a courtroom if some poor, uneducated person had given an answer such as that.

Then, the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam is reported as saying:

> I ask the minister to check it very carefully. I have reason to believe that in the allegations there are other persons, or at least one other person, named.

Why did the minister forget that? Mind you, he had never told the Prime Minister. He had never spoken of this matter, apparently, to the Minister of Transport, who is an all-knowing person. He did not know anything about this. Of course, there was no question of foreign affairs, so the matter would not be taken to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Is it not a strange thing that he forgot? His memory failed him. It was only a parliamentary secretary. If it had not been for the statements by the parliamentary secretary the next day, would we have ever found out?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of privilege. Does the right hon. gentleman imply that if the member for Dollard had not risen I would have lied to the house? That is what he just said.

Mr. Diefenbaker: No, you would have forgotten. I would be the last to say to the minister that he would do that. However, I am sure that many people would envy one with such a convenient memory as he has shown on this occasion.

I go on from there. I believe I have pretty well covered the situation. I should point out that the minister was rather guarded in some of his answers. He was not sure that his memory might not play him tricks. He has been asked pressing questions by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam and the hon. member for Yukon, and then he asked if the hon. member had something else in mind to be added or included in his question because the minister wanted it before he gave an answer. What a course of action. Have you ever seen a parliament having to strain its very sinews to get information? We have often said, regarding this government, that it does not answer questions or if it does, on many occasions, conceals. The truth is here now for all to see.

Then, the minister is asked what was the date he first became acquainted with this situation. His answer was that, subject to being corrected, he thought it was approximately in August or maybe September. Well, that does bear out that his memory of these events was not quite as clear as it should have been.

Sir, the course of action that has been taken here cannot be erased by loud yells of "smear" and "McCarthyism". This is not smear, this is assuring parliament shall not be given partial information. If the hon. member for Yukon had not stood, all of this would have been concealed, covered up and remained confidential. The minister was asked regarding the contents of the police report. I realize that police reports are confidential. He mentioned some of the contents. He was asked to give us the details, and his answer was that the minute details in the file remain confidential in the public interest. The Minister of Justice said if he were to reveal more of the terms it would be a betrayal of trust. "Betrayal"—I will not use that word, but I say to the Minister of Justice that in the years I have been in the House of Commons no other minister of justice has ever kept the facts from parliament as has the hon. gentleman. I make that quite clear.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, was the 1958 report on the Banks case, on a criminal offence, the general report of 1959 or the 1961 report on the Banks case on criminal offences, ever referred by the government of the right hon. gentleman to the law officers of the crown? They never have.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Now, the minister comes back to Banks. A guilty conscience looks for something to justify its conduct. I am not going to be led into that; we have dealt with that over and over.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We did not get the contributions. You produce the record and some of the hon. gentlemen who sit opposite now and laugh will be in sackcloth and ashes.

Miss LaMarsh: Will the right hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman—

Miss LaMarsh: Will the right hon. gentleman permit a question?

The Chairman: Order please.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I always show courtesy to a lady.

The Chairman: The right hon. gentleman has the floor unless he wants to reply to a question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, I am not answering questions from her. She is the one who questioned truth and then had to swallow it herself two days later.

Miss LaMarsh: Will the right hon. gentleman permit a question?

The Chairman: Order please. The right hon. gentleman has the floor.

Mr. Diefenbaker: On the basis of the statements of the minister one is led irresistibly to the conclusion that this thing was to be kept in the dark. They did everything they could, but they could not conceal the facts. I do not know Mr. Lamontagne, excepting by reputation now. He says that in large measure what is alleged did take place. They must have believed him to be a good counsel or they would not have had him on the job.

Here is what happened. Here was this thug from the United States engaged in the most nefarious traffic. The mounted police worked day and night in order to control this traffic. Then one alleged mastermind was caught. Money means nothing to him. Twenty thousand dollars is peanuts.

Why the solicitude on the part of a parliamentary secretary? Why the action taken by Mr. Denis? I cannot understand the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. You would have thought he would have opened the door and thrown him out, and said "Get out of here;" but he said "You can stay for the time being." That must have taken place because it was only six weeks later, when he resigned, that he finally left the minister's employ.

I conclude this portion of my remarks—

Mr. Regan: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) does nothing but engage in occasional desk tapping. It shows his intelligence that he makes that his major contribution.

At no time has any minister or member of the government denied the specific statements made by the hon. member for Yukon. It is a strange thing. They say it is a smear, but they keep the truth under cover. They will not tell us what happened. Parliament is to be denied. I cannot go into facts because this matter, as has been pointed out, being before the courts denies further consideration.

But I ask, why the strange doings of the last few days? First it was nothing. It was a lie, the Minister of Justice said. Then the cat was let out of the bag when the hon. member for Dollard got up. I looked at them. Many of them had never heard of this before. They could not believe their eyes and ears. Then the government decided to set up a committee.

We have had to drag out the admissions, and it is a difficult thing when you sit in an opposition and you have a government adamant in its desire to cover up and withhold information. First members of the government thought they would get away with an in camera hearing. That went by the boards with the revelations that came out. Then they tried to continue the blanket of concealment. Then they tried to place the responsibility on the mounted police.

Sir, this house as the supreme court of parliament has the right to know that justice is administered without fear or favour, has a right to know that the administration of justice shall not depend on the persuasion of alleged wrongdoers. It has a right to know that it will not be strangled by the concealment of facts.

If the minister had come into the house and said: "Well, I will tell you the facts," I think generally speaking he would have been subject to some criticism but people would have said, "There is a man who has stood up and quite frankly admitted his mistake." But there has been no admission. He stands and simply challenges, "Say out of the house what you say in the house." I say, first you say in the house what the situation is so that we can get the facts.

In this matter the government has shown a blatant disregard for the rights and privileges of parliament. We have not yet been told why a senior official in the highly confidential position of an executive assistant should be "separated"—to use the expression. Why was he separated? What were the reasons? The parliamentary secretary said he resigned because his name appeared in the report. However, the government endeavours to brush aside this matter, the press across Canada and people everywhere are demanding a full inquiry. The present terms of reference are too limited to bring about an investigation that will be adequate and satisfactory. Sir, when will the government, or any member of it who has any knowledge of the matter, rise and tell the truth about this matter?

The Windsor *Star* has an editorial headed "Assistants to Ministers Embarrass Government." It says:

> That is a thoroughly nasty situation in Ottawa—

And later on says:

> There is no current suggestion that either Mr. Favreau or Mr. Tremblay at the time had any knowledge of the actions of their assistants.

The hon. member for Yukon referred to that.

> They are responsible, however, for what goes on in their offices. That officials so closely associated with them should have attempted to interfere with the course of justice, if the allegations be correct, is almost incredible.

Then it goes on to mention gangsters and says:

> It is evident, however, that such gangsters are willing to do anything to be left undisturbed, or to defeat the law if they are caught. There must be entire assurance that they cannot get comfort or assistance from anyone in Ottawa.
>
> The disclosures in Ottawa represent a danger signal to the government and to parliament. It must be heeded and promptly.

What I have tried to do is simply deal with the parliamentary side of this, the utter contempt shown to parliament, the ridicule heaped upon the hon. member for Yukon on Monday, and on Tuesday, and on Wednesday the facts started to come out. Instead of reviling him and condemning him, Canadians from one end of this country to the other owe him a debt of gratitude for having the intestinal fortitude to stand up here and speak. He having spoken, parliament has the right to be assured that this is the last of this kind of thing—that there will not be any more incidents of the like kind, that justice will remain pure and undefiled. It cannot be if you have executive assistants in places close to the throne participating in actions which cast aspersion on the very name of justice and constitute the most terrible indictment ever made against any government at any time.

Mr. Gordon: I think the best way in which I could express my feelings about the performance we have just witnessed would be to ignore it completely.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is what you did with your first budget.

An hon. Member: We know how you feel.

Mr. Gordon: An hon. member over there says he knows how I feel. I am sure he does. I have made no secret of my feelings about this man.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

An hon. Member: You would like to hide this from the people.

The Chairman: Could we have order, please?

Mr. Gordon: I have five points I should like to make, and I will try to make them in a quiet fashion and without any insinuations or innuendos. On Monday of this week the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam asked for a judicial inquiry into the charges which have been made. Those charges relate to allegations of attempts to bribe or to bring pressure to bear on counsel in a serious extradition case in Montreal. This proposal by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam was agreed to immediately by the Minister of Justice and at the outset of Tuesday's session the minister suggested, very tentatively, as I recall, the kind of reference which he thought might be appropriate.

The terms suggested were objected to on the ground that the proposed reference did not go far enough. The emphasis suggested was on determining whether there was sufficient evidence to lay charges. It was felt by some members, including myself, that the terms should be expanded to cover the question of alleged improprieties.

Mr. Brewin: Why did you not extend them?

Mr. Gordon: Would the hon. member sit down and let me finish? I was saying it was felt the terms should be extended to cover the question of alleged improprieties—I apologize for getting cross with the hon. member for Greenwood, particularly since by speaking now I am afraid I am interfering with some plans he had for later in the evening.

The new draft was prepared on Tuesday evening and when I saw the final version on Wednesday morning, as did other members of the cabinet, I, for one, felt fair minded people would consider that it covered the whole spectrum of the charges which have been made. I also felt that the appointment of Chief Justice Dorion of the superior court of Quebec should satisfy everyone that the inquiry would be fully and properly carried out. For those who think of these things in partisan political terms, I would remind hon. members that Chief Justice Dorion was appointed to the bench by the previous government. What is of more importance is my understanding that he enjoys an enviable reputation among members of the bar.

Though I am not a lawyer, I have been chairman of three different public inquiries and I am not unfamiliar with terms of ref-

erence. Naturally, no commissioner would accept an appointment without being satisfied that his terms of reference were broad enough to cover all aspects of the matter he was being asked to inquire into.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Brewin: Blame the judge.

Mr. Gordon: No commissioner of any standing would accept an assignment of this nature if his actions were to be circumscribed, I am sure of that. It is true the terms of reference do not cover a general fishing expedition.

An hon. Member: Why not?

Mr. Gordon: Nor should they. It is equally true that they will allow the commissioner to deal completely with all the matters covered by the charges which have been made. Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition said as reported on page 10510 of *Hansard*:

> That order in council is so limited that what I stated yesterday will in effect be the result, namely, that the chief justice appointed will be limited to what the government wants to produce in order to bring about a whitewash.

Apart from being untrue, this statement amounts to a wholly improper suggestion. It reflects on the integrity of a senior and respected member of the judiciary.

Mr. Churchill: It does no such thing.

Mr. Scott: You are trying to hide behind the bench.

Mr. Gordon: In my opinion the Leader of the Opposition owes an apology to this house.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Gordon: There is a second point I wish to make. There is one serious question which is not referred to specifically in the order in council and which obviously must be examined fully in one way or another. This is, how a confidential report of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police which, I am told, is marked "Top Secret"—

An hon. Member: No wonder.

Mr. Gordon: I am being serious about this —how this report came into the hands of the hon. member for Yukon or into the hands of members of the press.

Mr. Churchill: Are you making a charge?

Mr. Gordon: What do you mean—"a charge"?

Mr. Churchill: I am asking whether you are making a charge against the hon. member for Yukon.

Mr. Gordon: That is about as silly a question as I have heard for a long time. I am asking how this report got into the hands of either the member for Yukon or the members of the press. It seems to me this is obviously a matter which the government and the R.C.M.P. must look into very thoroughly.

Mr. Douglas: The minister should be asking why he did not know the contents of that report.

An hon. Member: Or did he know?

Mr. Winkler: Answer the question. Did you know, or didn't you know?

Mr. Gordon: I want to make a third point, Mr. Chairman. In view of the charges that have been made, the government and all hon. members must insist on finding out whether there has been any wrongdoing or impropriety. It will be the duty of the commissioner to ascertain this. This does not mean that members of this house or members of the press should take it upon themselves to judge the guilt or innocence—

Mr. Bigg: We won't.

Mr. Gordon: —of individuals on the basis of rumour, and unsupported and loosely worded allegations.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gordon: In particular, Mr. Chairman, it is our responsibility not to indulge in the kind of tactics that were employed by some people in the United States in the early 1950's.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bigg: Or the truth squad in 1960.

Mr. Gordon: I would like to recount a personal experience that I had in those days. I was in conversation with a respected member of the staff of Columbia University, who told me that he was endeavouring to collect funds so that another professor who was charged under these same kind of loose allegations by the U.S. un-American activities committee could be in a position to provide himself with an adequate defence.

An hon. Member: How much did you give him?

Mr. Gordon: Certainly I gave him some money, and I would have been ashamed not to. He told me that because he was trying to collect money to make sure that somebody got a fair defence, not only was he being persecuted and threatened but so were his children.

Mr. MacInnis: Did you give him $20,000?

Mr. Gordon: I told him that I would make a modest contribution to the fund. This man begged me not to, because he said if I did something like that my name would appear on certain lists in the United States and I ran the risk of being smeared. I told him the only thing I would be ashamed of was if my name was not on that kind of list.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Chairman, I submit that it is the duty of all members of parliament to respect the tradition of justice that we have inherited. I do not mind saying that I was horrified yesterday to hear members of this house hurling questions of the "When did you stop beating your wife?" variety. As an example I refer to the question asked by the hon. member for Yukon of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, which can be found on page 10534 of *Hansard*:

> Likewise the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration should rise and tell the committee what he knows. I challenge him to rise now and tell the house where he was when the bribe was offered.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Gordon: And he repeated that:

> I challenge him to rise now and tell us where he was when the bribe was offered.

Mr. Bigg: Where was he?

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Nugent: Shame that he didn't.

Mr. Gordon: If ever there was an attempt to prove guilt by alleged association, that was it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Yukon has obviously been under some stress and he may have been carried away—

An hon. Member: Just look at your front-benchers.

Mr. Gordon: —when he asked that question. I suggest that if so, he should apologize and withdraw it, and I would ask him to do that now.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister of Finance should have read on from that quotation, because if I recall my remarks —and again I say that I have not yet read the *Hansard* of yesterday's proceedings—I believe that if he would check carefully he would find that, not once but three times I said I was not suggesting any motive on the part of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and that I accepted his word to this house. I said that twice or three times.

Mr. Gordon: Nevertheless—

Mr. Munro: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I may just raise a point of order and point out to the hon. member for Yukon that at page 10534, where he made this allegation—

An hon. Member: Is this a point of order?

The Chairman: Order, please. May I suggest to hon. members that the proceedings during the last few minutes have been a little irregular. The Minister of Finance has the floor, and unless he wants to relinquish it—I understand at least one hon. member is anxious to speak—he should be allowed to continue his remarks.

Mr. Gordon: I have another point I want to make, Mr. Chairman. Over the past several days this whole matter has been built up step by step in a way which to me—

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—it is a very simple point of order—I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that the minister is reading—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacInnis: —something written by somebody else.

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Chairman, I will try not to read even my notes, although I would remind my hon. friend that the Leader of the Opposition read a so-called speech for about an hour and a half before I began.

Mr. Nugent: That is nonsense, and you know it.

Mr. Monteith: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I deny that that happened. I was sitting beside the Leader of the Opposition and watched him use his notes.

Mr. Nugent: I invite the minister to give an appearance of honesty and withdraw that last remark.

The Chairman: May I suggest to the hon. member that the Minister of Finance has the floor and should be allowed to make his speech without interruption.

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Chairman, after listening to my friend the hon. member for Perth, of course I withdraw it, if he assures me that what I said was not the case. We have over the last several days watched this thing being built up step by step in a way which to me, as I said before, is clearly reminiscent of

what was allowed to go on in the United States in the early 1950's. The original charges were made on Monday and, as I have said, the government acted immediately to set up a commission of inquiry. The hon. member for Yukon then went on the air to say he believes his telephone wires have been tapped.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Gordon: He refused to elaborate on that or to indicate what reasons he might have for making such a statement.

Mr. Nugent: Can you think of one?

Mr. Gordon: If he was not solely interested in sensationalism I suggest it was and is his duty as a member of parliament to report his suspicions to the Speaker and to the commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, may I rise at this point, if the minister will allow me, and tell him that two inspectors from the Bell Telephone Company have been in the west block to look at telephone lines; and I have discussed the matter briefly—because he had to go to New York on occasion—and he tells me that he is instituting an investigation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gordon: I think we will all be very pleased—

Mr. Nugent: Does that take care of that item for you?

Mr. Winkler: And I will support the hon. member in his case, too.

Mr. Gordon: I am informed that the Speaker requested that action, and not the hon. member; but I do not know.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: That is quite true.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: I did not for a moment, may I implore the minister, imply that I instigated—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: —the investigation by the Speaker; I said that the Speaker had informed me that he had instituted an investigation.

Some hon. Members: You did not.

Mr. Woolliams: He did so.

Mr. Gordon: In the same kind of way that I remember very well in the 1950's, yesterday the hon. member for Yukon succeeded in getting headlines by mentioning the name of a man who is alleged to be charged with capital murder.

Mr. MacInnis: You are reading again.

Mr. Gordon: If he had any purpose in mentioning this name other than sensationalism I suggest he should have made it clear just what is his charge.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, if I may say a word on a question of privilege, I should like to support the hon. member for Yukon in his suspicions with regard to the tapping of his telephone line.

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Chairman, there have been hints of further charges and more revelations to come.

Mr. Smallwood: You are breaking the rules and reading again.

Mr. Gordon: I do not know whether this is merely a build up or whether there is any substance to these hints and innuendoes. However, I do say that if there are any new charges separate and distinct from those covered by the commissioner's terms of reference, it is the duty of the hon. member for Yukon or of anybody else to make them unequivocally and without reservation.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word about the way this matter has been used, deliberately or otherwise, in parliament and in some sections of the press to undermine the unity of this country.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nugent: Are you going to bring the flag in too?

Mr. Gordon: We should not pay too much attention to speculative articles, but some members will have seen one this morning suggesting that the Prime Minister may be asked by a group of Ontario members to discipline two principal members in this government, not because they are guilty but in the interests of political expediency. Now, most of us who have known the Prime Minister of this country for many years know—and I say this categorically—that he is not the kind of man who would consider that kind of action for one moment. As a member of parliament from Ontario I consider it a privilege and an honour to have as colleagues two ministers like the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. We need

more men like them in public life. I have no doubt about their complete honesty, integrity and courage. I have no doubt that they are here, like some other hon. members, not because they prefer this kind of life to something else but because they think it is their duty to do what they can in the interests of their country.

Mr. MacInnis: Would the minister permit a question?

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Gordon: They have the complete support, Mr. Chairman, of all of us who know them, particularly—and I want to emphasize this—of all the members from Ontario. There is no foundation for the kind of speculative articles to which I have referred. I can only say, Mr. Chairman, that if a man like my hon. friend the Minister of Justice were ever forced to resign for the kind of political reasons suggested, I for one would not be happy to remain in this house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the minister.

The Chairman: Does the minister who had the floor wish to reply to a question?

Mr. Gordon: I will be pleased to, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Chairman, I ask this question because of the apparent interest it will create among the minister's colleagues on the front bench. I ask the minister if his participation in this debate at this time confirms his position as 2-i/c of the party? I would further ask him, who was the author of the speech he just read?

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Chairman, I am accustomed to writing my own speeches. The other silly remark I will leave unanswered.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, I will try to summon to my contribution in this debate all the reason and charity that is possible. I must say to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance that I think the government needs all the charity we can possibly extend to it in view of the pitiable speech we have just heard from the minister in defence of the government. I believe the Minister of Finance is a very excellent accountant, so I suggest he stick to his knitting.

The Chairman: Order. Is it the desire of the committee that the chairman call it six o'clock?

[Mr. Gordon.]

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the committee would agree to hear the hon. member speak until 6.30 and then adjourn.

Mr. Fisher: No.

Mr. Churchill: We should like to hear the hon. member and then take the supper recess.

Some hon. Members: Six o'clock.

The Chairman: We would need unanimous agreement of all hon. members. Unless I did not hear correctly there are obviously a number who do not agree.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Just to accommodate the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. Fisher: No; six o'clock.

Mr. Pickersgill: Let us hear the hon. gentleman and then adjourn.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I think the hon. gentleman himself has a rather important engagement and it would suit his convenience. That being the case I think the suggestion is a good one.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the kindness of the Acting Prime Minister and he is correct, I did have an engagement. However, I have changed my engagement because I regard being here as more important. Other hon. members of the committee wish to leave at this time and I prefer to continue my remarks at eight o'clock.

The Chairman: Order. It is my duty pursuant to provisional standing order 39A to inform the members of the committee that the question to be raised at 10 p.m. this evening is as follows: The hon. member for Halifax, national defence, ships laid up through lack of technical personnel.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, just before six o'clock I was saying that in this debate I hoped to be able to muster all the reasonableness and charity that I had, but I must say that having mustered all the reasonableness and charity available to me I find there is only one way in which I can describe the terms of reference and the unwillingness of the government to change the terms of reference in this matter, and that is that they

appear to me to be a studied effort at evasion. The terms of reference as originally drawn were so narrow that they could only invite one conclusion, that conclusion being that the government indeed must have something to hide. I cannot understand any other reason why they would refuse the reasonable request that I am going to describe in a minute to clarify the terms of reference, and make them broad enough to have a full and adequate inquiry.

Again, why does the government seek to hide something? What do they fear? Do they fear a full and adequate inquiry? What is the reason for their fear? I think that is something that this house has to be concerned with and must look into very carefully. As long ago as October 7 the hon. member for Yukon introduced a motion in the debate on item 1 of these estimates to reduce this particular item to $1 and, as I understand it, Mr. Chairman, this is equivalent to a motion of non-confidence in the minister. I want to explain tonight why we feel obliged, reluctantly obliged I may say, to support that motion.

If the government had been willing to accept a broadening of the terms of reference so that the commission of inquiry could include in its inquiry the basic question, which is the manner in which the Minister of Justice, having been informed of the allegation of attempted bribery, from that point on discharged his duty as Minister of Justice, my observations this evening might have been different. That is the matter that should be inquired into and if it had been included in the terms of reference we would have been very glad in this debate to say that it would be premature for us to come to any conclusions on that particular matter. We would not have attempted to prejudge the decision of the commissioner. We would have waited until the evidence was produced before him and we had had the benefit of his findings in this matter.

But I say to the committee, Mr. Chairman, that it is abundantly clear on any fair reading of the terms of reference that the commissioner is precluded from looking into that basic matter. The terms of reference have been read before and I do not intend to go into them in detail. I simply wish to remind the house that there is only one matter of substance referred to in these terms of reference and that is the allegation about improper inducements offered to and improper pressures brought to bear upon counsel. The one matter of substance that is included in these terms of reference is whether counsel, Mr. Lamontagne, I take it, was in fact offered improper inducements or had improper pressures brought to bear upon him. All the other words that follow from there on are just words to bring in other matters relative thereto, and so on and so forth. They are all connected with this one narrow aspect of whether in fact these improper inducements were offered, and at the end the commissioner is asked to report on one thing and one thing only, whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant a prosecution for offences that may be involved. All the rest is words, Mr. Chairman, and there is no other instruction to the commissioner whatsoever.

When we saw this we were disturbed because of the allegations that have been made. We had hoped that they might have been adequately answered and we felt that although no one in this house and no one anywhere else so far as I know had ever accused the minister or ever will, I hope, of any participation in wrongdoing, nevertheless, despite the fact that no one suggests wrongdoing or any suspicion of wrongdoing on the part of the minister, the Minister of Justice requires more than being above suspicion in that way. His judgment and his ability to deal with matters of this sort are in question and that matter is not within the terms of the inquiry at all. That was made clear by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam when he invited an extension of the terms of reference.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member would yield to me for one minute, please. As he knows, I am not trying to interrupt his speech. While I have always felt he never thought otherwise, after the words with which the hon. member for Greenwood has prefaced his remarks and now that he has made it publicly clear that in his view there was nothing pertaining to moral misconduct in the way in which I handled this matter, which is the matter of political judgment—those last words were not in his speech —I think it is fair for me to refer to what was said earlier today by the Acting Prime Minister. I know the hon. member for Greenwood does not agree with him, but the effect of his words was that what the hon. member has suggested would be deemed to be included in the terms of reference. As far as I am concerned, whether or not in a strict interpretive sense what was contained in the suggestion of the hon. member for Greenwood is included in the present terms of reference, I would be ready to agree and undertake—it

would be on *Hansard* and I could be faced with it—to state to the commission that it is my wish that this matter be looked into and inquired into. I think the point is, from a strict constitutional point of view, that I doubt this could be spelled out in any official terms of reference. This is the only point. The hon. member for Greenwood may take my word for it, they will be there tomorrow, reported in *Hansard,* that it would be my wish that what he referred to be the object of investigation by the commissioner.

Mr. Brewin: I have not the slightest doubt that the Minister of Justice, in making that statement, is speaking with the greatest of good faith. However, he is a good enough lawyer to know very well that when a matter of this sort comes before the commissioner the judge will decide how the terms of reference are to be interpreted. If the terms of reference are in themselves too narrow to permit the inquiry about which I am speaking, then it does not matter how much the minister says in *Hansard*: The judge will say, "I am bound by the terms of the order in council".

I point out to the Minister of Justice, the Acting Prime Minister and the other members of the government, that when I wrote to the Acting Prime Minister this morning I suggested that this matter be put beyond any doubt. I said that this should be added to the terms of reference, that the commissioner should inquire into and report upon the way in which the allegations, when brought to the attention of the R.C.M.P. and the Minister of Justice, were dealt with. I still say that it is not too late now. We do not want the minister, who I am sure would like to see the thing fully investigated, to make a statement; we want to see the terms of reference broadened so that when the chief justice comes to deal with the matter he will have terms of reference that will enable him to inquire into this matter, which I say is at the root of the confidence of the Canadian people in the administration of justice under the minister.

I know that the Acting Prime Minister wrote me a letter and made a proposition in his letter in regard to this, with which I intend to deal. I will come to that in a minute. This is only one aspect of the terms of reference. The other aspect that I asked should be included beyond any peradventure was that the commissioner should be given the power to inquire into and report on the activities in the Department of Citizenship and Immigration of Mr. Raymond Denis. I say that if these matters were included so that there could be no doubt the inquiry would encompass them, then we would be happier and prepared to say that the matter is being looked into fully and adequately, so that we would not be required to censure the Minister of Justice at this time. We would wait to see what the inquiry brought out.

The minister cannot get away from the letter written in black and white and read this morning by the Acting Prime Minister, because it very clearly turns down the suggestion for broadening the terms of this inquiry. Indeed, he used this argument. He said that the incorporation of the suggestion—that is the suggestion that the commissioner should inquire into and report upon the way these allegations were dealt with by the Minister of Justice—would be a specific direction to the commissioner, who is not a member of parliament, to pass judgment upon a minister of the crown whose responsibility, under our system of government, is to the House of Commons. I believe that this sentence contains a dangerous and nonsensical doctrine. Certainly the house should be the final judge of this matter. However, there have been innumerable examples in Canada, Britain and the provinces—I cannot mention them all at the moment—in which the conduct of a minister has been inquired into. I, myself, was counsel on the royal commission on crime in Ontario when the conduct of the attorney general was one of the main subjects of inquiry. To suggest that the commissioner cannot be given that authority to deal with the conduct of a minister of the crown in this case is nonsense. As I said, we are not imputing misconduct in the sense of any participation in wrongdoing. What we are imputing is inadequacy of judgment, the sort of judgment that is required from a person holding the high office the Minister of Justice holds. This excuse, therefore, offered by the Acting Prime Minister as the reason that they will not expand the inquiry is without substance, without meaning, and so far as I can see can only be taken as evidence of a desire to limit the terms of the inquiry unduly and prevent a full inquiry being held.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what about the second aspect of the inquiry, the second item that should be dealt with? There has been clear and undisputed evidence about a person holding a confidential position of executive assistant to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. This credible evidence may turn out to be wrong, but it was given by a man of reputation and substance. This is evidence to the effect that there was a bribe offered by people who were said to have

participated in a narcotics ring through a person holding the position of executive assistant. We say that if that very sensitive position of executive assistant to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration is occupied by a man who is found to be intermediary of a narcotics ring, then it is time the whole activities of that particular gentleman in the department were looked into. This is a department where desperate people may be ready to do anything to get into this country. I do not have to bring forward any smear because it has been admitted by the minister himself.

Let us see what the government's attitude toward this matter is. On Tuesday the hon. member for Grey-Bruce got up and said that the inquiry should include these matters. The right hon. Prime Minister answered him in this way saying that Mr. Sedgwick is a commissioner and Mr. Sedgwick is going to look into this matter. This was on Monday. On Wednesday I asked the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, because I knew that was not Mr. Sedgwick's function and he was not going to inquire into the matter, another question. Perhaps the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration had forgotten to tell the Prime Minister what Mr. Sedgwick was doing. The Prime Minister was clearly mistaken. What does the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration say? I will read what he said as reported on page 10517 of *Hansard*: He was asked by myself about this misunderstanding by the Prime Minister, and he replied:

> Mr. Speaker, the setting up of a special inquiry commission under Chief Justice Dorion, as decided by the cabinet, leads us to hope that all the aspects of the problem raised in the house, where the name of Mr. Raymond Denis was involved, will be considered and therefore there is no reason now to believe that Mr. Sedgwick would have to conduct an investigation with regard to Mr. Denis' activities since they will be covered by that inquiry.

So on Wednesday the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration tells us that Chief Justice Dorion is going to look into this matter. What do we find on Thursday, when we point out as I did in my letter to the Acting Prime Minister that this matter was in no way covered in the terms of reference. We find out on Thursday that it is not within his terms of reference at all. Anybody who is interested in the details should read *Hansard* to see what the minister said in that letter. On Monday it was Sedgwick; on Wednesday, it was the chief justice; and on Thursday no one at all is going to look into this, although the matter we believe is serious enough that the people of Canada have a right to know the answer. So long as the government continues to insist on its unwillingness to broaden the terms of reference, so long will suspicion be created that they are trying to hide something they do not want the people of Canada to know.

I have said, and I am quite serious in this, that if the terms of inquiry were broadened adequately we would be very glad to have to deal on these estimates with a motion which is the equivalent of a motion of censure on the Minister of Justice. But we are not permitted to take that course. As the Acting Prime Minister has said, that is for the house, and we are now faced with the painful task of deciding whether we should or should not vote confidence in the administration of the Minister of Justice.

I say reluctantly, and I speak for the other members of my party in this matter, that we have come to the conclusion that we have no choice, in the absence of proper terms of reference, but to vote in favour of that particular motion. I said reluctantly, and I mean reluctantly because so far as I am concerned—I cannot speak for everybody here—I have appreciated the fairness and courtesy of the minister. I know of no other member of the government front bench who is more highly regarded, but this is not a matter of personal friendship and good will. This is a matter of adequacy of performance of the vital, important functions of the Minister of Justice.

Before I go on to deal with our conclusions on this matter in detail may I be permitted to say something by way of background. I happened to be one of the counsel appearing before the royal commission on crime in Ontario, and from my experience there and what I read at the time I learned that there is no more sinister force in North America than organized, syndicated crime. I learned the methods they use for their operations. They are highly organized; they are continent wide; they dispose of tremendous funds, and a large part of those funds goes for protection.

What is protection? It is paying policemen. It is corrupting, where they can, politicians. It is getting their tentacles into government wherever they can; and I say the person who is Minister of Justice must be aware that when any appearance of this octopus—if I can call it that—of organized crime getting into the government of Canada comes up, then it

is his duty to act promptly, wisely and decisively to dispel it.

We are not able to support the minister in this, as we regret to say we have come to the conclusion he did not act promptly, wisely and adequately when this matter was called to his attention. It was a grave matter. It affected the minister's associates, people in positions of utmost confidence. What did the minister do? He received this information from the R.C.M.P. and then he decided for himself—I do not doubt the good faith of his judgment—but he decided for himself that was to be the end of it. He told no one else. He did not consult his officials. He did not get the advice of a crown attorney. He did not turn the matter over to some other counsel. He did not tell the Prime Minister and some other colleagues of his, and I say he made a grave error of judgment that he disqualified himself from holding the position he now holds.

I do not think there is much more I can say on this matter. I say that the minister substituted his judgment for the judgment of a court. I say that he decided he would be the grand jury—as someone has put it—he would substitute for the preliminary inquiry; and I say this was a most foolish and unwise procedure, when looked at from the background of the matter.

The matter had been called to his attention through the representations and statements of a lawyer, Mr. Lamontagne who, from all I hear, has the highest possible reputation. What possible motive could Mr. Lamontagne have for bringing forward this story so highly embarrassing to himself? It is always embarrassing to be involved in such a matter. It is embarrassing to cast charges at your fellow lawyers. The minister is a lawyer and he would find it very embarrassing.

The minister speaks of charity in respect to this matter. There is no place for charity when dealing with spokesmen and agents of organized crime. There is no place for any sort of charity then, and in my judgment—and I believe it to be the judgment of the people of Canada—the minister should have said, "At least I will get the judgment of others as to whether or not this very serious allegation has substance," an allegation I regret to say not implausible on the face of it because the offering of money and this sort of thing is part of the regular technique of people of this ilk.

The minister should have had enough experience with Hal Banks to know about problems that arise in the getting of bail, and if this person—the special executive secretary in the office of the minister of citizenship—was prepared, or there was a serious allegation he was prepared to lend himself to the machinations and corruption of this international crime syndicate, then I say to bury the thing on the basis of his own judgment was a grievous error of judgment and makes him, I regret to say, unfit to occupy the position which he holds at the present time.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Brewin: I hear some hon. members saying shame. The shame is not my shame. I have made it perfectly clear that in my judgment the minister never consciously acted wrongly, but I think a person in his position, leading a department such as he does, has to have a great deal more than integrity; and the minister has integrity. I think he has to have the judgment to enable him to deal with problems of this sort and I say he has failed to show that judgment. We on the opposition side of the house—and I would have thought those on the other side of the chamber as well—could have no choice but to say that unfortunately a man of great ability and charm, whom we think so much of, is not fitted to this position.

That need not be such an awful tragedy. Mr. Hugh Dalton, who was a close associate of prime minister Attlee, made a mistake—I think trifling to the mistake the minister made—but as a result of his mistake he resigned from the cabinet. I do not think it would be the end of the career of the Minister of Justice. By no means; I think he would have a great future and great career in anything. But I say he has not, in the discharge of his duties in this method, shown the capacity to understand the significance of his action or lack of action in this matter. That is the best possible view with which one can look upon the matter, and that is the view I prefer to put on it.

All I can say is that just based on what we know now, though if there were an inquiry with satisfactory terms of reference I might take a different view, but as the matter stands at the moment and on the evidence before us we in this party will have no option, reluctantly I say, but to support the motion of the hon. member for Yukon to cut the minister's estimates, based not on doubts as to his integrity but on doubts as to his ability to discharge the duties of a minister of justice as revealed by this incident—not revealed by anything else, but just by his handling of this particular incident.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon when the Minister of Finance got up and followed the Leader of the Opposition I had hoped we were going to have the spectacle of that minister dealing with the very forceful arguments put forward by the Leader of the Opposition. Instead the minister ignored the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. Personally it seemed to me that the minister realized the Liberals had sent a boy to do a man's job, and he faced up to the task just like a little boy. I did find some of the minister's statements amusing, or perhaps the word "bewildering" would be more accurate. They illustrate the mental attitude of members on the front benches on the other side of the house. They illustrate a morality which I can hardly comprehend. The Minister of Finance apparently thought that quite as important as the matters which have been brought up in this committee, the suggestion that the fingers of crime had reached into the offices of the government, is the fact that some member of the opposition had a means of finding these things out. I hope I do not misrepresent the Minister of Finance in pointing this out, but this is certainly the only inference I can draw from his remarks. I believe he suggested there was just as much reason to set up a commission to inquire into the source of the information in possession of the hon. member for Yukon as there was to investigate the activities of the various people mentioned. If that is the standard of morality and conduct which governs cabinet ministers, then there are, perhaps, more than one or two ministers whose judgment is such that we do not want them around any more.

I notice the Minister of Finance said he could serve with no finer man than the Minister of Justice. If that is his mental attitude, I can understand it. Personally I think the handling of the Banks case as well as the revelations which have been made here have left the rest of us with less than that amount of confidence in the hon. gentleman. I also saw tonight the television performance given by the Minister of Justice. The hon. gentleman has been on his feet in this house in the last few days apparently livid with indignation about smears, insinuations and suggestions, calling for charges to be made, and so on. I heard him on T.V. tonight. What a performance—moustaches bristling with outraged indignation as he described the terrible things we were doing, our base conduct, asking, in his words: "How can people stoop so low just for political purposes?" While he is bristling—

Mr. Favreau: What I said applied to the official opposition.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nugent: He went further in the course of that performance in that same tone of bristling indignation, the same as he got up in this house and screamed about how cowardly the opposition could get. Attacking the member for Yukon and the Leader of the Opposition, he said their only purpose was political effect. If there is any suggestion of hypocrisy, the Minister of Justice should not be so ready to jump to his feet and scream. I say to the members of this committee: If that is the standard of the mental and moral honesty of the Minister of Justice it is no wonder the affairs of the department have been so bungled. How are the people of this country to put any confidence in the administration of justice when a man of that mentality is responsible for it?

I think we should review a few of the events which have taken place in the last few months, events which have given the people of this country reason to wonder about the administration of justice in Canada. I am not sure all members have realized the significance of the lack of information forthcoming from the minister in the Banks case. I am sure that all of us who were familiar with Banks' record and the fact that he had been convicted and sentenced to five years were astonished when he was let out on bail. The Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Renfrew South would say, as soon as we expressed this astonishment, that we were maligning the judge. Nothing of the sort. The only way that judge could be brought in would be by the minister trying to hide behind his skirts as an excuse for not giving the explanations which the people of this country so urgently require. The Minister of Justice told us he had instructed counsel to oppose bail. But he did not tell us whether counsel had been told to make a last ditch stand and fight all the way. He did not tell us whether counsel was furnished with Banks' record, or what representations were made in the court. It is possible that the minister hired competent counsel and that counsel did take the proper steps. Even in those circumstances the judge might still have decided to release the prisoner on bail. But I suggest the people of this country would be much reassured had the minister bothered to tell them that all this had, in fact, been done. Instead, he did not.

After the initial concern about the circumstances in which Banks was able to leave this country it took us a long time to find out about the bail bond and the missing clause which permitted his escape. We have our suspicions why he was allowed bail. Proper representations were not made, and this is something which is the responsibility of the Minister of Justice. Then again, what happened to the reputation of the R.C.M.P.? For weeks, after Banks failed to return, we tried in this house to find out the circumstances. People were wondering whether the R.C.M.P., the force of which we are so proud, was slipping. It took many days before we were told about the fault in the bail bond. Mr. Chairman, the job of the Minister of Justice is to protect the reputation of our police force, not to hide behind it, not to let it suffer because he preferred not to answer questions.

In the present case, all the hon. member for Yukon asked, all the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam asked, was that the Minister of Justice should get up and make a frank explanation. The hon. gentleman did not do that in the Banks case, nor has he done it in this one. The information had to be dragged out little by little, and the attempt to extract it was met by accusations of slander. Members who were trying to find out the truth were told to get up and make charges. I suggest the hon. member for Yukon gave the minister sufficient hints and clues as to the information he had for the minister to have a choice as to the best way in which to handle the whole situation without embarrassing anyone. The minister was given an opportunity to regain the confidence of this house and revive the faith of the people of this country in the administration of justice.

I think the minister made the basest sort of attack on television tonight by impugning the motives of the hon. member for Yukon. All I can say is that if I had had that information I do not see how I could have sat back without making an effort to have the matter investigated. I do not see any better way of proceeding than the course followed by the hon. member for Yukon. Certainly, if there was anything morally wrong in the way in which the hon. member for Yukon handled this affair, I do not see it and I want to tell the committee that I stand behind him 100 per cent.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nugent: The Minister of Justice has a heavy onus in respect of the portfolio he now holds. I had always thought he had done a very fine job as minister of citizenship and immigration. I could never quite understand why he appeared to get into so much trouble in his present portfolio, and now I think he has revealed to his house and to the whole country the reason—he has not got the right mental attitude; his concept of his duty in that job is slightly off base. I will agree with the hon. member for Greenwood that there is nothing dishonest in the minister's actions; it is a plain case of honest stupidity, honest bungling, honest incompetence, and then very sneaky excuses when he starts to get into trouble.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nugent: I could not agree more with most of the comments made by my leader, by the leader of the New Democratic party and by the hon. member for Greenwood; but I did want to draw one distinction in the speech of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam on the extent of the inquiry. I do feel that it should be unnecessary in a democracy for any parliament to ask any judicial inquiry to inquire into the conduct of a minister or of ministers in the handling of any affair. If we have truly responsible government—and I submit it is the job of government supporters as well as opposition members to make it truly responsible—no cabinet minister can get away with that bungling incompetence; and certainly when he has been that incompetent he should not be able to get away with the arrogant attitude and secretive actions that he has taken with regard to this case when he has had it within his power. When the administration of justice is so important an element in the very belief in democracy in this country, it is incumbent on members of parliament to stretch every bit of their authority and take their political fate or their courage in their hands; but you must draw the line at this sort of behaviour by the government. It is, I maintain, the lifeblood, the mainstay of democracy; and this minister makes certain that so long as he is in that post, people in this country have their confidence shaken in the administration of justice and will find it very difficult to have much faith in our democracy. Stand not upon the order of your going, but go.

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I may be permitted to take a different tack in this debate. I think it is only fair that I warn the committee that I am not a lawyer, nor even a person endowed with a better than

average knowledge of the law of the Department of Justice. But as one who spends a good deal of the day in this house, as one who feels very deeply about his party and about parliament, I am more than a little concerned about the events of this week. Some of the opinions I may express may even cause murmurs from the ranks of the government, for I intend to speak out not in defence of my party, not in the defence of a minister but as an ordinary man of conscience.

Mr. Skoreyko: Who wrote your speech?

An hon. Member: Diefenbaker wrote it.

Mr. Mackasey: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I do believe that the role of the opposition in the House of Commons is to criticize a government; I do believe it is the role of the opposition to act as parliament's watchdog; I do believe the opposition is duty bound not only to suggest improvements in legislation but to ferret out by all the legal and honourable means at its disposal events which cannot stand close scrutiny and which are not necessarily in the best interests of this nation. I am the first to admit that the hon. member for Yukon and the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam are fulfilling their role as members of an opposition in bringing before this house their distressing suspicions.

Parliament is the highest court in the land. Its traditions, its procedures, the jurisprudence which it has developed through the years, are the cornerstone upon which democracy in Canada rests; and we the members of this house, regardless of political affiliations, are duty bound to this nation to see that these traditions, these procedures are never destroyed, never reduced to a mere ineffective shell incapable of rising to the challenge of fairness, of honesty and democracy. Listening to the debate this week I was left with the uncomfortable feeling that in preserving these traditions, we were at the same time sacrificing a still greater democratic right—the sacred premise that a man is innocent until proven guilty.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mackasey: Now, Mr. Chairman, I would ask hon. members of the opposition to believe in my sincerity, to hear me out, to grant me the courtesy of their attention, for I am not pleading the case of the government, I am not pleading the case of the Minister of Justice; I am pleading, in the only way I know how, for those persons who are unable to defend themselves in this House of Commons. I am pleading for those people who are unable to take advantage of the facilities of this house and are unable to answer the inevitable insinuations, the inadvertent presumptions that debate without proof must engender.

There are two obvious reasons why this matter is before us. The first, and I sincerely hope the real reason, the reason that has motivated the hon. member for Yukon and the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, is the desire to promote the best interests of parliament and justice. The second and less honourable method could be a desire to discredit the government and destroy the reputation of the minister or ministers. But, Mr. Chairman, regardless of the motives of these hon. gentlemen I am haunted by the fear that the reputations of Mr. Lord and Mr. Denis have been tarnished, perhaps permanently, by statements made in this house, statements without proof or evidence, evidence tabled for all members of this house to scrutinize.

All of us know of cases where guilt seemed overwhelming. Not many of us have to go too far back in this house to recall such a case not too long ago, a case in which the fact eventually proved the gentleman to be innocent. I know that no member of this House of Commons would want to be part of a society that would tolerate a kangaroo court. All of us know the difficulty of erasing in later years the stigma which remains.

The headlines of the press in this country have screamed out for four days the alleged guilt of Mr. Lord. Some newspapers in their haste have even forgotten to use the word "alleged". Thus in the hysteria of the day, the almost pathetic plea of innocence uttered by Mr. Lord in London which appeared in a one column story in the Ottawa *Citizen* last evening, has been overlooked. All of us should reflect for a moment. If for some reason yet unrevealed Mr. Lord is not guilty, as indeed he stated in London almost 3,000 miles away, what are we, the members of this House of Commons, going to do to restore this young man's broken reputation.

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order, if I may. The hon. member for Verdun is making a very eloquent speech in defence of those who he purports cannot defend themselves. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Dollard can be in the House of Commons this evening, if he wishes to be to defend himself.

Mr. Cashin: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Mackasey: Is he accused?

Mr. Skoreyko: He is. So far as I am concerned he has resigned from a very responsible position in this House of Commons. I say to you, Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Order. I cannot see what point of order the hon. member is raising here. Perhaps he might refer to the standing order and indicate what is the basis of his point of order.

Mr. Skoreyko: If you will hear me out, Mr. Chairman, I am sure you will agree with my argument. The hon. member for Verdun asked me whether the hon. member was charged or accused, and I said he has resigned from a responsible position in the House of Commons; and certainly there is more under the carpet than one might suspect. My point of order is related to this matter. The hon. member for Verdun has made a number of very brief speeches in this House of Commons, I will admit, but nevertheless he has made speeches in the House of Commons, and according to the rules he has no right to read a speech word for word written for him by somebody else.

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

The Chairman: I should tell the hon. member that he has no right to suggest that another member of this house is making a speech which that hon. member has not written himself. The hon. member knows, as do all hon. members, that it is quite customary for members on both sides, even in the course of this debate, at least to refer to notes, and a number of them have read their speeches. Perhaps the Chair has been too lenient but it has become the custom—

Mr. Lambert: Oh no.

The Chairman: —at least in the course of the current session to allow members to refer to their notes. I do not feel that the hon. member for Verdun is going beyond what has been done by other hon. members either in the course of this debate or in the session.

Mr. Skoreyko: With respect, I accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman, and I have only one point to make, and that is that obviously you have not been watching the hon. member for Verdun.

Mr. Lambert: It is a reprehensible practice.

Mr. Mackasey: I thank the hon. member for his courteous attention and kind co-operation. I regret he had not made note of the fact that at no time in my remarks have I sprung to the defence of the hon. member for Dollard, which was the point of order he raised.

[Mr. Mackasey.]

Mr. Skoreyko. Nonsense. He does not know what he is saying.

Mr. Mackasey: I say it is entirely up to the hon. member for Dollard to stand in this House of Commons at the first opportunity and defend his own reputation if he thinks it has been attacked, and I presume like all hon. members of this house he is fully capable of doing so. I am the devil's advocate in the case of Mr. Lord.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): He did not read that.

Mr. Mackasey: Without any reflection on the character of the hon. member for Yukon I say there is something very sick in this House of Commons when he is permitted, or I or any other hon. member of this house, to place on record allegations which can only end by tarnishing the reputations of Mr. Lord and Mr. Denis without either of these gentlemen having the opportunity of rebuttal in this house. Surely, Mr. Chairman, there are many competent lawyers in this house who must at times do a little soul searching when they see, not only on this occasion but on others, people proven guilty without the benefit of a fair trial.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not the only person who feels upset about this particular aspect of the House of Commons. I think the Ottawa *Citizen* is a very respected newspaper—

Mr. Orlikow: Very objective too.

Mr. Mackasey: —and it pleaded this matter in an editorial in its issue for November 25, which if I may I should like to read.

Mr. MacInnis: Would the hon. member permit one question before he quotes that report?

Mr. Mackasey: I am sorry; if there are any questions I shall answer them at the end of my speech, I promise. I hope I am not to interpret the murmurings from hon. members opposite as an indication that in any way they want to deprive me of the privilege of speaking on behalf of Mr. Lord. This particular editorial does not do anything to help the Minister of Justice and I do not refer to it for that purpose. It says:

> These are the facts in brief. Two questions arise:

I should point that out because I am only dealing with one; the other question is for the minister to defend.

> How far should the Minister of Justice go in deciding whether or not there is sufficient evidence in any particular case to warrant court action?

That is the minister's problem.

And how far—

This is our problem, or mine.

—should the private member of parliament go in using parliamentary privilege to reveal the names of persons suspected of an offence?

Mr. Douglas, leader of the New Democratic party, suggested that Mr. Favreau might place the case before a judge in a special inquiry, to see whether a case existed that could stand up in the courts. This might be a useful procedure in future, and will now be adopted in the present instance. If carried out privately, it would not damage the reputations of the persons involved. Since the names in the present instance have already been disclosed, the inquiry will be open—

As for the distance a private member of parliament should go in naming people suspected of wrong doing, the matter must be left to each member's conscience. If it turns out that the private member has made an error, has based his accusations on insufficient evidence, he will have committed a great wrong.

I can give an illustration, Mr. Chairman, of how we can use the rules of this House of Commons to slander and insinuate. I have not seen any rule which would prevent me from asking this type of question of Mr. Lamontagne. What if I were to ask on orders of the day or at some other time: What was the time lapse between the alleged bribe and the time it was reported by Mr. Lamontagne to his superior? And if by chance, Mr. Chairman, that answer be 20 days, would it not be unfair to Mr. Lamontagne for us to presume that possibly his indignation at this bribe was a little slow in prodding him into action? I could turn around and ask another question about Mr. Lamontagne. I could refer to the point that the hon. member for Yukon brought up yesterday, the proximity of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to the events, to Mr. Lamontagne and to Mr. Denis at the time of the alleged bribe, I presume, and, according to the member for Yukon, in the same office. I could ask whether Mr. Lamontagne—

Mr. Nielsen: If the hon. member will permit me to interject, I at no time suggested that the alleged bribe offer was made in the same office.

Mr. Mackasey: I will accept that. I am not one of those members who have an argument with the member for Yukon so far as the performance of his duty is concerned. I will agree that I assumed that; but let us assume it was in the next office. We are all familiar with the office set-ups. The hon. member nods his assent. Did Mr. Lamontagne take advantage of the proximity of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to run around the partition, which might take five minutes, and expose Mr. Denis for having made that bribe offer?

There are dozens of questions I could ask in a similar vein and each and every one of them by my own standards would be very unfair to Mr. Lamontagne, just as unfair, I submit, as the type of questions that has arisen in the house this week concerning the character and reputation of Mr. Lord. Finally, let me say as a naïve Irishman that I hope I echo the sentiments not only of the members of my party but of all members of the house when I say that when the facts are fully known and the judicial inquiry has brought down its report the Minister of Justice will emerge fully vindicated with his reputation for compassion, for integrity and for devotion to his country intact.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of aspects of the matter we have been discussing on which I should like to touch. I was intrigued by the speech of the Minister of Finance this afternoon. He tried to make out that people who were dealing with this matter were trying to foster disunity in the country and he went to the trouble of referring to misinterpretations in the press about an incident. He fastened particularly on a story by Stanley Westall carried in this morning's *Globe and Mail* and he could have referred to several others. I want to tell him and the other ministers, particularly the Secretary of State, that I am very surprised that throughout the day no one has come to the support of the man who is getting the worst of all deals from the interpretations that are being made. It seems to me that the man who has been the subject of the really critical interpretations, the man whom no minister has stood up to defend, not even the Minister of Finance who obviously felt he was defending the integrity of the Minister of Justice, is the man who holds the highest office which in my opinion is within the gift of the Department of External Affairs. I refer to the Canadian high commissioner in Great Britain.

The Minister of Finance specifically referred to the article by Stanley Westall entitled "The Root of Pearson's Problem" which is accompanied by a picture of Mr. Chevrier with these words underneath it: "The old guard's influence has faded but its backlash is still being felt".

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Fisher: Hon. members can laugh but I want to make a point. I am not saying this.

This is in the newspaper. This is their interpretation and it is only one. I want to refer to another article and I think my hon. friends will recognize that this particular writer has never been identified with the official opposition. As a matter of fact, he was put forward in the house a year or two years ago as a rather heroic newspaperman and book writer. I am referring to the author of that famous book, "Renegade in Power", Mr. Peter Newman. I am sure hon. members on the government side must have read the article in yesterday's Toronto *Star* entitled: "P.M. Stabbed in Back from Quebec He Tried to Reconcile".

The article is a very thorough description and analysis of the whole play within the Liberal party. It names a great many people and weighs the balance. It talks about the old guard and the new guard. Furthermore, on page 7 of the same Toronto *Star* Mr. Newman has a very intimate story about the executive assistants of the various ministers, including a little anecdote that reflects, if you want to read it straight, on the Mr. Raymond Denis about whom we are talking.

Why would I bring in this particular argument? The hon. member for Verdun read an editorial from the Ottawa *Citizen* that gave one interpretation. Here is an interpretation that the Prime Minister has been stabbed in the back from the Quebec he tried to reconcile. We have all this talk about the old guard and the new guard. We have a reference here to the fact that the Minister of Justice gained a seat when the seat was given up by a member who shortly after was appointed to a judgeship in Quebec and has since had a somewhat unfortunate experience.

Throughout we get all this building up, of the idea of the old guard and the new guard. I want to ask some of the ministers—I would ask the Minister of Finance if he were here—what is the origin of this talk about the old guard and the new guard? Where does all this material come from about the new politics?

Mr. Cashin: Gossip.

Mr. Fisher: That fierce, bad rabbit over there is talking. The hon. member feels it is just gossip. It may be. I simply want to suggest to him that this gossip had a source. I want to say that he knows where the source is and I think he will realize Mr. Newman did not get it from the official opposition or from our party. The hon. gentleman should realize from where this material comes. He is getting it from a source within the Liberal party.

An hon. Member: This is the new politics.

Mr. Fisher: This is the new politics. In other words, in the display by the Minister of Finance this afternoon, with that genteel distinction with which he put forward his case, we are having a demonstration of the kind of politics that are being played here. This is a reflection of something that is going on within the Liberal party. I suggest that the hon. gentleman should realize that the kind of information Mr. Newman is putting forward, this analysis of the old guard and the new guard, demonstrates the fact there are some enlightened, informed, radical elements in the Quebec membership but there are others who are back in the old days of Chevrier and Azellus Denis, and this information comes from a particular source.

The Chairman: Order, please. The remarks which are being made by the hon. member for Port Arthur are, of course, extremely interesting, but I am wondering to what extent they come within the ambit of the resolution now before the committee, that is, item 1 of the estimates of the Department of Justice. I realize that these remarks are introductory in nature but time is running by quickly.

Mr. Fisher: I am not going to take much more time. I just wanted to draw attention to the fact that here we have had the government today put forward the Minister of Finance to stand up and say—I suppose it shows a certain kind of integrity—that the Ontario members stand with the Quebec members.

They are all loyal together. It is reminiscent of the Minister of Trade and Commerce who, on television one night, put forward as proof that the Prime Minister was still in control of the party the fact that his caucus was still loyal to him.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fisher: It is very much, Mr. Chairman, the same kind of argument that the Minister of Finance gave us today; that everything was fine; that the Minister of Justice was in an unimpeachable position because they all stood with him. I want to suggest that there is a strong indication here of what is brewing within the internal caucus of that party when they are prepared to sacrifice the former minister of justice, who is now high commissioner to England. If they want to get up here and talk about all this nobility and have

people like the hon. member for Verdun call us to some high concept that should be basic to this organization; that we should have accepted some kind of defence from the Minister of Finance; if this "hate the old guard", which is being interpreted in the newspapers and in the very article to which the Minister of Finance referred as being at the root of all of this trouble—

Mr. Cashin: We do not pay as much attention to these articles as you do.

Mr. Fisher: We hear from the little rabbit, who says they do not pay as much attention to these articles. The Minister of Finance read from one of these articles. Surely, he must have noticed Mr. Chevrier's picture was there and there was this interpretation.

I just wanted to bring this to the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite because they have obviously decided, after shuddering for two or three days, that they had to make some kind of a defence. It came forward this afternoon, first of all with McCarthyism and extremism over here, and second, the preachers of national disunity. I want to say that the Liberal party has always, in a sense, been the object of envy about the way in which they could come forward with so much membership in this House of Commons from the province of Quebec. It has always been a problem. There have been analyses of this by professors of history and political scientists that go right back to Riel and the conscription crisis, to get an explanation of how the Liberal party can have this sort of power in Quebec, and so be the power of national unity.

I should like to suggest that perhaps the people of Canada at this time have a new inkling as to the reason the Liberal party has this strong basis in Quebec. I think they have got a real inkling as to where the basis of the Liberal party is. There is no question about it, the Liberal party seems to have an understanding of how to deal with things in the province of Quebec. I give you the situation where you have a minister of justice sitting in this house representing a constituency from which another hon. member of the Liberal party retired, and under what circumstances, and what followed. I give you this as an example of these people. The details that we have heard very recently, as these fellows come forward with their details which I am convinced they are getting from sources in the Liberal party, is the explanation of the Liberal power in Quebec, and it is becoming very, very clear. I hope that the country in general will realize the significance of this, whether it is the old guard or the new guard fighting, they have certainly got their basis and we certainly see the evidences of how it operates and how it works.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I wish to say, at the beginning of my brief remarks, that this will not be the merriest or the most cheerful speech I have ever made in this noble assembly which, particularly these last few days, has unfortunately witnessed a turmoil beyond description and, too often, bordering on indecency.

I have pointed out before, in the strongest possible terms, that the rules of the house were outmoded and I urged a complete redrafting of the rules as soon as possible, and I still say so. But, in the meantime, I wish we had at least more respect for our present system, especially when we are having such bitter, improper and highly undesirable debates, such as the present one, which are frowned upon by the people of Canada and which, I would say, are a disgrace to honest members sitting in this house.

Mr. Chairman, you will readily understand that I, as a French Canadian, and I am proud of it, with all due deference to the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher), and also as a conscientious representative of the Montmagny-L'Islet riding, could not help but protest strongly against what I would call "operation smear" which apparently is giving extreme pleasure at this time to some members of the so-called loyal opposition of Her Majesty.

Under cover of parliamentary immunity, some hon. members undertook a wild and hot-headed smearing campaign against ministers, personalities, officials, especially those of French Canadian descent. Always malicious insinuations voiced in a soft-spoken tone and with the air of shocked virgins—

Mr. Balcer: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege.

My hon. friend is making insinuations against the members of the opposition.

In his opinion, they denounced the conduct of the present government because they wanted to launch an anti-French Canadian campaign, etc.

Some hon. Members: That is true.

Mr. Balcer: I wish to protest most vigorously against such insinuations, and as a French Canadian, I hope that this scandal

will be cleared up so we, French Canadians, can walk proudly in this house. I wish to say that this is an unfortunate affair, and I deeply regret that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau), for whom I entertained great respect, acted as a schoolboy and showed infantilism.

In my opinion, it is quite improper for a Quebec member to make a racial issue out of the situation to save his party which lies in a vale of tears following this scandal.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Chairman, I have a great respect for the hon. member for Three Rivers and I am sure he must not feel that my remarks were meant for him.

Coming back to my subject, I should like to point out that the Minister of Justice, who is fundamentally honest according to me and many others, has quite frankly and properly asked the fiery member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) to lay formal and definite charges, under the circumstances, and even to put his seat on the line with respect to accusations like the one he made against the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Tremblay).

But no, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member chose to remain behind the barricade of parliamentary immunity to continue his indirect attacks. I see his point; you get less involved that way and you stay under cover.

Are we really seeking justice, Mr. Chairman? Or are we not after that big publicity we can get from those parliamentary correspondents who are listening to us now, when they inform the public tomorrow?

I remain convinced, however, that all those honest news reporters and newscasters are quite able to analyse the situation and will succeed in informing the people about the truth which will come out of this painful debate.

Far be it from me to question the sincerity of the hon. member for Yukon in this matter, but I wonder if he knows what happened to the M.L.A. for Three Rivers, Mr. Gabias. Obviously quite sincere and well-intentioned, he accused a minister of embezzlement and today he finds himself out of the Quebec legislative assembly for three years. Remember that he, at least, had levied specific charges against the minister concerned; he had shown courage, if not foolhardiness.

I would ask that the same thing be done here. How is it that in this case when the member concerned is asked to levy specific charges, he slinks away in a maze of sly insinuations? When he is asked to repeat his allegations outside the house, that is without the parliamentary immunity and with the risk of being prosecuted for libel, he is alarmingly quiet. When he is asked to put his seat on the line, if his charges are proved false, he becomes surprisingly deaf.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, that leaves me puzzled and leads me to conclusions which, for the sake of parliamentary ethics and decency, I will keep to myself.

[*Text*]

You may have noticed, Mr. Chairman, the right hon. gentleman opposite is very fond of speculation. He himself admitted so this afternoon. I very respectfully suggest that he should stop speculating on the future of our country—

Mr. Nielsen: May I ask—

Mr. Berger: —and work more heartfully, sincerely and truthfully toward the real unity of all Canadians in these hours of great need.

Mr. Nielsen: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Berger: I will answer when I have finished, be sure of that. The right hon. gentleman this afternoon quoted the Montreal *Star*. May I in turn quote the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* which is not usually recognized for its fondness of Liberals. Referring to "Opposition charges of government complicity in the escape of Harold C. Banks" the *Star-Phoenix* stated:

> Not only have members of the opposition created an undocumented fiction in this accusation; they have also been able, under the rules of parliamentary immunity, to give this fiction the widest possible publicity.
>
> The immunity of parliamentarians from suits for damage is a necessary democratic safeguard; but its use, in instances of this kind, is being pushed too far.
>
> Members of parliament must be protected in their right, even their duty to speak forthrightly and fearlessly about the behaviour and policies of their colleagues. But when they use this right merely to smear an opponent and thus to destroy him in public life, they are grossly misusing their high privilege.
>
> It is not too much to demand that legislators and parliamentarians use their immunity as a democratic tool rather than a political weapon. It is not too much to expect them to conduct themselves as decently in the House of Commons as they must conduct themselves in open society.

I think this article was worth reading.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, you can draw your own conclusions.

In closing, I should like to suggest very humbly to the Leader of the Opposition to abide a little more by the Canadian Bill of

Rights so dear to him, which bears his own signature and which I was reading over in my office this afternoon; he should set a better example for his supporters.

To come back to the estimates of the Department of Justice, we are called upon to pass, I think it is amazing that nobody pointed out, during this debate, the active commendable and sensible part played by the Minister of Justice in the projects concerning a reformation of our penitentiaries, anticipated amendments to the parole system, a revision of the Combines Investigation Act and especially, what struck me personally as one of his best achievements, the importance of his personal participation in the agreement concluded between the federal and the provincial governments, which will soon lead us to what is called the repatriation of the constitution, to the great disappointment of the Leader of the Opposition.

They rather decided to stick to low class discussion which the Canadian people from coast to coast condemn as being incompatible with the almost sacred character that should be reserved to the parliament of the nation.

Consequently, I hope that this fratricidal struggle will be brought to an end, because it could unfortunately degenerate into a national genocide for us in Quebec, leaving it to Hon. Justice Frédéric Dorion to hold an impartial inquiry into this unfortunate and explosive situation which has been for much too long, I would say, the only concern of the house to the detriment of the legislation which is more urgent, more appropriate and more in keeping with in the interests of all Canadians.

Mr. Chairman, I have only one wish to make before resuming my seat; it is that we come back to national unity, which must be preserved at any cost, if we want sound justice for all Canadians without exceptions. Let the unbounded ambition of some yield to moderation. Let the thirst for publicity be quenched by more evident sincerity in parliamentary work. Let the petty politicians try and become politicians worthy of that name and the Canadian parliament will remove the blot on its escutcheon due to the happenings of these troubled days.

[*Text*]

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat said he would permit a question at the conclusion of his remarks. I wonder if he would tell the members of the committee whether he feels that the eminent young counsel from Montreal, Mr. Pierre Lamontagne, would subject himself so lightly to the possibility of libel or slander charges in view of the statements he has given in which he has called the charges I made in the house on November 23 substantially exact?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Berger: To answer briefly, since a judiciary commission is going to investigate the matter, I shall say that, personally, I will not impute any motives, as was done by members opposite, to persons who may be quite honourable, though I found strange the long silence before the said statement was made.

This is my answer to the hon. member.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of participating in this debate, tonight, but following the fiery remarks which the hon. member for Montmagny-L'Islet (Mr. Berger) has just made, I cannot help but rise and speak also, as a French Canadian, after the hon. member for Three Rivers.

Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago a member from the province of Quebec was ready to place a saintly halo on his own head. But the halo will not fit his head.

The hon. member for Montmagny-L'Islet requested a full inquiry. That is all we want.

We want this whole matter cleared up.

I regret that, as a French Canadian, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) has shown such incompetence in the performance of his important duties, but the fact that one of my fellow French Canadians shows such incompetence does not mean that I do not want the truth to come out in the open.

If there is nothing to hide, why do the hon. members opposite try so hard to hide the facts? Why have we only learned a few things in the house, and piecemeal at that? How did we come to hear about it? Because of the statements made to the house by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen).

A few moments ago, reference was made to a smearing campaign. Has there ever been a more smearing campaign than the one carried on in the province of Quebec by friends of those who are now sitting on the other side of the house? Since 1960, friends of hon. members opposite sullied the reputation of the whole population of the province of Quebec. Today, we are hearing those so-called saints shedding crocodile tears.

If you want the truth to come out, you can do it by producing the report referred to by the hon. member for Yukon. Open it for the people to see, so that they may know who is telling the truth and who is hiding the facts.

Those who are hiding the truth are sitting before us; they are the ones who, for political reasons, try to hide their turpitude.

They hope that by endeavouring to smear other persons as much as possible, people will forget their own scurvy tricks, misdeeds, treachery and lack of sincerity.

We want a full inquiry. That is what we want and what we always asked for. Give us a full inquiry. We do not want to condemn anybody in advance. We want everybody to be able to judge.

Accusations and allegations have been made. If there is no basis in those accusations or allegations, then let the situation be cleared up as soon as possible. Some people feel pity and talk of national unity. They say national unity is at stake.

Mr. Chairman, you have heard those people when it came to throwing mud at Mr. Courtemanche. They went at great length on the other side of the house in respect to this matter, to try and make it rough for Hon. Pierre Sévigny, to try and accuse Hon. Mr. Dorion about a letter drafted and signed by his secretary. Hon. Mr. Chevrier is no longer on the other side to put things straight.

That is the gist of the story. Hon. Mr. Chevrier is no longer there to straighten out your small deficiencies. He is gone. Why is he gone?

An hon. Member: Tell us the story.

Mr. Ricard: That is all you can do. You do everything and you do nothing; all you can do is make insinuations.

Let justice prevail. What we want is justice, nothing else. Stop using national unity as a smokescreen; through your doings it has nearly disappeared. If there is now misunderstanding between the groups which make up this nation, it is you who are responsible, because of the irresponsible promises you made, although you knew very well you would be unable to keep them, but you made them nevertheless during the election campaign merely to get votes. Are there other ways to tell that you are hypocrites? I cannot find any other.

Mr. Chairman, those are the few remarks I wanted to make to the hon. members who sit on the other side of the house and who worked for years to destroy national unity. To those who rise here to try and jump on the bandwagon of national unity, I say that their heads are too small to bear the halo of the saints.

[Mr. Ricard.]

[*Text*]

Mr. Otto: In as calm and quiet a voice as I can muster I should like to answer the hon. member for Greenwood. As a matter of fact, I originally stood up to ask him a question. It seemed to me, as he explained it, that his party intended to vote in favour of the amendment because the terms of reference were not wide enough to permit a judicial inquiry to determine whether or not the minister acted reasonably on the basis of the evidence before him.

If hon. members would consider carefully the implications of this suggestion they would see that this is an attempt to have a commission examine whether or not a minister of the crown acted correctly, or properly, or reasonably. This I suggest would be a complete denial of the procedures of our parliamentary system, a complete departure from our practice as I think both the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam will admit. If we were to allow such an examination to take place, why could the hon. member for Kootenay West, for example, not ask for judicial inquiry into whether or not the Secretary of State for External Affairs had acted properly in concluding the Columbia river treaty?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would the hon. gentleman be surprised if he were told that his friends on the front bench are even now working on something which would bring them together?

Mr. Otto: As I have said before, there is a much greater gap between the front benches and the back benches than there is between the front benches of government and the front bench of the opposition.

But to get back to the point I was making. If the reasoning of the hon. member for Greenwood is correct, ministerial decisions would no longer have to come before the House of Commons; they could simply be reviewed by a judicial inquiry. The fact is, and we all know it, that the minister is responsible to one body alone, that is, this House of Commons, which is itself in turn responsible to the people. If the house feels that the decision reached by the minister was not a correct one, remedies are available. After all, members opposite have given us our lumps. I hope, now we have had all our lumps, we can get down to the business of the house. If the members of the New Democratic party vote in favour of the amendment on the ground to which I have

just referred, I am sure the hon. member for Greenwood would be the first to admit it would not be a proper ground. I myself can see no reason why the members of that party should vote with the opposition.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chapdelaine: Mr. Chairman, after hearing the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher) vent his spleen upon us, after the fits of hysteria of the hon. members for Montmagny-L'Islet (Mr. Berger) and St. Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard), I simply wish to state the position we will assume when the estimates of the Department of Justice are voted upon.

Like other members, we somewhat hesitate to give our entire approval to the order in council as it stands, particularly in view of the insinuations which were levelled this afternoon and tonight concerning the integrity of the members from the province of Quebec. The hon. member for Port Arthur gave the most vivid description before this house of the opinion entertained by the rest of the country toward the actions of the members from the province of Quebec and, in general, respecting the reputation which the latter enjoy in this house.

I just want to say that if we were to accept, in its present form, the order in council before us, it would seem that we want to allay the suspicion which hangs over the French Canadian members. I do not want to take such a stand. Therefore we ask the government to change somewhat the terms of the order in council, so that a full inquiry may be conducted in order to throw light upon the matter before us and to clear completely the character of our colleagues.

I have no hesitation to recognize the honesty and the integrity of the Minister of Justice. All we can hold against him, in the circumstances, is that he was reluctant to act on a matter which, in his opinion, could become known publicly. If he hesitated, I am inclined to believe that it was due to the fact that he did not have all the required information to launch proceedings.

On the other hand, in view of the insinuations which have been made with regard to the integrity of the members for the province of Quebec, I feel the present government should accept part of the amendment proposed or suggested by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) to extend the inquiry in order to ascertain to what extent the minister failed to fulfil his duties.

As members, we all recognize readily the honesty, integrity and competence of the Minister of Justice and, though he may have shown weakness in this instance, we will vote in favour of the passage of his estimates, inasmuch as the terms of reference of the commission will be extended to encompass all actions taken within the Department of Justice in connection with the matter.

I do not think we should hesitate to increase the powers of the judge who will be responsible for the investigation. This proposal should be accepted, if only to remove any doubt about the integrity and honesty of the members from the province of Quebec, who sit in this house.

[*Text*]

Mr. Basford: Mr. Chairman, the right hon. Leader of the Opposition paid me the honour of bringing my name into the debate this afternoon when he said that "the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard was quoted as saying he was one of the recipients;" he was speaking, of course, of money from the seamen's international union. I only want to reconfirm the statement that I made in Vancouver and put the facts on the record. I reconfirm the statement I made on November 10, that I have received no financial assistance or aid from the seamen's international union, and having checked the matter very carefully with my official agent and campaign manager in both the 1962 and 1963 campaigns, I am assured by them that there has not been paid toward either of my campaigns any financial assistance whatsoever from the S.I.U. However—

An hon. Member: What about campaign workers?

Mr. Basford: I am coming to that. I want to put the facts on the record. However, at that same time in Vancouver I readily admitted that some members of the S.I.U. in Vancouver worked on my campaign; and this is something I have never tried to conceal. Most notable of those people is a Mr. Walter Sawadsky, who in 1962 was a member of my poll captains organization and in 1963 was my campaign manager. Mr. Sawadsky was an immigrant to Canada in 1948 and was a minor official of the S.I.U. on the west coast up until February of 1962, when he resigned from that position. He has over the last few years been attending special night school courses, has completed his senior matriculation and is now a third year political science student at the University of British Columbia. From everything that I know of Mr. Sawadsky he is an example of those immigrants to

Canada who by their hard work and perseverence are making a place for themselves and their families in their adopted land.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Basford: Also, from everything that I know of him, I am proud to have had him associated with my campaign, and I think all hon. members of this house, either on this or the other side, if they knew him would be equally proud to have him associated with them. He has maintained his membership in the S.I.U. for the purposes of obtaining summer employment while a university student, and last summer worked as a deckhand on one of the coastal freighters on the west coast. Being in my campaign organization, he naturally, I think—I certainly regarded it as quite natural—was responsible for having some of his union friends work in my organization. I had some 800 campaign workers in 1963, many of whom were union members. I was not sure at the time how many were members of the S.I.U., but I have since determined that in the 1963 campaign in Vancouver-Burrard there were five members of the S.I.U. who worked on my campaign, plus the wives of two of those members. They worked at the various jobs that are involved in anyone's campaign, namely putting up posters, addressing envelopes, etc. I do not see anything particularly sinister in the wife of an S.I.U. member pouring tea and serving cookies to the ladies up and down the street on behalf of a Liberal candidate. I suggest that this is probably less sinister and more wholesome than the right hon. gentleman opposite appointing his chief fund raiser in British Columbia to the board of the Bank of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Basford: In so far as I was concerned, these people were working for me in the Liberal party in British Columbia as individuals; as part of a whole army of Canadians, from bank presidents to deckhands, who wanted to work for Liberal candidates and say to the right hon. gentleman and his government, "Go; for heaven's sake go. We have had enough of you".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That was certainly the attitude of the S.I.U. toward us.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Chairman, I am very honoured at the response I seem to be getting from the right hon. gentleman opposite. He must feel that his political position is extremely weak, when he has to pay such attention to a mere backbencher.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Basford: As I say, Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned these people worked for me as individuals. If they thought that their efforts created on my part, or on the part of the Liberal party, any obligation to Hal Banks or the S.I.U., they are mistaken and I have not been put under any obligation by these efforts, nor has the government been put under any obligation, to act in any way other than according to our conscience in the best interests of this nation. I am sure that hon. gentlemen opposite are going to be disappointed to realize that none of these people ever suggested to me that I was under any obligation to Hal Banks or to their union.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Basford: Nor did they say that they were in any way agents of Hal Banks. In fact, I am sure it would surprise hon. members that I do not recall any discussion with any of them about Hal Banks. I do recall a number of discussions on the re-establishment of the Canadian merchant service, which seems to me a very natural subject for Canadian seamen to be concerned about.

The right hon. gentleman opposite also made a statement this afternoon to the effect that help from members of the S.I.U. was help of value, no matter whether in cash or nuts. I find this is a very surprising statement to come from a gentleman who has gone from one coast of this nation to another bragging about his bill of rights, claiming he is the great defender of civil liberties and human rights. I find it very surprising that here this afternoon he can in one fell swoop condemn every member of this union as a political leper.

We in British Columbia have many workers. Among these are the seamen, who are an essential part of our economy. Their leader, Hal Banks, through the actions of this government, has been deposed from office and is a fugitive from justice. We have in British Columbia truck drivers and transport drivers whose leader, by the action of the United States government, is in trouble with the law. We have fishermen in British Columbia whose leader, Homer Stevens, is an avowed and admitted communist. We have miners whose union chief has from time to time been accused of communist leadership. We have outside workers in the city of Vancouver—

Mr. Herridge: McCarthyism.

Mr. Basford: If the hon. member for Kootenay West will keep himself in control I think that at the end of my remarks he will agree with my point, because I do recognize the hon. member for Kootenay West as a man of justice.

We have in the city of Vancouver outside workers who work for the city, the school board and the parks board, with whom I worked as a university student for five summers in a row and whose leader, Jack Phillips, is again an avowed and admitted communist. Are we, Mr. Chairman, going to deny the seamen, truck drivers, fishermen, miners and street workers what I think is certainly the undeniable right of every Canadian worker, and that is to support and to work for the party and candidate of their choice?

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this House of Commons, in the mood of political hysteria it seems to be in at the moment, is not going to follow the hon. member for Yukon and the hon. member for Bow River and the right hon. gentleman opposite in some sort of McCarthy-like witch hunt to deny to ordinary Canadian workers their undeniable civil right to support the party of their choice.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Chairman, the last speaker says the house is in a mood of hysteria, yet the Minister of National Health and Welfare described this as a tempest in a teapot. Perhaps they might both get together on their terminology. But no matter whether it is a tempest in a teapot or a state of hysteria, the country has obviously lost confidence in the administration of justice. This week we have been treated to an example of negligence in high places, I think unexcelled in recent Canadian history, largely brought about because of a conspiracy of silence from the Minister of Justice. The risks this hon. gentleman was prepared to take in September would make the most daring and avid speculator catch his breath. He has hazarded himself and his career. He hazarded, of course, his Prime Minister by withholding vital information from him. He hazarded his party and his government; and he hazarded something he had no right to do—the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the integrity of the whole Department of Justice.

This minister was one who was known as being a devoted public servant before he entered political life, but he has turned his back on the very department and officials with whom he once served and with whom, I would have thought, he would have shared a common loyalty and a common trust. By his failure to share this burden with others he surely has compounded the problem and compounded that which faces all of us when we try to make a judgment about this affair. As a matter of fact I think his omission to tell the Prime Minister is one of the most incredible omissions imaginable and really stretches the bounds of our belief to the very limit.

The Minister of Justice, the Prime Minister and the government, who now scramble behind a narrowly drafted order in council, must share responsibility for any danger done to the reputations of others. The minister must have realized the contents of the R.C.M.P. file could not have been kept from public scrutiny. The minister had many avenues open to him which would have provided a thorough investigation of the charges, but he chose to cover up, thus vastly compounding the hurt to those allegedly involved.

I think we are entitled to some explanations. What explanation could the minister give, for instance, for the failure to inform his Prime Minister of this police report? What excuse could the minister possibly provide us with for his neglect in asking that the contents of the file be examined by independent minds? What reason lies behind the minister's refusal to permit the commission to examine the procedure or the obvious lack of procedure followed by the department in pursuing this squalid affair? What other telephone calls were made to other people during this interesting year? What excuse is forthcoming for any executive assistant, or parliamentary secretary for that matter, communicating with a lawyer engaged in a court appearance? What excuse can the Prime Minister of Canada have for preferring the clear reaches of the west to the place where his duty lies, namely this House of Commons? What is more important this week but for the Prime Minister and the government to take every necessary step to restore the shattered confidence of the people of Canada in the government, and the manner in which they conduct the public business? What is the explanation for the Prime Minister's utter lack of control of members of his cabinet? What is the explanation for the lack of frankness and loyalty of the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration?

An hon. Member: Read on.

Mr. Fairweather: That does not disturb me. This is a tempest in a teapot and I am hysterical, but I will leave it to the editorial writers, the news commentators and others

in Canada to ponder, having been shattered by a squalid week of abdication of responsibility. Speaking of reading, we might have had a couple of readings from the minister responsible or his parliamentary secretary. We have not really had a full explanation from them, and I hope that some of these questions will provide them with areas and avenues to be pursued here tomorrow.

The judicial inquiry in its present terms will do nothing to allay our proper and genuine suspicion. All it will do is to say whether or not there is enough evidence to permit the proceedings to be instituted. I suggest that this is no longer the point. The point is that the minister in an obviously delicate area demonstrated impropriety and negligence in his handling of the affair. Until the minister permits the scrutiny of the commission to go right to the foundations of his department, I think that the public has real cause for concern.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, it is ten o'clock.

Progress reported.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—SHIPS LAID UP THROUGH LACK OF TECHNICAL PERSONNEL

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to use my full seven minutes on this subject. I asked the Minister of National Defence a supplementary question, following upon a series of questions, concerning the matter of housing for armed forces personnel in the Halifax area and elsewhere where our forces are stationed. The minister had said that one of the problems in keeping trained personnel in the navy with the necessary skills to man all of our ships was that there was a certain amount of dissatisfaction with the housing that has been provided for naval personnel.

[Mr. Fairweather.]

My question was whether the minister would take immediate steps to initiate a program of housing for naval and other military personnel under which such housing would be intermingled with civilian housing wherever military personnel are stationed. If this were done the result would be that when military personnel came home from work at the end of the day they would come in contact with civilians with other interests living on each side of them. In this way I felt that military personnel would be more a part of the community and would be happier if they were living a normal type of life. A person who happens to be in one line of work does not want to live in close proximity with people who are all doing the same type of work. You will have a far better opportunity to enjoy an ordinary healthy type of community life if you have a bank clerk living on one side of you and a dentist living on the other side, and so on and so forth. It is the variety of interests of your neighbours that makes community life worth while.

I want to compliment the minister and the associate minister on the many changes they have made since this administration came into office. Never before has the Department of National Defence had such expert direction as it has had during that period of time. I suggest that the department should continue its worthwhile improvements in order to provide for our greater security and that the lot of the men and women of the armed forces can be improved by following the policy suggested in my question.

The department should establish such a policy with regard to housing even if the acquiring of land under such a plan may occasionally result in greater cost. Even if it costs a little more, let us remember that the men and women in the armed forces provide security for our country and it is worthwhile to see to it they are well treated. We have to overcome the problem of too many of these skilled people who have been trained at the taxpayers' expense wanting to leave the services prematurely. I hope the minister will look deeply into this matter and will be able to do something about it in the near future.

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation has undertaken a study of the housing needs in the city of Halifax. This has been initiated in consultation with the flag officer for the Atlantic coast. It is

their intention to inquire fully into the availability of accommodation in that area, and also as to what steps, if any, are required to improve the availability of housing for naval personnel. I can assure my hon. friend that we are concerned about this problem. It is one which has existed for some time, and when the study of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation is complete we will review it in the light of the suggestions he has put forward tonight.

I know that the overriding interest of all of us is the best accommodation, the most pleasant surroundings and the best possible integration into the community that we can provide for the men and women of the armed forces who serve us so well. I can assure hon. members of the house that every effort will be made in order to accomplish this end.

It being ten minutes after ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

20220—670

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, November 27, 1964

The house met at 11 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PERMISSION TO PHOTOGRAPH HOUSE WHILE IN SESSION

Mr. Speaker: If I may have the attention of the house for a moment I would like to make a request that, by tradition, requires unanimous consent.

At the present time Canadian teachers are badly in need of lively and authentic material to teach the subject "Government in Canada." To help meet this need the national film board is now producing a series of film strips designed for use in Canadian schools. It is hoped to include in this film strip series still colour photographs taken while the house is actually sitting.

I am informed that to obtain these photographs it would be necessary to have one photographer on the floor of the house itself and two photographers in the gallery. I have been assured that they would go about their work as quickly and unobtrusively as possible and that no special lighting or elaborate equipment would be needed. The national film board have undertaken to clear all photographs with the Speaker before they are released for use in the film strips.

I may say that the right hon. Prime Minister, the right hon. Leader of the Opposition, and the leaders of the other parties have been good enough to give me the assurance of their agreement with this request.

The photographing in question is scheduled to take place next Wednesday, December 2, and I would hope that there would be as full an attendance in the house as possible.

Do I have the unanimous consent of the house to permit the national film board to undertake this photography?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): No. I do not think photographers should be allowed on the floor of the house. I think it is quite permissible that they be allowed to take pictures from the galleries, but it would be setting a most unfortunate precedent if they were allowed to take photographs on the floor of the house while the house was in session.

Mr. Knowles: Does the minister disagree with the Prime Minister?

Mr. Speaker: Do I or do I not have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Hellyer: You do not.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I thought the Prime Minister agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Does the house give consent to pictures being taken from the gallery for the precise purpose of film strips to be used in an educational program in the school system of Canada?

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): It is difficult to ask you a question, Mr. Speaker, but you mentioned that the Prime Minister had given his consent. If he gave his consent to photographers coming on the floor, as I did and as the other leaders did, I am sure the Minister of National Defence, in his own defence, would be willing to withdraw his objection.

Mr. Hellyer: No, I am not. This is a subject which concerns members of parliament as individuals, and as an individual member of parliament I do not give my consent to having photographers on the floor of the house when the house is in session.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Another split in the cabinet.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

AMENDMENT OF TERMS OF REFERENCE TO INQUIRY COMMISSION

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): As has been stated in the course of the discussion on the estimates of the Minister of Justice, the government is most anxious to have an inquiry which would be comprehensive. We have been giving consideration to suggestions which have been made on this side and on all sides of the house.

Our view was that the original terms of reference were sufficiently broad and comprehensive to take into account everything which could reasonably be considered relevant to the allegations which have been made. However, it is apparent there are some concerns on the part of some members. It is the desire of the government that the inquiry

should not only be comprehensive but that reasonable and serious concerns that it has all the necessary powers to be so, should be satisfied.

In an endeavour to meet these points while at the same time avoiding certain of the problems which were mentioned in my letter of yesterday to the hon. member for Greenwood, the government has decided on amendments to order in council P.C. 1964/1819 of November 25, 1964. These are set out in an amending order which was passed this morning, copies of which I now table and copies of which, in English and French, I send to the leaders of parties opposite.

An hon. Member: And read into the record.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): And which I will read. I think with these changes there can remain no reasonable doubt whatever that the inquiry will be comprehensive.

It will be recalled, with regard to one of the amendments to the order, that the Minister of Justice himself rose last night and said that in relation to the correctness of the position he had taken in the matter he would see to it that the commissioner examined that feature. This voluntary statement made by the minister is now incorporated in the language used to provide authority to the commissioner to deal with this very point. I will read the whole of the order in council:

> The committee of the privy council on the recommendation of the Prime Minister advise that order in council P.C. 1964-1819 of 25th November, 1964, be amended by deleting, in the first paragraph thereof, all words commencing with the words "to inquire fully", and substituting therefor the following:
>
> "to inquire fully into allegations about any improper inducements having been offered to or improper pressures having been brought to bear on counsel acting upon an application for the extradition of one Lucien Rivard and all the relevant circumstances connected therewith, including the manner in which the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and any officer thereof and the Department of Justice and the Minister of Justice dealt with the allegations when they were brought to their attention, and in particular but without limiting the generality of the foregoing to consider fully the reports submitted to the Minister of Justice by the R.C.M.P. and the evidence laid before him in connection therewith and any further evidence elicited by or laid before the commissioner, and, if he considers that there is prima facie evidence of an offence in relation to the activities as an employee of the government or an officer of a department of any person involved in the allegations, to consider such other matters as may appear to the commissioner to be relevant, and to report fully thereon".
>
> R. G. Robertson,
> Clerk of the Privy Council.

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

These amendments have been referred to and discussed with the commissioner.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Acting Prime Minister, I can only say that this has been a strange story of denial and then retreat. To begin with, the government said it would set up an inquiry that would sit in camera, and had to back down in that regard. Then for a couple of days it was argued by the government, and it was their contention, that the terms of reference in the order in council, hastily constructed in the light of all the political considerations connected with this matter, were sufficiently wide. All of us said they were not; the government said they were. The Acting Prime Minister even wrote a letter in that connection.

Finally today we have the government, having passed one order in council, now amending it having learned that the New Democratic party were going to vote nonconfidence. This government, fearing for itself, has retreated even in the face of what it has done. While it represents, apparently, an agreement between the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the Minister of Justice who met together, I doubt whether it goes far enough. But it does indicate the fact that this government knows it has been and is in difficulties.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, ever since this matter was first brought to the attention of the house by a question asked on Monday by the leader of this party our position as a party has been very clear. It was stated explicitly last evening by the hon. member for Greenwood. It has been our view throughout that the matters that have been brought to light should be fully investigated. We felt that the order in council was not drawn in terms sufficiently wide to make possible that full investigation. Yesterday the hon. member for Greenwood, on behalf of this party, put in a letter to the Acting Prime Minister the three points concerning which we thought there should be an amendment of the order in council.

First, it was our belief that provision should explicitly be made for an inquiry into the manner in which the Department of Justice and the Minister of Justice dealt with the allegations when they were brought to their

attention. In the second place, we stated the view that the order in council should provide for an investigation into the allegations made against persons in the employ of the government. In the third place, we asserted that the power of the commissioner to report should be wider. We were disturbed and concerned that the order in council in its original wording seemed to us, at any rate, to limit that power to report to one question and one question only.

We have, as I say, made this clear in statements on the floor of the house. There is nothing to hide when I say we have made this clear in conversations we have had with various ministers of the government. I note that the revised order in council which the Acting Prime Minister has now laid on the table of the house meets the three points the hon. member for Greenwood indicated in his letter. From a quick reading it strikes me that it has met his first point by using verbatim the words proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood, and it has met the other two points in spirit.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we stand by the decision taken on our behalf last night by the hon. member for Greenwood. He stated quite clearly that if the government did not widen the terms of reference we would have no option but to support the amendment of non-confidence that is before the committee of supply. On the other hand, if the terms of reference were widened we would not prejudge the inquiry of the commissioner. In that circumstance we would not vote in a manner to prejudge that inquiry.

The debate this week, Mr. Speaker, need not have taken all this time. The Minister of Justice on Monday last could have answered the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam by saying that he would have a full investigation. However, since he did not do that, this week has shown the value of parliament and the value of constructive criticism, as a result of which these changes have been made. In the light of these changes we feel the house should not prejudge the action of the commissioner to be appointed under this investigation, and therefore that the non-confidence amendment should now be voted down.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I think the government has acted wisely in yielding to the pressure that has been brought as a result of the debate which has taken place during the last few days regarding widening the terms of reference of the judicial inquiry. Last night the hon. member for Sherbrooke, speaking in the debate, made our position very clear when he said that providing the terms of reference of the commission could be extended to encompass all the actions taken within the Department of Justice, we would be prepared to support the estimates of that department.

This revision of the action taken by the privy council has met these requirements. There has been considerable debate as to whether the Department of Citizenship and Immigration should also be included, but I believe that the revision now made, which definitely allows for an investigation of the conduct of an employee of the government or of an officer or employee of the department involved in the allegations which have been made, providing there is prima facie evidence, covers this point as well.

I agree it is rather unfortunate that the Minister of Justice did not agree to this action earlier in the week, in which case much of the time which has been consumed in bitter debate would have been saved. It is imperative at this stage that the government clean its stable. The integrity of the Minister of Justice and his own sense of fairness have not previously been called into question, but now that he has left himself open to the charges which have been made, whether his conduct be the result of an error or mistake in judgment it has become essential that these terms of reference be broadened as they have.

Public opinion is very important at this stage, because not only are the government and the Minister of Justice involved in this matter, but parliament itself. I am very concerned that the image of parliament and the image of we who constitute this House of Commons be not brought into further disrepute as far as public opinion is concerned. To prejudge this whole situation without the fullest possible inquiry into it would likewise be unfair.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the broadened terms of reference of the judicial inquiry, we in this party give our support and will also assist in the passage of the estimates of the Department of Justice as quickly as possible.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words in order to state our position in this house concerning this matter.

Yesterday we had decided to vote against the government because, like the other groups of the opposition, we wanted to know the

truth about this affair. I believe that we would have been blamed by the public had we not participated in forcing the government to broaden the terms of reference of this inquiry.

This morning we learned from the Minister of Justice that after the decision made had been reconsidered, the order in council regarding the creation of that commission was amended so as to clarify this situation.

We are happy to have at last a commission of inquiry which has the necessary powers to reveal everything possible concerning this affair. That is what we were asking for: that all facts be revealed and that justice be made to prevail.

Therefore, we can no longer blame the government if the terms of reference are not sufficiently broad to look further into that affair. However, I regret that we lost two or three days during which the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) was quite busy. This is the first time that he presented his department's estimates, and we regret that things have turned out as they did, but we could not do otherwise because we have trust in Canadian justice.

In view of what went on during the last few days, we could not do otherwise, because we wanted to see Canadian justice prevail and retain its integrity, as has always been the case.

[*Text*]

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Terry Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona): I have a question for the Minister of Justice. I wonder whether the Minister of Justice could tell us which cabinet ministers knew of the Denis report before the Prime Minister did?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I understand the import of the question, but it seems to me to be completely out of order.

Mr. Nugent: The question has to do with cabinet solidarity. We have already heard that the Prime Minister did not know about this Denis case until the day before it was brought up in the house, and I think the house is entitled to know whether the Minister of Justice discussed it with any other of his cabinet colleagues other than the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

Mr. Speaker: Order. In my humble opinion the question is not in order.

Mr. Gene Rhéaume (Northwest Territories): I have a further question which may, perhaps, be in order. Can the Minister of Justice advise the house as to the basis of his answer yesterday as reported on page 10547 of *Hansard*, when he said:

> I learned this when the report was made to me by the commissioner of the R.C.M.P.

Can the minister tell the house when he received that report?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): I do not know where the hon. member was, but I answered that question.

Mr. Churchill: You did not answer it. You did not give the date.

BANK ACT

PROVISION FOR REVISION AND EXTENSION OF BANK CHARTERS

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution, which has been recommended to the house by His Excellency:

> That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the decennial revision of the Bank Act and the extension of the charters of the existing chartered banks till July 1, 1975, and to provide further for certain changes in connection with the administration of the act.

Motion agreed to.

TRADE

APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND HUNGARY

On the order: Government notice of motion:

> November 25—the Minister of Trade and Commerce—the following proposed motion:—That it is expedient that the houses of parliament do approve the trade agreement between Canada and the Hungarian People's Republic, signed at Ottawa June 11, 1964, and laid before the House of Commons on June 11, 1964; and that this house do approve the same.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to section 2 of standing order 21 this government notice of motion stands transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders at the next sitting of the house.

APPROVAL OF RENEWAL OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND RUSSIA

On the order: Government notice of motion:

> November 25—the Minister of Trade and Commerce—the following proposed motion:—That it is expedient that the houses of parliament do approve the protocol renewing the trade agreement between Canada and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, signed on February 29, 1956, and renewed on April 18, 1960, signed at Ottawa September 16, 1963, laid

before the House of Commons on October 9, 1963; and that this house do approve the same.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to section 2 of standing order 21 this government notice of motion stands transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders at the next sitting of the house.

APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND BULGARIA

On the order: Government notice of motion:

November 25—the Minister of Trade and Commerce—the following proposed motion:—That it is expedient that the houses of parliament do approve the trade agreement between Canada and the People's Republic of Bulgaria, signed at Ottawa, October 8, 1963, and laid before the House of Commons on October 21, 1963; and that this house do approve the same.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to section 2 of standing order 21 this government order of notice stands transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders at the next sitting of the house.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NATO—PROPOSED ATLANTIC NUCLEAR FORCE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Secretary of State for External Affairs in a position to give the house the views of the government with regard to the Atlantic nuclear force concept advanced by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom? What consideration has been given to this matter by the government, and will the house be given an opportunity to discuss this question so that its views may be heard—for certainly its views can be influential, as was shown by the order in council tabled a few minutes ago—before a decision on Canada's stand in this regard is finally made.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this question was asked the other day of the Prime Minister, and I should like to say in reply, as I indicated in the house on November 19, that in preparation for the NATO ministerial meeting in December we are currently exploring with our allies certain general lines of approach designed to meet the problems now facing NATO. The British prime minister will be here on December 9 with his foreign minister, and there will be an opportunity then of reviewing with the prime minister the nature of the proposal to which they have been giving consideration. The full details have not yet been made known to us nor, I believe, to any other country.

There will be no decision on this matter immediately. There is to be a meeting, as my hon. friend knows, of NATO ministers in December, when there will be an opportunity of further discussing all aspects of this matter. I think I can give my hon. friend the assurance that there will be the fullest opportunity of dealing with the Canadian position in this house before we take a final decision.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Will the minister say whether the Canadian government has been in touch with President de Gaulle regarding his views in this connection, and whether the government shares those views?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, the government has not, within recent days, been in direct communication with the president of France. However, through our mission we have been in communication with the French foreign office. We have had consultations with the French and other NATO governments in the NATO council.

As I stated in the debate last Friday the desire of Canada, and I am sure of other countries in NATO, is to preserve the unity of that organization in the face of the admitted disagreement that now exists between different concepts as to how the organization should be militarily organized and concerning proposals made outside of NATO by the government of the United States with regard to the MLF. Discussions between the various governments on this subject are proceeding. I believe we can say that the situation within the last 10 days now warrants the belief that the disarray about which we were concerned will not arise.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I want to thank the minister for the latter part of his statement. Has President de Gaulle given an indication of a softening of the attitude which he has adopted during the last year?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No, I would not think there was any ground for believing that the position of the government of France with regard to the MLF or with regard to the form of NATO has changed. However, I believe, having in mind the unanimous position taken by all members as to the purpose of the alliance, it will be possible, notwithstanding these positions, to preserve its integrity and unity.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): May I ask a supplementary question. Will the house have an opportunity to discuss the

question raised by the Leader of the Opposition before this session adjourns?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, before I answer my hon. friend's question may I take advantage of the opportunity to welcome, on behalf of all hon. members in this house, the secretary of state for external affairs of Australia, Mr. Paul Hasluck, who is sitting in the Speaker's gallery. Mr. Hasluck comes from a country that is close to Canada, and we are very happy to have him in our capital today.

In answer to the question, we did have a discussion of this problem last Thursday and Friday, but as I have indicated, I am sure no decision will be taken that will preclude an opportunity in due course to review the whole problem that faces NATO.

BRITISH GUIANA—APPOINTMENT OF CANADIANS AS ELECTION OBSERVERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): My question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Will the minister elaborate on the report which has been made by the colonial secretary, Mr. Greenway, that two Canadians have been appointed as observers in the coming elections in British Guiana? Who are these two men?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, a number of commonwealth countries including Canada were asked by the colonial office to name two observers, for the elections that will be taking place shortly in British Guiana. I recommended Mr. John Holmes, president of the Canadian institute of international affairs and Mr. William Parker, of Windsor, who has had considerable experience in elections.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): May I ask a supplementary question arising out of the announcement of the nomination of two observers for the British Guiana election, one being Mr. William Parker who comes from the minister's own riding. Would the minister not feel it would have been better to send Canada's chief electoral officer or his deputy to observe such an election?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, there are various possible judgments about appointments, of course, but I do not think I need to apologize for these two.

Mr. Nicholas Mandziuk (Marquette): May I ask the minister what will be the duties, functions or obligations of these Canadian observers? Will they be just what the word implies?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Precisely. My hon. friend is aware, of course, of the situation in British Guiana. He knows the nature of the political discussions under way there. He knows what will follow, depending on the result of the election. The colonial office was anxious to have observers to provide for the scrutiny of the conduct of the election.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

INQUIRY AS TO BUSINESS FOR COMING WEEK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eric Winkler (Grey-Bruce): I should like to ask the house leader if he would outline the business of the house for next week.

Hon. J. G. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I understand the hon. member for Humber-St. George's will be moving concurrence in the report that stands in his name on the order paper.

Mr. Winkler: May I ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Finance. Does he intend to proceed with the bill that will follow the notice of motion which is on the order paper in his name this morning, as well as Bill No. C-103, which came out of committee yesterday and will be referred to the Senate in the course of this session?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): It depends on how fast we progress with the business now before the house, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Winkler: I would like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Labour or his parliamentary secretary. Does the minister anticipate that he will be able to proceed with Bill No. C-131 and Bill No. C-126 in the course of this session?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker. It has been pointed out that we intend to proceed, if possible, with these bills.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the President of the Privy Council in his capacity as house leader. In view of the apparent decision of the government that the house shall proceed with the flag debate on Monday, may I ask the house leader, if that debate shows any signs of lasting, whether the government would ask the house to in-

terrupt that debate for a couple of days next week to deal with the Canada labour code?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, that question of course is quite out of order because it is hypothetical. It is our intention to proceed as I indicated in answer to a question from the whip of the party opposite, and the hon. member seems to be assuming that the motion for concurrence in the flag committee's report may not be disposed of quickly. I think, before asking for a decision on this point, we should see whether it may not be disposed of relatively quickly. In view of the long debate which there was on the subject this summer, in view of the fact that the subject matter was referred to a committee, that the committee carried out its mandate and has reported back, the motion for concurrence should require very little debate.

Mr. Knowles: In view of the fact that although the President of the Privy Council thought my question was out of order he was able to make a lengthy answer to it may I ask him, since this decision was made without consultation with representatives of the various parties, if he will call a meeting of the house leaders to consider the possibility of having the Canada labour code debate some time next week?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to consider that point, but I hold the view that the practice in the house has been for the government to submit legislation as best it can assess the requirements of the house and in the light of the situation concerning preparedness of legislation and that sort of thing. However, I shall be glad to consider the hon. member's suggestion.

Mr. Knowles: It is government legislation I am asking to be considered by the house.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): I am afraid I am experiencing a little difficulty. I would have liked to address a question to the leader of the house or to the acting prime minister, but neither of them is in the chamber at this moment. May I therefor address a question to the acting prime minister or to the acting house leader and ask whether it is the intention of the government pursuant to an order of the house, to proceed with the appropriation bill at six o'clock even though a number of departments will not even have been opened for discussion by that time?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): This is an order of the house, and it is the intention of the government to comply with the order.

[*Later:*]

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the house leader. Before moving into committee of supply may we be informed as to the order in which the estimates will be called today?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Justice estimates will be called first. We propose calling the estimates of the other departments in whatever way the opposition groups want them called, by agreement and consulting quite closely with them.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would earnestly submit to the government house leader that it might help in the proper handling of these estimates if we had none of this sort of "let's play it by ear" attitude. There are various departments that have not even come before the committee, such as the Department of National Defence. Hon. members want to discuss these matters; therefore I would ask the minister to tell the house the order in which the estimates will be called.

Mr. McIlraith: I was being co-operative, Mr. Speaker, and offered to call them in whatever way the opposition house leaders wanted them called. If they prefer me to do it without consultation with them I would be glad to do so, but I thought that the method I proposed was a fair way, in the circumstances.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lambert: The house leader cannot slide away that quickly. Members are busy with other duties. I realize that there is some value in consultation, but perhaps the minister would give us an indication of the first department to be called after the Department of Justice.

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. member apparently was not listening. I had indicated that we were starting with the estimates of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Lambert: I did hear that. What is the next one?

Mr. McIlraith: If the opposition groups would like me to indicate the order I will be glad to do so. We will then call the estimates of the Department of Public Works, then those of the Department of National Revenue, then the Department of Forestry, followed by legislation and then the Department of Transport.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why didn't you say that in the first place?

Mr. Lambert: What about defence?

Mr. McIlraith: Then the Department of National Defence; I am sorry.

Mr. Lambert: Where does defence come in?

Mr. McIlraith: As the hon. member asks me, Mr. Speaker, we will put it last.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

PROTECTION OF HUNTING RIGHTS GRANTED BY TREATY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, during the orders of the day on November 12 the hon. member for Lisgar asked for assurance that the hunting rights granted to the Indian people by treaty would be protected.

The hunting and fishing rights of Indians under the various treaties is a most complicated subject and has given rise to a number of closely related questions in the house. The first was asked on May 31, 1963, by the hon. member for Skeena following the announcement of the judgment of Chief Justice McRuer of the Ontario supreme court in the Calvin William George case, which involved the application of the Migratory Birds Convention Act on an Indian reserve in Ontario. In reply the Prime Minister indicated that he would be pleased to communicate the decision to other federal and provincial administrations, as well as to do what he could to ensure that the royal proclamation of 1763, and its provisions for the Indian people, would be maintained.

Immediately thereafter we learned that the McRuer judgment was being appealed. As yet no decision has been handed down, and it would therefore be inappropriate for the Prime Minister to circulate for administrative action information on a case which is still before the courts.

Another case which recently received much publicity involved Michael Sikyea, an Indian of the Northwest Territories, who on appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada was convicted of unlawfully killing a duck out of season, contrary to the Migratory Birds Convention Act regulations. There have been other similar cases, and I might mention that of Rufus Prince and Robert Myron, involving an infraction of the Manitoba game act, which in December, 1963 resulted in a supreme court decision in favour of the Indians.

These cases are all part of a process to determine the precise quality of the Indian rights under the treaties which must be maintained. Although not a party to the litigation, my department has taken an active and conclusive part on behalf of the Indians and has paid the costs of counsel so that the legal position of a substantial number of Indians in relation to a particular law or treaty, or within a particular region of Canada, could be clarified.

The supreme court judgment in the Sikyea case provides for the first time the precise relationship between the terms of the Indian treaties in the Northwest Territories and the Migratory Birds Convention Act. Other departments of government are involved, and when their views have been obtained the whole question will be considered in detail to determine the most appropriate course of action which might be taken by the government.

Mr. Gene Rhéaume (Northwest Territories): As a supplementary question, can the minister tell the house when he will introduce the legislation setting up the Indian claims commission that has been promised to the Indian people for two years?

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, as I have said many times in the house, we are quite anxious to bring this bill to the house as soon as possible. During the discussion of my estimates I said we have revised Bill No. C-130. The amended bill will be ready soon, and I hope we can bring it back to the house as soon as possible.

Mr. Rhéaume: We all hope that.

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): As a supplementary question can the minister assure the house that in the meantime, until the question has been adequately decided, the Indian affairs branch will take financial responsibility in the case of Indians so charged?

Mr. Tremblay: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It is a policy of the Indian affairs branch to pay all the expenses of counsel who act for Indians in cases which can be related to the general rights of Indians with respect to fish and game.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

SHIPS LAID UP THROUGH LACK OF TECHNICAL PERSONNEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Will he rise and expatiate in more detail than heretofore in answering reports in newspapers that the Royal Canadian Navy is in trouble and is losing efficiency because of the lack of properly trained technical personnel, which is endangering and, as a matter of fact, making impossible the operation of certain ships?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I went into this question quite fully yesterday, and I do not think there is anything I can usefully add short of a debate on the subject, which would not be appropriate on orders of the day.

RECONSIDERATION OF DISBANDMENT OF IRISH REGIMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): I have a question for the Minister of National Defence concerning the Irish regiment of Toronto. I want to speak on behalf of the Toronto members, who are singularly silent about this. Was the minister able to assure the representatives of the Irish regiment who met with him yesterday that the regiment would be continued in the active order of battle as recommended by the Suttie commission?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): I can assure the hon. gentleman that the Toronto members, on this side of the house at least, have not been very silent in their representations.

Mr. Churchill: They have said nothing in the house.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Under their breaths.

Mr. Hellyer: I was able to assure the representatives of the Irish regiment from Toronto that I feel just as keenly as they do about the decision which had to be made to place this famous regiment on the supplementary order of battle. I also explained that in view of the fact that the opportunity had presented itself to perpetuate the name and the traditions through a unit in another city we had felt this was a good decision, rather than to create a new unit.

As the hon. gentleman is aware, we have transferred a unit in Sudbury from artillery to infantry, and this unit is to be designated the 2nd battalion, Irish Regiment of Canada, Sudbury. In this way the traditions of this great regiment will be maintained in the active order of battle Canadian militia as the hon. gentleman requests.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Will the Minister of National Defence please advise us—and I am speaking as one who was a member of the Irish Fusiliers—how you maintain the traditions and the flag of a Vancouver regiment or of one of the Toronto Irish regiments by establishing a new one in Sudbury? What is the sense in that proposition?

Mr. Hellyer: Yesterday I was assured by the delegation of the universality of the Irish. Notwithstanding the fact that most modern members of the regiment are not of Irish origin but come from all parts of the world, they serve with equal distinction in the unit and this makes them all Irish. As one who believes we should all be Canadians, I think there will be ample opportunity in the new location for this regiment to again provide an opportunity to people of all origins to be Irish while they serve Canada as patriotic citizens.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): Has any consideration been given to transferring to the non-active reserve, units which have battalions represented in the permanent army rather than ones which have not, and which therefore are completely discontinued?

Mr. Hellyer: This proposition was not put forward in the course of the studies of the commission, nor of the subsequent review.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary South): A supplementary question. What has been the reaction of the Sudbury gunners to this demotion which has been forced on them?

Mr. Hellyer: As another ex-gunner, though not with the distinction of the hon. gentleman, I think in the spirit of friendliness they will be very pleased to bear the tradition of the Irish in the formation of their new unit.

Mr. O. W. Weichel (Waterloo North): I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence why Sudbury was chosen.

Some hon. Members: Order paper.

Inquiries of the Ministry

PUBLIC SERVICE

SUGGESTED DRAFTING OF CODE OF ETHICAL CONDUCT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister in view of the unavoidable absence of the Prime Minister. Will the government charge the committee on privileges and elections, or any other committee, with the responsibility of drafting a code of ethical conduct to which members, employees of ministers of the crown and others might see fit to give their allegiance?

Hon. Paul Martin (Acting Prime Minister): I shall see that this question is noted, Mr. Speaker.

IMMIGRATION

REPORTED PRESENCE IN CANADA OF U.S. NAZI LEADER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, again regarding Mr. George Lincoln Rockwell now reported to have entered Canada at Windsor, with great detail as to his dramatic entry. Could the minister advise whether this unwelcome person has returned to the United States, and what steps he is taking to prevent Mr. Rockwell's further violation of the minister's prohibitory order?

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am informed by my department that Mr. Rockwell has left the country and, as I said the other day, an order has been given to all immigration officers in the country that if they recognize Mr. Rockwell, should he come again to Canada, to arrest him and proceed with an immigration inquiry at once.

INDUSTRY

REVISION OF CRITERIA RESPECTING DESIGNATED AREAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Fred F. Stenson (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry. Has his department studied the incentives offered United States industry by that government?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, there is a very wide range of incentives, for a variety of purposes, offered by the United States government, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that officers of the area development agency have considered them.

Mr. Stenson: A supplementary question. Does the minister not feel he should try to convince his colleague the Minister of Finance of the need to withdraw the tax on production machinery?

Mr. Drury: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): A supplementary question to the Minister of Industry. I should like to ask whether he can indicate that the formal revision of these designated areas will be available, if it is to be accomplished, by the first day of 1965?

Mr. Drury: I would hesitate to name a firm deadline in connection with the new program which is being evolved. This is a complicated question involving a number of jurisdictions, not only federal but provincial. In this area, as in others, we are hoping to proceed through consultation and by agreement.

Mr. Fisher: I raise this matter because my information from Ontario officials is that they can get no indication as to what action is to be taken or even what co-operative studies are to be carried out. I therefore ask the minister to explain to us what the difficulties are in the development of a new formula.

Mr. Drury: In a word, the difficulties arise because this is a large and complicated question breaking new ground. I should be very grateful if the hon. member would provide me with the names of the dissatisfied or discontented Ontario officials, and I will see that something is done.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): May I ask the Minister of Industry or the Minister of Finance whether they are yet in a position to indicate their points of view on the report of Professor Wilson, which was prepared for the Atlantic premiers and which has now been in their hands for some months?

Mr. Drury: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): A supplementary question to the Minister of Industry. In view of the fact that it has taken over a year now for the minister to come up with his new formula with regard to the depressed areas, would he consider removing Brantford from the list of designated areas until he has actually produced his new plan?

Mr. Drury: As the house was informed perhaps in the absence of the hon. member,

a review of the statistics looking to the designation or removal from designation of specific areas under the present program is now under way. It is expected that on completion of this review an announcement will be made.

PUBLIC WORKS

PICTON, ONT.—REQUEST FOR HARBOUR DREDGING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Prince Edward-Lennox): I have a question to address to the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Public Works in the absence of the minister. As a result of the serious situation created by low water levels in lake Ontario whereby marine commerce in Prince Edward-Lennox and the bay of Quinte district is seriously curtailed, would the minister consider the dredging of Picton harbour at the earliest opportunity?

Mr. Speaker: This is surely a question for the order paper.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON ATLANTIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that he has left the house I wonder whether his parliamentary secretary or the acting minister will take the question as notice. Is the Minister of Transport now in a position to inform the house as to the future of the Atlantic development board, especially with regard to an assurance that sufficient funds will be available when the present $100 million is expended, in view of the fact that most of the $100 million is now either spent or committed and in view of the further fact that the minister gave—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is a question for the order paper, and it seems to me the question was asked last week.

Mr. Coates: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I asked this question last week and the Minister of Transport told me that this matter would be discussed on his estimates. I will not have an opportunity, and other members of this house may not have an opportunity, to discuss this subject on his estimates. It is most important to the Atlantic provinces to know what the future of the Atlantic development board is going to be. I feel that I am charged with a great deal of responsibility in this matter and that the minister should provide an answer as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker: There may be an opportunity this afternoon for a complete and detailed answer.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I have tried to get the floor since the opening of the question period, but I notice that the Minister of Transport for some reason, possibly a very good reason, had to leave the house. Can we expect to see him back today? Possibly somebody on the treasury benches could answer that question.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal and other services—

1. Administration including the office of the superintendent of bankruptcy, grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, gratuities to the widows or other dependants of judges who die while in office and authority to make recoverable advances for the administration of justice on behalf of the governments of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory, $2,109,600.

The Chairman: Order. When the committee rose yesterday it was considering vote No. 1 of the estimates of the Department of Justice and an amendment proposed thereto by the hon. member for Yukon. The amendment is as follows:

That vote No. 1 of the estimates of the Department of Justice be reduced by the sum of $16,999.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether as an appropriate starting point I might now put to the Minister of Justice the question I put on the orders of the day a short time ago. I am sure the minister realizes the significance of the information we are seeking, and I am sure he understands the natural curiosity of the house as to cabinet solidarity and how many other members of the cabinet were backing him up in regard to his handling of this case. Perhaps I need not go into any further reasons. I am willing to yield the floor to the minister now so he can answer that question, if he will.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, my colleague whose department was immediately concerned with the matter of the allegation of a bribe being offered by Mr. Denis was, of course, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. As soon as I was advised of the reference made to me by the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. I advised him, telling him that I would keep him informed of the progress of the matter.

[*Translation*]

As soon as the last report on file was received, of course I informed him and together we discussed the matter. Together we reached a decision about his executive assistant. In regard to the other decision about the prosecution, I made it myself, of course.

[*Text*]

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Chairman, I gather from the explanation given by the minister that only two cabinet ministers were aware of this report until such time as the Prime Minister was informed the day before this matter was raised in the house. Am I correct in that assumption? I wonder whether the minister would indicate if that assumption is correct, that only himself and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration were aware of these facts until the Prime Minister was apprised the day before it was raised in the house. Is that accurate?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, all this was answered by myself and the Prime Minister in the course of the first two days of the estimates, and I do not think it is appropriate that I should be subjected to further questioning in respect to my relations with my colleagues in cabinet. If the hon. gentleman has not read *Hansard* that is no reason to force me to be subjected to further questions on this matter.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nugent: I have not only read *Hansard* but I was present in the house most of the time. The minister has not answered that question to this time.

Some hon. Members: He has.

Mr. Nugent: I am certain that even if it can be found among the various evasions of the minister that litter *Hansard* since this matter started, there is simply no reason why a simple response could not be given now to clear up the whole matter. This question is of sufficient significance that I am sure I would not have forgotten his answer; and I am quite sure that those trained seals opposite on the Liberal backbenches who now say he has are unable, any one of them, to stand up and tell me he has.

Mr. Badanai: He has.

Mr. Nugent: Because they never got that information. I hear the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration say he has given the information, but I will yield the floor now and challenge him to say how many other than those two were told.

Mr. Caron: Read *Hansard.*

Mr. Nugent: I give the hon. member for Hull the same opportunity. These trained seals on the Liberal benches have a great practice of sitting back and making these loud interjections.

Mr. Rhéaume: You are insulting seals.

Mr. Nugent: Then I will withdraw that. I suggest the hon. member should get to his feet like a man and simply prove what he is saying. I challenge him to give that information.

Mr. Caron: We do not have to prove it.

Mr. Nugent: It is like a lot of the allegations which are made; the less information the house has the better. I can understand perfectly why the Minister of Justice feels that this information should not be given the house. Naturally he will be a little embarrassed at revealing to the House of Commons how many of his colleagues he has more confidence in than he has in his own Prime Minister. He does not want to tell us—although he has had to reveal that he did not dare tell the Prime Minister—how many other cabinet ministers, colleagues of his, he had sufficient confidence in that he went to them and discussed the matter with them to see what was in the best interests of the government and of his party. I do not care whether he tells this house or does not; the significance of that action and of his failure to tell his Prime Minister can lead us to no other conclusion but that he had not enough confidence in the Prime Minister to tell him.

I got the impression from the way the secretary of state and the Minister of Transport jumped into the discussion from almost the first day that they were acting like two ministers who had been fully apprised of the situation and had been warned that it was coming up. I would not be surprised if the Minister of Justice had found it politic to take advice of the real front bench politi-

cians of the party. I think it is a shame that he probably took the advice of the politicians rather than the advice of someone would expect to be more interested in the proper administration of justice than in pure politics.

I wanted to comment briefly, Mr. Chairman, on a point which was brought out by the Minister of Justice and reiterated by the hon. member for Verdun and other hon. members opposite. I am sure no member of this house will quarrel very violently with the proposition that it is most unfortunate to have the name of a person smeared by allegations unless or until that person is facing a trial. However, I would ask hon. members opposite to consider what happens to the average citizen who is suspected of a crime, and an investigation by the police follows. Let us consider the amount of consideration given to the average citizen who does not have as his friend or employer the Minister of Justice. Across the length and breadth of the country thousands of criminal charges are laid every day and good citizens are hauled into court for the first time. When I say "good citizens" they are citizens with no previous record who so far as their friends and neighbours are concerned enjoy a spotless reputation. Many charges against citizens brought to court for the first time go no further than the preliminary hearing, after which the case is dropped. Some are arrested, their names appear in the paper, but the matter does not even get to the preliminary hearing stage before the case against them is dropped.

I suggest to the minister, who shed crocodile tears over the slurring of the reputations of the two gentlemen involved here, that it seems to me he has gone just a bit too far in his solicitude. His most prominent duty is to make sure that justice is done. Certainly the most solemn duty he has is to make sure that the appearance of justice shall not be tarnished. It must be obvious to all that there is such a thing as fair and equal treatment to all citizens, not just fair treatment to the friends of the minister.

This is a point which I think has not been mentioned enough in this house but which has been beaten to death on the Liberal side of the house, namely what is fair to those two people. Certainly if a cabinet minister is fair and impartial he must expect that judges, on whose activity he must keep an eye, must be fair and impartial as well. But he knows from his own experience in court that practising lawers of many year's experience who are appointed to the bench do not automatically acquire an ability for impartiality. This is something which is built up over the years. How the Minister of Justice can stand in his place and eloquently state that he had to be fair to that one citizen, just as though he were a practising lawyer in court talking of his client, when his own duty, which should be uppermost in his mind, is to watch for any weakness in his own character which would not permit him to be impartial when he is closely touched by the affair is beyond me. Certainly he has enough experience to recognize this.

Mr. Favreau: Would the hon. member yield to a question?

Mr. Nugent: Certainly.

Mr. Favreau: Would the hon. gentleman care to tell this committee against whom charges ought to have been laid, and what charges?

Mr. Nugent: The minister has a great facility for setting up straw men and knocking them down.

Some hon. Members: Answer.

Mr. Nugent: The answer is obvious. Not having seen the report and not knowing the evidence I would be silly to try to suggest what charges should be laid in view of the way the minister has handled the case. I am not saying that charges should in fact have been laid at all. I do not know. Maybe they should, maybe they should not. But what is obvious is that we do know the manner in which the matter was handled. We do know the duty of the Minister of Justice. I was explaining to this committee what the Minister of Justice should know, when it comes to a question of judgment, that the degree of impartiality required in a court of law is something which judges usually acquire only after long practice, and I sometimes think some of them do not acquire much of it even after many years. The minister should know that this is a great weakness. It is a human frailty of most of us, no matter how honest we may be, that we are simply incapable of coming to a really impartial decision, especially when it concerns the welfare of someone we know, someone for whom we may feel great pity, as obviously does the Minister of Justice to the gentlemen involved here.

I simply want to re-emphasize to this committee the unfitness for office of a minister of justice who puts his duty to his friends, his personal loyalty to them, first; who is unaware of that natural disability which we all have, that incapability of being completely im-

partial, and who should have known that he could not make a proper judgment.

He failed to report to his Prime Minister, in whom he should have great confidence, so that he might have obtained proper advice as to how to handle the situation. I suggest the fault lies in this complete failure on his part to do his duty to his department and to the administration of justice in this country. That is his first and predominant duty and he must sacrifice all else in order to carry out that duty. If he is not willing to do so—and he has shown by his attitude in this house during the past several days that he is unwilling—or has not realized his shortcomings, he should not occupy the position he now occupies, because he is not mentally suited for it. I say that without in any way impugning the honesty of the gentleman. I believe he is completely honest but suffers from a very high degree of stupidity.

In spite of all the comments and facts which have come to light, the minister still fails to show any recognition of the attitude that must be adopted by a minister of justice. I am not sure whether other members of this house become as inflamed as I do about this kind of situation, but I have observed many court cases in which a policeman has failed to do his duty, the crown prosecutor has failed to do his duty, and lawyers have been very harshly treated for making an honest but stupid mistake. In those circumstances a lawyer is likely to be suspended or disbarred. Certainly when we observe this obvious example of stupidity on the part of one so close to the seats of the mighty, one who should not only show but should exert the highest standards possible, it is unacceptable to the point that I would be surprised by any hon. member in this house who would seriously disagree with the comments I have made.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Chairman, I apologize for using some of the time of this committee, but I should like to record in about ten sentences—not ten minutes—an aspect of the situation presently under discussion which I hope the minister will cover before he closes our consideration of his estimates.

I should like to know, and I think the people of the country want to know, who thought it would be helpful to place the first telephone call to people in authority. I think we should be aware of the kind of individual who might think he could gain something by contacting an individual in government for the purposes obviously in the mind of the individual who made the first contact starting off this whole affair.

An hon. Member: Ask Nielsen.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Chairman, I asked to be allowed to speak for a few moments, but if the hon. gentleman who spoke wishes to make a speech perhaps he will wait just a moment or two and then be recognized. Some person or persons unknown apparently—

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member one question about his first question?

Mr. Fairweather: Yes.

Mr. Favreau: You spoke about the first telephone call. In order that I may understand you, who made the first telephone call to whom and about what?

An hon. Member: That is what we want to know.

Mr. Fairweather: I do not want to name any names, but I should like to know who in this benighted country thought it would be a good thing to contact Mr. Lamontagne and ask him to go easy. I should like to know why in this country of ours someone might think this type of influence would have a good effect. I think that is an important aspect of this question which affects all of us.

Miss LaMarsh: Ask Alvin Hamilton; ask McIntosh.

Mr. Fairweather The hon. lady has suggested that this whole thing is a tempest in a teapot. So apparently does the Prime Minister, because he prefers to remain in the west.

An hon. Member: Ask Nielsen.

Mr. Fairweather: I am sorry that some hon. members do not think this is a serious situation. I think it is serious, and for that reason I asked the Acting Prime Minister this morning whether it would not be a good idea to follow the lead set by the United States congress and the legislature of the state of New York, in adopting a code of ethics. I hope the vast majority of members in this house have their own built-in code of ethics. However, if some do not, then perhaps there should be a public standard of ethics such as exists in the hon. lady's own profession.

This is such a serious situation that one is entitled not only to ask about but to be made aware of the type of people who think there is some value in contacting an executive assistant to a cabinet minister or, for that

matter, a member of parliament, for the purpose obviously in the mind of the individual who first contacted Mr. Lamontagne. This is a serious situation because these people who attempt to wrongfully use pressures, or wrongfully exert influences, should be recognized. We should be advised of them so we will be forewarned and will not give them the time of day, so to speak. If we know who they are we will not allow them to cross our thresholds or bother us. I want to know who these people are, and I would be obliged if the minister would supply us with this information before our business is completed today. This kind of individual can do great harm to us collectively, and to this parliament.

Mr. Rhéaume: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few remarks about this subject under discussion, and in view of the fact that I have not been in the house during the last four days but have been in the far north, I may have some detachment that others, who have participated in the debate during the last week, may not have.

There is one issue which has not been discussed that I should like to raise seriously for consideration by the minister. That issue is whether people who aspire to and achieve high public office have a responsibility at all times to not only level with the public but give the appearance at all times of being completely and scrupulously honest. When a report falls into the hands not only of members of the treasury benches but of any member of parliament which suggests some impropriety, it can only be dealt with satisfactorily in the minds of Canadian people by an open and thorough study.

That has not taken place in respect of the case now under consideration. It is obvious from reading the debates which took place last week, which I might say have been very stormy, that the resignation of the parliamentary assistant to the Prime Minister only came about after the facts were smoked out into the open by the hon. member for Yukon. The hon. member was not named by the member for Yukon, but it was only until after several days of suggestions that others in positions of influence had been involved that his admission was forthcoming.

While all of us are happy today that the terms of reference of the judicial inquiry have been expanded so that all aspects of the case can be looked into and, hopefully, cleared up, I am wondering whether any other parliamentary assistant should make a statement at this time as to whether there are further implications. Many of us believe there are other implications. Surely this is the time for anyone involved to make a statement, rather than to keep the facts out of sight, only to be brought again to light a few weeks from now as the result of another debacle of the kind that has taken place.

I completely disagree with the statement made by the hon. member for Red Deer to the effect that this parliament is tawdry. He may feel that he is partially responsible for what the government has done, now that he is sort of being kept by them.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Rhéaume: I for one am not prepared to go along with that suggestion by the hon. member for Red Deer, that all members of this house are guilty of some sort of collusion or concealment, when in fact the responsibility rests squarely on the treasury benches.

The issue now before us is not new, nor is it the first example of the approach taken by this government. There have been other examples when the government has adopted the attitude that it is the greatest, that it makes the law but does not have to obey it, and that it can do as it pleases. Other examples indicate that this government will fix things if it decides to do so. One has only to consider what happened during the nomination in Waterloo South to understand what I mean by fixing. That situation was very democratically handled. This government adopts the attitude: "We will fix, we will wheel and deal". This is another example of what is going on. Many questions must be answered.

An hon. Member: How do you know about Waterloo South?

Mr. Rhéaume: Many questions remain unanswered. The other day in this house the Secretary of State for External Affairs made a statement to the effect that the regime they were building was the closest thing you could have to an earthly continuity. It is this sort of attitude, that the government have some sort of divine mandate to rule, that they need be unhampered by principles or even truth, that is rearing its head again in the particular issue that faces the house. I for one place the responsibility squarely on the shoulders of the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister. It is not for the Minister of Finance to get up and say that the Minister of Justice is naïve, perhaps even stupid, in the way he handled this thing but that he has the right to handle it because, as the minister said, he

has dedicated himself to the public service of Canada.

This does not give anyone the right to inflict their stupidity on the Canadian people, merely because they feel they have a duty to do it. You have to be more than a Liberal to be able to give good government. You have to have ability. I am not saying that the two are mutually exclusive, but I am suggesting it is not enough to say he is a dedicated man and he would sooner be somewhere else. I believe the Minister of Finance implied that he too would sooner be somewhere else. Well, the Prime Minister is somewhere else today. I know where he is, and so do the Canadian people. He is out on a fund raising campaign and using a Department of Transport Viscount to do it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Rhéaume: I know, Mr. Chairman, why the Liberal party might need a lot of money.

The Chairman: Order. I have listened to the hon. member with some interest for the last few minutes. He knows that we are considering at the moment, or have been considering, item 1 of the Department of Justice. Some of the remarks he has made certainly have no relationship to item 1 of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Lambert: In the same way as the remarks by the Minister of Finance last night.

Mr. Rhéaume: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I am establishing the point that at a time when the Department of Justice is in complete turmoil, when a variety of questions are being levelled at the minister and the government generally as to the integrity of the department, the place for the Prime Minister is in this house, not speaking to a Liberal fund raising banquet in Winnipeg or anywhere else. I was saying that I know why he may have to have funds. When phone calls are going to cost $20,000, it is very important to have lots of money in the kitty. I am going to suggest to the government—

Some hon. Members: More smears; more slander.

Mr. Rhéaume: If government backbenchers were allowed to speak, I am sure they would. Instead they have to choose this course of interrupting. I am not going to take up any more of the time of the house, having made the point that the issue here goes a lot further than just the Department of Justice, and having suggested that if there are others involved they should stand up and declare themselves prior to—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Rhéaume: Hon. members laughed when the hon. member for Yukon suggested there were others in high places, but after a couple of days we smoked them out. I am suggesting that if there are others they should declare themselves before we set up the inquiry so we do not have to go through this again. I am going to suggest something else to the government in relation to this case. Even if they do not consider the moral or ethical value of integrity, surely they can see the practical value in the future of being honest.

Mr. Fisher: I just wanted to make a correction in *Hansard* in my remarks of last night. I refer to page 10587, the sentence which reads:

> —we should have accepted some kind of defence from the Minister of Finance;

What I said was, "we should have expected some kind of defence from the Minister of Finance of Mr. Chevrier." I suggest this really needs to be made quite clear because the main point of my peech was that Mr. Chevrier was the one who was bearing the brunt of some quite nasty interpretations. I felt that if the Minister of Finance was going to make a defence of the government he should at least have defended his former colleague.

Mr. Peters: During the last few days the house has been interested in the developments that have taken place, and I think the country will watch very closely the attitudes that have been taken toward some of these things. However, Mr. Chairman, I am sure in calling the justice estimates when we did we did not expect they were going to last this long. When the house leader made the arrangement for the limitation of debate on the estimates we did not consider we were going to be taking this length of time on them. I should like to say that I personally think we owe a vote of some type to the hon. member for Yukon for bringing these matters to the attention of this house. Personally I feel quite sad that it had to be done in this way; however, I know of no other way of doing this. I have seen this done a number of times since I have been here, and I know of no other way in which this type of matter can be raised.

I feel it is very foolish for some hon. members on the other side to say the things they have said. I suggest also that it is unfair if the opposition continues to rag the government after a judicial inquiry has been

achieved, because I am sure it will get to the bottom of the matter with which hon. members have been concerned. Personally I have been hoping we would come to a consideration of penitentiaries, because I should like to change the subject for a moment, through I know this is not nearly as important in gaining headlines as is the case when people are being tried.

However, those who have been tried and found guilty are asking for a hearing in this place. I think it is necessary for someone to speak about some of the abuses that take place in our penal system. I would be very optimistic if I thought I was capable of changing the attitude of parliament, of the press and the public into one which would give assistance to some of those on behalf of whom I wish to make representations.

I should like to refer briefly to the riot that took place in St. Vincent de Paul. I have discussed this with many guards, as have people on a number of television programs, with a number of prisoners and some others who are connected with prisons and have been connected with them from a time prior to this riot. I want to be very fair. There is a new warden at this penitentiary, a warden who was not responsible for the riots. In my opinion he has gone a long way toward correcting some of the abuses that took place in that prison. The Minister of Justice is going to have to consider some of the results that have accrued from that riot and their effects upon individuals.

I believe this Minister of Justice is fair and reasonable, but that he is not fairly well attuned to the political climate that we have in parliament. This may be the result of his civil service background. I am sure I could have been of some assistance to him if I had been sitting behind him during the last two or three days. I do believe he is honest and that he is going to do something about penal reform. Anyone who read the statement he made, but which got lost in all this other confusion and court procedure we have been engaging in, must have seen in it a great response to the requirements which have been indicated by all the organizations interested in penal reform.

Mr. McIlraith: Would the hon. member permit a question at this point? I notice his remarks deal with penal reform and the penitentiary items. I wonder if it would be agreeable to the committee to take the vote on item 1 now so we could then go on to the penitentiary items.

Mr. Peters: If everyone else is agreed I would be prepared to do so; otherwise I do not want to yield the floor.

Mr. McIlraith: Perhaps I should repeat for the benefit of the house leader of the official opposition what has taken place.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. member of the N.D.P. party was addressing himself to the subject of penitentiaries, which is quite a proper item for him to raise, but I suggested that if we were going to deal with the subject of penitentiaries we could perhaps take the vote on item 1, dispose of it, and then call the penitentiary items.

Mr. MacInnis: Why waste time? You know consent is not going to be given.

The Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Mr. Churchill: No.

Mr. MacInnis: It has been clearly indicated to the Chair that this is not agreeable, that the hon. member for Timiskaming is going to finish his remarks, and there are others who have something to say.

Mr. Peters: Then I shall be pleased to continue, because I have an amendment to move. Recently we received a delegation which discussed many aspects of prison reform. Its members were interested in many of the things I have been advocating for years, such as conjugal visits to prisoners and better rehabilitation before a prisoner is released. We also had a visit from a person recently released from St. Vincent de Paul, who told us of conditions there which I believe make it the duty of any member of parliament, aware of them, to investigate the problem. We went to St. Vincent de Paul in company with this gentleman, and none of the things he told us were incorrect. He may have exaggerated a bit. Many hon. members may have seen him on television and, like many other persons, he has a propensity to exaggerate. The penitentiary staff gave us every cooperation, and we were able to ascertain many of the things which the minister himself must have learned, as revealed by his statement.

I am still of the opinion that there should be only one committee established. I do not want to be a member of a committee which is going to visit Stony Mountain and all the other penitentiaries merely to look at their physical aspects. I feel that unless one has an inside line into a prison nothing will be

seen that could not be seen on an ordinary visiting day. A prison is a big institution and many things go on in it. I do not believe anyone would hide anything from such a committee, but I do not believe everything would be shown. Therefore such trips around the country would be without much purpose.

However, I believe every member of parliament should be pledged to the reform of our penal system, should be interested in sentencing, pre-sentencing, trial procedures and equality of sentences for similar offences. This is why we ask the minister to establish only one committee, and if he likes to put representatives from other associations on it we would be pleased to have them.

Dealing with the riot in Montreal, I have before me a copy of a sessional paper which indicates some of the conclusions reached as a result of the inquiry. One of these points to the fact that there was maladministration at St. Vincent de Paul. I have not yet heard whether this committee has reported to the minister, and I would like to know whether he has received the report on maladministration.

I have talked to many guards who confirm that prior to the riot the warden at St. Vincent de Paul had got to the stage where he met every morning with two homosexual inmates, who did not live in the prison proper but slept in the administration offices. The guards have admitted they were not able to see the warden; that they would lay charges against prisoners but would then find the warden would call in his special informants, two homosexuals who slept in the administration offices, and get his information from them with the result that conditions in the prison deteriorated.

I am sure the second report must indicate that the maladministration was the total responsibility of the warden in charge of the penitentiary at that time. Where is this warden today? He has been promoted. He was a flop as a warden, but now he is the information officer of the department. So far as I am concerned, before these estimates are passed that man's salary must be deducted from them because I have tried him and found him guilty of gross maladministration, and so far as I am concerned under the circumstances I am not in agreement with paying his salary. If the Minister of National Health and Welfare disagrees, then I can go into this case and explain many more things. All I am asking now is that the minister tell us whether he has received the report of the commission which dealt with maladministration at that institution.

I have here a letter from a prisoner which I would like to read to the committee. He is a man who was accused of manslaughter. You may remember the case. His wife and he rented a canoe at the dock below the parliament buildings and went out into the bay. A pleasure boat went by and the canoe was upset. The man swam ashore; the woman was drowned; he was charged with manslaughter and sentenced to five or six years at St. Vincent de Paul. I have a thick file of the evidence in his case. It is in French and I have not yet been able to get the Secretary of State's department to translate it so I do not know much about the case, but in his letter to me he talks about the riot at the prison. I should point out that French is his principal language but he wrote this letter in English because he knows I and my colleague do not understand that language. His letter reads:

Mr. Frank Howard and Arnold Peters.

Dear Sirs:

The great sense of justice that was emitted by you, while visiting St. Vincent de Paul, has force me to write and relate to you the unbelievable events which took place in June 1962. Your visit has shown that there still are some human beings in society that are trying to end the suffering of their human brothers.

The following story, incredible as it may seem, is the truth.

The 21st of June 1962, I was brought out of my cell 2-V-16 by guards Lafrance and Leroux, who told me then that I was wanted in the nerve centre of the penitentiary. My hands were handcuffed behind my back and we started to go toward the dome. While walking, they punched me behind the neck without provocation.

I said to them: It is not a big score hitting a man who is tied up.

As I was a big man weighing about 190 pounds and practicing weight lifting, Lafrance said to me: "It is you, Nick the he-man? Wait a minute bastard, I will fix you up". We passed through the dome going to the hospital. After arriving they pushed me down the stairs, kicked me, then dragged me in the "hole".

"Holes" are segregated cells which are closed off; there are no beds and people have to lie on the floor.

After arriving there we went in a small room where I was frisked, undressed. After this, wearing only underwear I was put in a cell—No. 6—where a dozen human monsters were waiting for me. Their names are: Lafrance, Edouard Pepin, Lagueux, Leroux, Martel, Tellier, Fortin, Langlois, Lacombe, Lemay, Prevost, Cousineau.

Lafrance encircled my neck, Leroux paralysed my arms, then they asked me: Who was the bastard wearing the white T-shirt? I said: Nobody wearing a white T-shirt was with me June 17. One said: We will refresh your memory you no good dog." Another said: "Guard Proulx

told us that you were the leader of the riot and his assailant". "Confronted with him would you deny this?" I answered "Yes" '. Suddenly Pepin and Martel started to hit me, which awakened the sadistical tendencies of the others. "Result?" I was brutally kicked, hit with fists, black jacks; I fell on the wooden bed, kicked over and over in the face, head, ribs and before falling unconscious kicked in the genital parts. I awakened the next morning feeling pain all over, dazed, bloody. The floor was covered with my human waste. Suddenly I remembered the reception I had the previous day. I concluded that being kicked so many times in the belly, my bowels had agitated and this was the result. My head was cut and bruised, the rest of my body as blue as a navy uniform. My genital parts were swollen the size of a football and multicoloured. An excruciating pain stopped me from walking. That was the way I was treated (disgusting, is it not?) I managed to fix a bandage for my cut head by tearing my underwear. A while later, I heard a commotion. Painfully I went to the door which had a little porthole in the centre that served to keep vigil on prisoners. Suddenly, I heard a guard screaming excitedly, "Here comes Gunn, here comes Gunn" by the porthole, I saw Pepin and Lafrance followed by guard Proulx who was dressed in civilian clothes, dragging Alvin Gunn.

They threw him in cell No. 5 beside me, and followed him in. A few minutes later, I heard moanings and noise coming from the cell. It sounded like punches, kicks, black jack hits. It continued for about 15 minutes. Suddenly, I heard a voice (which sounded like Lafrance) say get the stretcher he's unconscious. I thought he was dead. They probably took him to the hospital. A while later my door was opened. I said to myself maybe Gunn is dead, and they are coming to murder me. Proulx, nicknamed "Killer", came forward with Lapointe (keeper of the hole), Lafrance, Lemay, Pepin, Martel, Lagueux, Leroux, Tellier, Lacombe, Langlois and Fortin. Lafrance said to me: "Will you deny that you are his assaulter and the leader of the riot?" Killer Proulx is here now." I said: Yes I deny it! I pursued by saying: even though I am hurt, you won't force me to accuse myself; I have enough courage left in me to fight you one by one! I talked that way then because, I thought I would die anyway. Finally I said: I'd rather die than talk with you. Immediately, I was hit over the head with a contendent object—

I believe he means a blackjack.

—blood streamed down my neck, guard Proulx punched me in the face. I was slugged over the head with black jacks, kicked by the others. I fell on the floor. While I was in a state of semi-consciousness, I saw Pepin, Lafrance and Proulx looking at me with the most heinous looks I have ever saw. My indignation then knew no bounds, how can sadistical treatments like these be still happening? Were we in a Monte Cristo jail era? It did not end there. Pepin kept on kicking me, until an unknown guard dragged him away from me. Then I fell unconscious once more to wake up a while later seeing by the half open door of my cell, Lecorre, Dr. Lefebvre and Nurse Hudon staring at me without doing anything, even if I was hurt. To be brief, they have participated by failing to do their duties and stop the carnage. This proved that they cannot be given important duties. After my door was locked I heard screams from the other inmates who were getting beaten up. A nurse came in and bandaged my head. I think it was Paulin. Pain stopped me from eating, my head was full of lumps, my genital parts hurt so much I had to hold them when I walked. A few days later Lecorre came, he looked at me and went away. They changed me from cell No. 6 to No. 5 where Al Gunn had been beaten. The cell had been washed, but blood spots were still visible. I thought he was dead. Myself the only thing that saved me was my strong constitution. Today my reflexes have diminished; I don't think I would be able to bear what I have endured in the hole. I am physically and morally affected. Three weeks later I was taken out for a shower—

Note that. It was not until three weeks later that he was taken out for a shower.

—my bandage was stuck to my wounds. I had to use soap to unstick it and it was very painful. A spot about 3 inches by 2 inches in the back of my head was free of hairs. Then "coco" Paul-Emile Demers No. 6201 saw me and said: "Nick, what have they done to you? You are in bad shape, Look in the mirror".

I did not look because I knew I was cut all over. Demers himself had been beaten and was blue all over his body from the punishment he suffered. I asked for the nurse who came and bandaged my head. A few days later they took me out for a 15 minute exercise.

This is almost a month later.

The other inmates hardly could recognize me. While in the hole we were served meals without soup, tea, dessert and this for over a month. What a treatment after being nearly killed. We were transferred in segregation C-B-1 and while there Al Gunn complained to Lecorre about the soup and finally we started to get it at every meal. Everything was done and is still being done to break my spirit where I am confined since July 1962.

He is confined in segregation. He is in that cell 23½ hours a day as punishment for a riot which took place 2½ years ago.

The ignominies that the inmates have suffered and are still suffering to this day must be uncovered for the sake of our sanity. This contemptible institution is directed in an idiotic manner. The only action they take is revenge. When after being provoked for years an inmate looses his nerves and gives a well deserved punch in the kisser to a sadistical guard the newspaper try to get the poor guy's head. But does the newspaper print the infamies that are committed here? No, even though they are aware of them.

Now you are asking yourselves after reading this story: How come this happened to him if he is innocent? Here is the answer.

The day of the riot, guards were all excited and they were shooting at anybody. I asked guard Proulx politely to tell the guard over the carpenter shop to cease fire as innocent inmates were getting shot at without provocation.

I have discussed this with several of the guards and I understand Nicholas did not do this as gently as he indicated. But this is one of the things he did; he tried to get them to stop shooting. This is one of the ways in which he participated in the riot.

A while later after guys were getting shot I asked the same question of Lecorre. Is it a sin to ask for the cessation of a massacre? Results? They had to find a scapegoat and I was chosen. For this I was given 14 additional long years. If I had been guilty I would have taken my medicine. All this because a ridiculous penitentiary had concluded (framed) that I was a rioter.

Dishonest guards have committed perjury—

I stop there, Mr. Chairman, to indicate that many of these guards did commit perjury.

—some of them were fired from this institution.

I would point out that some have been charged and have been let out of the service; others have quit. I go on with this letter:

The yard is about 16 acres in size, full of buildings. The day of the riot a dense black smoke was covering the yard. How can a man, in these conditions, see convicts about 300 feet away; a bunch of them with blue sweaters, pick one out of them and say he was a rioter? Well maybe they are lynx! That is it! I have lost great confidence the way justice is carried out there, even though I am a person of good will. My parents have suffered very much, the day I was sentenced.

I am innocent, and once for all a royal inquiry should be made about my trial, a revision of it for the sake of justice. I do not want a conditional release—

You should note this, Mr. Chairman.

I do not want a conditional release, which would be an affirmation of guilt. What I want is a full pardon or at least a retrial.

We want in this institution, rehabilitation facilities, work, occupation of some kind. We are fed up with being locked up to vegetate with moral turpitude for years. For Christ sake, will some people of good will do something? Will it change? I sincerely hope it will for the sake of us.

St. Vincent de Paul is a public disgrace, and presently it only breeds psychopathy, insanity, hate. I end this letter by asking justice for me and all the others in here. Also hope you will do something to ameliorate the fate of hundreds of human beings.

In you we trust to accomplish the impossible. Thank you very much.

I could also read a letter written to the commissioner of penitentiaries. This is the problem; I do not know whether there was an answer to this letter that was written to Mr. MacLeod, the commissioner of penitentiaries, because I do not have access to all this information. But I believe this is a great deal of the problem in St. Vincent de Paul. The prisoner never knows whether his letter has been answered; he never knows whether his request goes anywhere; he is completely isolated from the warden. When I went to Kingston penitentiary I found that the warden knew the prisoners by name. I was surprised to find out that in St. Vincent de Paul the last time the prisoners had seen the warden was when he was in there after the riot. I also found out they have not had any connection with him other than when he made his Christmas broadcast last year. They do not know whether the warden is a good guy or not. They think he stopped the beatings about six months after the riot took place, but they do not really know. The previous warden is a disgrace to the prison service and it is a damned shame that we still have him and are paying him $14,000 a year. I suggest that before these estimates are passed his salary should be deducted from them.

I should like to continue with Gaston Nicholas' case. This case has been reported widely in the newspapers, and I think at the request of the commissioner of penitentiaries Mr. Nicholas has been moved to Kingston penitentiary. I thank the commissioner for having done this. I would also suggest this is not really enough, because I have talked to many people in similar circumstances in St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, people who were connected with the riot. I am told there has been consideration by commissions that have sat and dealt with this matter, but it was indicated to me that those trials were a mockery of justice.

Alvin Gunn, O'Brien and Melançon were indicated as the leaders in the riot. Only twice in the evidence regarding the riot is there any evidence that Gaston Nicholas was involved, and then only in a very minor manner. Gaston Nicholas went before a court in Montreal and was sentenced to 14 years imprisonment for his participation. He was charged with causing public mischief. Public mischief; and he got 14 years. Is that fair? Mr. Alvin Gunn, who admits himself that he was a leader—he said he was pushed into it, but admits he was a leader of the riot—says that Nicholas was not one of the leaders. He went before the new attorney general of the province of Quebec, Mr. Wagner, who was the judge in his case. Mr. Wagner heard witnesses on both sides. He heard in particular from a chaplain. I asked the chaplain why he did not testify in the other cases, and he said "My effectiveness was only good in one case and I had more personal knowledge about this case. I picked that case to testify about".

Mr. Wagner when hearing this case heard evidence that Alvin Gunn had been beaten almost to death. He lay in hospital for four days and was not expected to recover. What did the penitentiary do about it? Did they send a doctor on the first day to see him? Did they send a doctor on the second day? The third day was St. Jean Baptiste day so they

did not send any doctor then, either. It was four days before a doctor saw this prisoner. When the present attorney general of Quebec, the judge in this case, heard the evidence he sentenced Mr. Gunn to one day's imprisonment, to run consecutively. You can look at the return made in this house on November 16 and you will find the offences listed there. Mr. Melançon—I do not know him; I have not met him—got two years on the first and second charges and three years on the third.

Another man who has always been mentioned is O'Brien. There was not sufficient evidence to convict him and he was acquitted. He was acquitted on the evidence of some of the prisoners who received very severe sentences. Five years went to the other leader of the riot, the sentence being consecutive to the sentence imposed by Judge Provost. Each of these sentencing judges passed different sentences. I do not know what the defence was. I know these people do not have any money. I do not know whether defending lawyers are provided in Montreal. I understand that some of them see a defending lawyer only half an hour before their trial commences.

There was a great deal of evidence that the penitentiary staff would not allow lawyers to come in, and that these men were discouraged from having lawyers. But this man received a sentence of 14 years imprisonment. The appeal period has gone by and I know that justice cannot be served now. I do not know whether the minister has the right to ask for a new trial; I do not know whether it would serve any purpose. But we had better ask ourselves one thing. What the hell are we doing with these prisoners? Do we want to rehabilitate them or do we want to punish them? If you wanted to punish Gaston Nicholas, why didn't you put one more guard in there and kill him, instead of beating him half to death?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Peters: This man's nerves are bad; his mental condition is not good. He says himself that he is mentally upset. The staff are accusing him of inciting this riot. He was segregated for 23 months in a cell and was not in contact with any other prisoner, had no job and received no exercise except for this half an hour; and they do not get even this amount of exercise every day. We treat these men as animals. We treat Gaston Nicholas as an animal because he participated in a riot. His participation was grabbing the warden and telling him "For God's sake don't shoot my friends who are lying on their bellies on the ground". Don't forget, Mr. Chairman, that the smoke was down almost to the ground, and also that the army was in there, the federal police were there, and all the guards. Most of them have never fired a gun in their lives.

The minister will have to do something about this, because the situation is a disgrace. I do not blame him for it, but in all honesty he must do something about it. These men got rid of $2 million worth of property. Guards should be well enough trained to see that property is not destroyed. We do not want homosexuals sitting in an office with the warden drinking coffee every morning. That is not the way to run a prison. Why should this man be promoted to this position? This is not a Sunday school outing. What is an information officer for the penitentiaries branch anyway? Is this a $14,000 a year job which some clerk did before? We should not put him in a soft job to keep him out of trouble.

I know the minister has considered this problem, and I appreciate that he has given the penitentiaries more consideration than they have had for many years. He is, in my opinion, energetic and is making decisions in light of the over-all problem. But as long as the back door to a prison exists there will be no more beatings in St. Vincent de Paul, because I am sure they will get news of any beatings straight to parliament. So it will not happen again. They will carry the blackjack for self defence from now on.

I know the minister will correct some of these problems, but I should like to know what will happen to the people who took part in the riot and to the general inmate population of the prison. I do not suggest you should let all prisoners out for exercise every Sunday, but there must be enough guards provided to let one half out one day and the other half out another day. When there was a riot at Dorchester we did not cut off for three years the privileges of all the prisoners, many of whom had nothing to do with the riot. I am sure this was not done at Stony Mountain and at all the others. There have been riots at Kingston. Kingston has been burned on a number of occasions, but not all the prisoners were penalized. In my opinion this hits at the whole idea of reform.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I must interrupt the hon. member to advise him that the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, this is a big subject and I will not be long. The committee has been very courteous.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could take advantage of the interruption to raise another matter. As far as the government is concerned it is quite agreeable to sitting through the lunch hour. Since there is a vote pending on item 1 of the Department of Justice estimates I suggest that we leave item 1 of the department on the understanding it will be called immediately at 2.30 of the clock and that in the meantime we proceed with other items. When I say "proceed with other items" I wonder whether hon. members would consider, after the hon. member for Timiskaming has concluded his remarks, leaving the estimates of the justice department until 2.30 and having another department called, such as public works.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, we are quite agreeable to sitting through the lunch hour on the condition that the first item of justice will stand and will be resumed at 2.30 irrespective of what is then before the committee. In the interval we are prepared to continue with the other items of justice and public works and any other department brought forward.

Mr. Knowles: That is acceptable to us, Mr. Chairman. I think there was a general feeling in the house that the hon. member for Timiskaming might be given an extra few minutes to complete his speech, and then we will go on to some other department.

Mr. Leboe: We agree.

The Deputy Chairman: Is it agreed that the hon. member for Timiskaming continue his speech?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Peters: I do not wish to say much more, Mr. Chairman. In St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary there is still a terrific fear on the part of the guards. This arises from their lack of training, which is being corrected with the building of a training centre, but it is my suggestion that some of the guards at Kingston be transferred to St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary and some of the guards at St. Vincent de Paul be transferred to Kingston on a temporary basis. I have been in Kingston penitentiary, and I found a much better morale among the guards there than at Montreal. I found this was mainly because the guards at Montreal have not had the opportunity for training as have the guards in the other institutions. I know the minister has this matter under consideration and will consider it. I think the chief warden at St. Vincent de Paul is to be complimented on the fact that he has been able to eliminate most of these abuses.

I might mention that under the former warden it was possible for a homosexual to be moved into a cell next to his friend; this was always arranged for with the guards. Perhaps there is nothing wrong with this, because I do know some of the problems connected with homosexuality. I do not know what you can do about it in prison. The prisoners themselves say that this affects 60 per cent of the prison population and affects the guards too, though not all according to Mr. Gunn. But it is a factor which has to be considered, and the guards should be sent to a proper training centre where competent people will be able to train the staff.

The penitentiaries are also plagued by a lack of psychiatrists. For example, the psychiatrist in charge of Kingston penitentiary said something which surprised me, and that was that we have such better success in curing psychiatric patients in the penitentiary at Kingston that we sometimes send other patients there too. This psychiatrist to whom I talked indicated that they were able to keep them within the confines of the prison because of the better environment, which I think is the word he used.

What do they do with these patients at St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, Mr. Chairman? They put them in a dungeon in the basement, a rat infested place where no person could ever be treated. There is only a part time psychiatrist, and all he seems to do is give them pills. When the goof ball rumble commenced they said it was due to the psychiatric patients. Half of the prisoners convicted as leaders were doped up with goof balls.

Although the psychiatric aspect is very important there is no excuse for it. I say to Mr. MacLeod, the commissioner, that there is no excuse for not immediately evolving some system whereby the complaint of an inmate is referred to some designated person who will be able to give a reply the following day. I found when at St. Vincent de Paul that the morale of the guards was much higher four years ago under the former warden who has now retired, whose name was Lacourt or something like that. He used to see all the inmates who had complaints. I do not say that all complaints should be handled in this way because probably the warden would have more to do than that, but the prisoners should be able to go to somebody.

Let us suppose, Mr. Chairman, that you are a prisoner in jail. A prisoner may receive a letter indicating that his wife has decided to leave him and live with the next door neighbour because he is not there. The prisoner immediately wants someone with whom he can consult, someone who will not only make an effort to do something in the prison but will, if possible, contact the John Howard society, the Elizabeth Fry society or other agencies including the Salvation Army, so they may visit his home and talk to his wife because he is not allowed to do. I think a prisoner has a right to expect that this will be done on his behalf. They should not be thrown in a dungeon to which the key is thrown away.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter here and a reply from the deputy warden, in his own handwriting, which contains a picture of Gaston Nicholas' little girl. This picture was sent to him and is of his six year old daughter dressed in a confirmation dress. He wanted to have possession of this picture in his cell, but he was not permitted to do so. There are stooges today who carry the keys to the locks on their cells at St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary. Those individuals have their cell walls covered with pin-up girls. I see the commissioner shaking his head, but he was with me when I visited those cells and knows that that is the situation. Why should we allow this situation to exist, yet not allow a prisoner such as Nicholas to have this picture of his little girl in her confirmation dress? I think that is a reasonable request on the part of any prisoner.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to belabour the point, but there seem to be discriminatory practices in various penitentiaries. I believe this situation has existed for a long period of time. I know what Mr. MacLeod said in this letter, and that he was influential in having this prisoner transferred to another penitentiary. I am sure that through investigation he would find that this man is not a vicious or antagonistic prisoner. While he is very highly strung, he is serving whatever sentence has been imposed upon him. He has now served one year of the new 14 year sentence, and I think some consideration should be given to him.

If the minister is not interested in the individual prisoners themselves and their representations, all his highfalutin' statements about changes to be made at the higher echelon level will be to no avail. These prisoners must feel that the minister is their friend and that justice is being and will be done. They must also be convinced that the officials believe they are not fair game for anyone just because they have been convicted of an offence. We must convince them that they cannot be punished in any other way or in addition to the sentences imposed by the courts for the offences of which they have been convicted. When one looks down the rows of segregation cells he will find that individuals have been kept there in some cases for 23 months, not even knowing when they were going to get out. That is not fair and just treatment but a form of punishment worse, in my opinion, than corporal punishment. The lash is used at the Kingston penitentiary, and if by using the lash there they have done away with the practice of segregating prisoners one might even consider that a less barbaric form of penal reform.

Mr. Chairman, I will conclude my remarks by suggesting that anyone who has listened to the story told by Gaston Nicholas will realize that he is not an unreasonable prisoner but an individual who feels he has been taken advantage of, that justice has not been done and that he is being punished to a greater degree than the punishment imposed on him by the court for the offence he committed.

It is my understanding that the original court case involved grave doubts as to whether he was guilty of manslaughter. As I remember the circumstances, some evidence about an insurance policy came to light several weeks after the death had been certified as accidental drowning, at which time the case was reopened. There was considerable doubt about the innocence or guilt of this man at his first trial, and if by some strange quirk of justice he is innocent, one can imagine the agitation of his mind at times when he is unfairly treated, to say nothing of the fact that he is serving a lifetime sentence for something that he at least claims he did not do.

The Deputy Chairman: Does the committee agree that item 1 of the estimates of the Department of Justice stand now until 2.30 this afternoon?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Deputy Chairman: In the interval perhaps the committee will consider the estimates of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, is there any reason why we should not go ahead with the other estimates of the Department of Justice?

Mr. Pickersgill: The minister would like to get some lunch.

Mr. Churchill: What about the rest of us?

Mr. Knowles: Perhaps the rest of us can have something sent in.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall I call the first item of the estimates of the Department of Public Works?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, if the minister must remain here during the consideration of the other items in his estimates without knowing when they will be carried, he would prefer that we go on with our consideration of the estimates of the Department of Public Works at this time.

Mr. Churchill: I do not know whether anyone on this side intends to speak on the other estimates of the Department of Justice. If anyone has such an intention perhaps he could give some indication at this time. If not, perhaps we could go ahead and pass the items.

Mr. McIlraith: Is that agreeable?

Mr. Knowles: I think that would be agreeable, providing an opportunity is afforded the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond to speak on the combines investigation item.

Mr. McIlraith: Perhaps he could do so on item 1.

Mr. Favreau: Yes, he can make his remarks on item No. 1.

Mr. Alkenbrack: I have several remarks to make during our consideration of the item regarding the administration of penitentiaries.

Mr. Pickersgill: You can make those remarks on item 1.

Mr. Alkenbrack: If that is agreed I will make my remarks when we are again considering item 1 at 2.30.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move that we reduce the item regarding the liaison service director.

Mr. Walker: Let us consider those two items at 2.30.

Mr. Peters: Will the minister give me an assurance that he will personally look into this situation?

[The Deputy Chairman.]

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, I have listened very carefully and with interest to the remarks made by the hon. member for Timiskaming. I felt that he had a very sincere interest in the matter, and I followed his remarks very closely. I am sure he knows what I have been trying both to say and to do in the relatively short time at my disposal. I am sure he realizes now that we intend to do a great deal within a short period of time. If I do undertake to look into the particular situation to which he has referred, with his co-operation, perhaps he will not wish to pursue this matter further.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the other items stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McIlraith: That leaves items 1, 1a and 1b.

Item stands.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

1. General administration, including grants as detailed in the estimates, $12,114,500.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, would the minister make a statement about the national capital commission? I am very interested in this item.

Mr. Churchill: That is vote No. 60.

Mr. Peters: O.K., I will make my remarks on vote 60.

Item agreed to.

National capital commission—

60. Operation and maintenance, general administration and interest charges on outstanding loans that were made for the purpose of acquiring property in the national capital region, $5,420,000.

Mr. Peters: I am interested particularly in a decision that is being made, and which is before the house, in relation to moving the railway station. I am curious about whether or not if we defeat this bill, the capital commission will still be empowered to go ahead and move the station. I should like to know if we have the right to instruct the national capital commission as to the wishes of parliament.

I do not want to belabour the point, but in my opinion, this should be the last time the national capital commission estimates are brought before parliament in this way. I believe the commission itself should appear before a committee of the house so that hon. members could be acquainted with what the commission is doing and the commission could

receive some direction from members of parliament. I believe that when the former government was in office they decided to divest the prime minister of this responsibility and put it under the ministry of public works. I believe the capital commission should be in the same category as Canadian National Railways and some of these other large government operations and should, therefore, come before parliament in one way or another for direction.

I believe there are many members in this house who believe a commuter station should be constructed, not necessarily anything like we have down here now, in the centre of the city. In this way Montreal and Ottawa could be connected by means of a rapid transit service. This commuter service could utilize a two track road through a tunnel from the area where the proposed station is to be erected. I understand the whole area is going to be covered over, anyway.

We had a discussion yesterday, Mr. Chairman, in which we were told of plans to build a 500 bed hotel near the Chateau Laurier—at least, they are going to offer the property for this purpose. For what purpose are you going to build a hotel if you are not going to make any arrangements to get the passengers down town? I do not believe we have thought this plan through. I understand that Mr. Greber came over from France and drew up a plan. It has been changed a number of times. I do not say that parliament changed it, but it has been changed as a result of Ottawa politics, the mayor and her council. I do not believe parliament has been able to really consider this matter. I think it is the responsibility of the commission to give some consideration to the wishes of members of parliament.

I have never been happy with the Expo '67 coat of arms. Parliament said that they thought it was nuts, but that decision was overruled. Perhaps if we had considered this matter a little earlier the directors might have given more consideration to our wishes. However, we are not too late to give consideration to this station. I understand they are going to have a depot for express at Alta Vista road on Industrial avenue. However, we are not too late for the station. The cloverleaf is not built at Alta Vista. The trains cross the road there and stop traffic every morning as I come in. There is an open crossing there which is going to be eliminated when the cloverleaf is completed. If they are going to construct a four lane highway along the canal, as has been indicated, you will have a four lane highway leading nowhere. We are going to get rid of the railroad bridge, as I understand it. While I am not objecting to the four lane highway, it seems to me that much more consideration could be given to a small two track roadway coming in from the marshalling yard at Walkley road or Industrial avenue.

I have no objection to the erection of a small station out there to serve that end of the city as well. It seems to me a survey was conducted which indicated that about 75 per cent of the passengers coming into the station were businessmen who were going down town. There are not many people coming to visit other people in Ottawa. It is true that we have government buildings now at Confederation heights as a result of some crazy deal to spread them all over the landscape. They should be concentrated near the parliament buildings so that members of parliament could walk over and have investigations made into matters which interest them.

If we had not agreed to this silly business of cutting off debate tonight I would not be prepared to pass the national capital commission estimates. I do not believe there has been any study made of this plan. I do not believe it is too late to do so now. I do not want to be obnoxious and hold up the minister's estimates, but I think we should have some assurance that the national capital commission is not going to get itself into a mess. If the members from the other parts of Canada are not going to support a national capital commission, you are not going to have one. It certainly is not going to be run the way it is. The Minister of Public Works is going to be responsible for the parkways, and so on, rather than the capital commission, and that may be the way to do it because we can question him. We have the commission in an exalted position where we have not been able to talk to them. The first time I had the opportunity of talking to them was in the railway committee room.

This is the first time I have heard anything about this plan or had any opportunity of discussing this plan since 1957 when I first came here. I understand it was discussed in 1956, but since I have been here it has not been discussed. I do not believe we should say it is too late to change it, because we never had a chance to change it or to say anything about it.

Mr. Deschatelets: The points raised by the hon. member are not only interesting, but I can say they are well taken. We are dealing

here with a portion of the over-all Greber plan, a plan which has been reviewed by Parkins and Associates. I may say to the hon. member that so far I have received many suggestions, many of them coming from this side of the house, which have had to do with expropriation by the N.C.C. and other matters such as the relocation of the railway lines and the tearing down of the old union station.

It would not be easy for me to go into the very technical details of this over-all plan, but since the plan was made some 15 years ago I think it would be a good thing to have it reviewed by a committee. I have previously said so, and I believe it would give all hon. members an opportunity to become more acquainted with the plan and to express their own ideas. If some members are not satisfied with the expropriations by the N.C.C. they would have an opportunity to say so.

I would bring the N.C.C. experts with me and, if it could be arranged with the house leader, I would be most happy to arrange for a committee and have my officials present at it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caron: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to delay passage of the national capital commission estimates we are considering at present.

We had a plan prepared by Mr. Greber who came to Ottawa and I know that, since then, implementation of the plan has started on the Ontario side, but the Quebec side has been completely overlooked. In fact, the Greber plan has been shelved because it provided for two stations, one in the western area, in Ottawa and the other in the eastern area, in Hull.

I asked officials of the national capital commission what would be done on the Hull side and I was told: "We are going to repair the station we have there".

Mr. Chairman, that station is nothing more than a shed which cannot be repaired. A new station is a necessity in Hull. It would permit us to enjoy more rapid service between Montreal and Ottawa, through Hull, as the distance is 20 miles shorter.

But no one seems to worry about Hull. It is remembered when time comes to build a road to the Gatineau hills, because the scenery is beautiful; other than that, the national capital commission forgets all about Hull.

I maintain that this situation should be remedied, with regard to the attitude not only of the N.C.C. but of all the departments, for the city of Hull is an integral part of the national capital. It seems that Hull is ignored, and this is where I start to revolt.

It seems that we must always bow and abide by the decisions of the national capital commission. I am tired with this state of affairs, and I do not intend to accept it in the future. The national capital commission will have to grant Hull the services which we can see from the parliament buildings, and also those from the inside, which we cannot see.

All kinds of works are undertaken in Ottawa. Contributions are granted toward the construction of the queensway, the sewer and water systems, but when we ask assistance for the city of Hull, no financial means or time are available.

I would ask that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Deschatelets) intervene with the national capital commission so it changes its attitude toward the city of Hull.

Hull is part and parcel of the national capital and it should enjoy the same services as the city of Ottawa, on a smaller scale, I admit, but it should still be considered as an important thing, and I am tired of the unfortunate attitude taken by the commissioners.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that when the mayors sat on the commission, things went differently because they stood up for their municipality. But since the mayors were eliminated, decisions are reached without our being told about them. I ask the minister to urge the authorities of the national capital commission to open their eyes, their ears and their hearts, to look on the other side of the river where something important is going on, is developing and wants to become an important part of the national capital.

[*Text*]

Mr. McBain: Mr. Chairman, we are all aware of the value of the tourist dollar which comes into Canada each year. The city of Ottawa is quite conscious of the large number of tourists visiting it each summer, and in Ottawa there are certain places of interest which tourists like to see. One of the most attractive is the parliament buildings, and tourists also are great patrons of sightseeing trips by bus through the city.

A friend of mine who often drives one of the O.T.C. sightseeing buses tells me that in summertime, travelling along Sussex street, when the bus stops outside 24 Sussex drive it is almost impossible to see the residence of the Prime Minister behind the trees and shrubbery when they are in full foliage. The

same is true of the residence of the Governor General. It cannot be seen from Sussex street, but if a little pruning were done a wonderful view of the residence could be obtained from McKay street.

I ask the minister to place this suggestion before the N.C.C. as it would please a lot of tourists if they could see these two points of interest.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY

1. Departmental administration, including grants as detailed in the estimates, $1,381,000.

Mr. Knowles: Where is the minister?

Mr. Deschatelets: I am the acting minister.

Item agreed to.

LEGISLATION

1. Allowance in lieu of residence to the Speaker of the Senate, $3,000.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate very much the opportunity of making a short statement. It is not too short but it should not last many minutes. It is an attempt to summarize the activities of the Speaker's establishment or department during the past year. I am sure that this statement—and I have copies of it for all hon. members—will prove to be of interest, and if I might have the consent of hon. members—

Mr. Churchill: You are going to read your speech, are you, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: This is an occasion which arises once a year. If the house will give me a little indulgence—it is my only opportunity—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Chairman, I think it might be of some assistance to the committee if I were to make a brief statement at this time.

Someone once observed that the real difference between the Speaker and his fellow members is that he never says anything which does not need to be said. Whether that be so or not, I do think that this is one occasion on which a Speaker is bound by the responsibility of his office to speak and to give an accounting of his stewardship.

In a very real sense, the Speaker's estimates are of more direct interest and concern to the members of the house than those of any department of government. Included in the amount which parliament is asked to vote under the legislation item are all the funds necessary for the payment of the staff, the maintenance of services and facilities, the printing of *Hansard* and other parliamentary papers, the work of committees, and all the other complex activities that are part and parcel of the operation of a modern democratic parliament.

In Canada today the nation's business has become big business. And it seems to me that the time has come to bring a business approach to its operation.

The Speaker's establishment—totalling some 1,000 persons and with a budget this year of nearly $10 million—is the equivalent of a fairly sizeable business operation. It is, of course, very different in many respects from any other business or government organization—and not the least of these is the fact that it has not one but 265 bosses.

This has been, shall we say, an "interesting" year for the Speaker in this very interesting house. I shall not comment on the Speaker's experiences in the Chair—interesting or otherwise—as these are a matter of record.

Suffice it to say that this has been the longest session on record—both as to the number of sittings and as to uninterrupted continuity. Questions on the order paper are nearing the 2,500 mark; *Hansard* exceeds 10,500 pages; and on December 1, the House of Commons will have completed more than 200 sitting days.

A Speaker in this country must not only be bilingual; he must be ambidextrous as well. He has on the one hand his responsibilities in the chamber; on the other hand, he has to assume the ministerial responsibility for the administration of all staff and services of the house.

In these brief remarks, I should like to deal first with developments related to the chamber itself and then to comment on some of the administrative and related questions.

PROCEDURAL CHANGES

As hon. members will know, we have had during this session a very active special committee on procedure and organization of which I have the honour to be chairman. This committee was appointed on the motion of the right honourable the Prime Minister and with the unqualified support of the leader of the official opposition and the leaders of all other parties in the house. Its appointed task was to help improve the efficiency of our operations, in short, to suggest any changes or reforms that would strengthen parliament and make it more effective.

I think the committee has many positive—if unspectacular—achievements to its credit, and that it continues to make steady prog-

ress. A number of other important and fundamental matters are currently before the committee with which it would, of course, be improper for me to deal at this time.

Although the committee has already produced 14 reports, incorporating more than 30 recommendations, some hon. members may feel we have been rather slow in bringing before the house proposals which could be described as far reaching. But I should like to emphasize that from the very outset the committee has taken the view that changes in our procedure should be evolutionary rather than revolutionary; that they should be acceptable in all parts of the house; that they should be achieved through the slow process of discussion and persuasion to the point of unanimous conviction rather than by a majority forcing its will. Every member of the committee has taken this view, with the result that we have achieved a collective team spirit and a common awareness of the problems which need to be solved. This surely is the way to success.

Perhaps I may be permitted to enumerate a few of the procedural changes which have already been implemented on the recommendation of the committee:

—a revised procedure for the question period;

—a safety-valve in what the hon. member for Kootenay West has described as "the late show" for debating grievances on the adjournment motion at the end of the day;

—an improved procedure for dealing with notices of motions for the production of papers;

—the better regulation of statements on motions;

—the limitation of debate on the resolution stage of a money bill and the tidying up of the committee stage procedure;

—the definition of the powers of the Chair in relation to the acceptance of emergency adjournment motions;

—certain reforms affecting the appointment and sittings of committees;

—provision in the standing orders for the house not to sit on certain statutory holidays.

All of these reforms, I am convinced, have contributed and will continue to contribute to the more effective functioning of the parliamentary machine.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS

When the Speaker's supplementary estimates were under consideration last April, the hon. member for Lapointe spoke of certain difficulties in respect to the French edition of the debates of the house. He referred to the fact that the French *Hansard* was often late in delivery. He also made the suggestion that some means be found whereby the pagination of the French version would be the same as that of the English edition.

I am very pleased to report that both of these problems are solved—or on their way to solution.

Late Delivery of French "Hansard"

A number of changes have been made in the *Hansard* format, type-styles and editorial practices which have all but eliminated the problem of late *Hansard*. Implementation of other proposals is pending or under study to effect further improvements in this important area. Corresponding improvements in the translation, printing, and publication of committee proceedings are also under review.

Uniform Pagination of English and French "Hansard"

Experimentation began in April of this year, commencing with Fridays, and by June 19, these experiments had been extended to each sitting day of the week. Since then, the pagination differential between the two editions has remained almost constant. It should be possible, if we start at the beginning of the next session, to maintain uniform pagination between the two editions.

Entirely English and French versions of "Hansard"

Since September 1963, *Hansard* has been printed entirely in English in the same manner as the French edition. An average saving of $400 for each sitting day has been possible through this change.

Order Paper

Hon. members will have noticed, I am sure, the improvements made in the order paper during this session, on the recommendation of the special committee on procedure and organization. In June 1964, the content and format of the order paper were changed on a trial basis for the present session with a view to providing

1) a weekly projection of the order of business day by day of the house;

2) a complete list of all house business under each heading of the order paper;

3) permanent numbers for government orders; and

4) a disposition list of finished government business or of business otherwise disposed of.

From the comment which I have heard, the changes in the order paper seem to be welcome improvements and I expect that they will become a permanent feature.

I may say that the committee on procedure and organization—through a subcommittee under the chairmanship of the former Speaker, the hon. member for Edmonton West—is now working on a number of additional suggestions for the further improvement of *Hansard* and other parliamentary papers.

Division Time Shortened in the House

A modified division list has been devised which has shortened the length of time formerly required to call and record divisions in the house by as much as 35 per cent.

Physical Services

An effort is also being made to improve the physical services directly related to the chamber of the house and its committees.

Simultaneous Interpretation

On the recommendation of the special committee on procedure and organization, simultaneous interpretation facilities are being extended to all galleries of the house so that visitors from all parts of Canada will be able to follow the debates regardless of which of the official languages is being spoken.

This work is already in progress together with the repair, refinishing and reupholstering of gallery seats.

Electronic Recording in Committees

We are also, on the recommendation of that committee, experimenting with the use of electronic recording of debates in committees.

Trials with electronic recording apparatus in selected committee rooms started at the end of May and have been successfully extended to provide a complete recording service of all committee proceedings in rooms equipped with suitable sound pick-up amplification apparatus. In actual practice, the French portions of these recordings are being transcribed for use in the printed proceedings of committees. In this way, the problem of French reporting services in committees has been solved. The trials will be continued and extended to those committee rooms not having any sound pick-up or amplification apparatus.

Renovation of the Chamber

We have been informed by senior officials of the Department of Public Works that major renovation and repair work is necessary, both in the chamber itself and elsewhere throughout this building. The work in the chamber is extensive, involving stone work, glazing, lighting, seating and other general repairs or replacements.

The house will be glad to know that arrangements have been worked out to have this project—involving about nine months' work—scheduled during recesses and in such a manner as to have the chamber completely refurbished in time for the centennial year of 1967.

Renovation of the Centre Block

The work elsewhere in the building will involve, among other things, complete rewiring, extensive plumbing and the installation of air conditioning throughout the building. There is also work to be done in the library, the hall of honour and the restaurant. This extensive work would involve major disruption and disorder in the building if it were intended to have it completed by 1967.

It has therefore been decided to postpone this major work until 1968 when it can be carried out most efficiently and with the least inconvenience to members.

This decision does not mean that normal maintenance and repair work will come to a standstill for the next three years; nor would it preclude new major work that could be carried out in the interval without serious disruption or inconvenience to members.

ADMINISTRATION

Let me turn now to administration.

Reorganization

The most notable event on the administrative side has been a thorough organization study of the structure of the staff and services of the house. This study revealed that the Clerk, who has extremely heavy burdens of responsibility at the table, has to spend a disproportionately large amount of his time dealing with administrative and personnel problems large and small.

The result has been a complete reorganization, carried out in June of this year, to provide sufficient senior staff to relieve the Clerk of administrative routine and to pursue problems to a solution. A director of administration has been provided as well as a director of legislative services.

These two men, together with the Sergeant-at-Arms, as director of building services, form a three-man staff board to which all questions respecting establishment and personnel are now referred, whatever the source of the questions or whatever the branch involved.

Hon. members may be interested in learning that the new staff board held its first meeting on August 31, and has met nine times to date.

Salary Revisions

Following the salary revisions for group B employees in the civil service last August, all employees of the house in comparable occupations also received pay adjustments. By and large, the amounts of revision authorized for our employees were the same as those granted civil servants in the same salary groups. None of our employees got less; a few, however, received more.

This is as it should be, for members are entitled to the very best of service and this can only be provided by competent staff. To retain our present staff and to attract our fair share of good candidates in the future, salaries and working conditions should be as good as they possibly can be. In these respects the House of Commons should lead and not follow.

Classification Study

Altogether apart from the general salary revisions, a complete classification study of all positions on the staff of the house is now under way. This will result in further salary adjustments where warranted.

Sessional Employees

I should point out that almost half of the staff of the house is composed of so-called "sessionals". I am sure that all members will welcome the action taken by the commissioners of internal economy in September, on my recommendation, to grant sessional employees benefits which they had never previously enjoyed.

In the past, sessional employees have not been eligible to accumulate vacation leave, regardless of their length of service. This anomalous situation has been corrected and sessional employees may now earn vacation leave on the basis of 1¼ days for each complete month of service, for a total of 15 working days per year.

The new benefits for sessional employees is only one item in a series of new measures—some already approved and some still under study by the staff board—to improve working conditions for the staff of the house.

Changes in Vacation Leave Benefits for Continuous Employees

Regulations governing the granting of vacation leave to continuous employees were also amended in September. The restriction against the granting of leave while the house is sitting has been removed. Employees are also granted one extra week annually after 25 years of service. Furthermore, compensation for work done on a day that is not normally a day of work is on a day for day basis and is no longer included in the over-all vacation leave provisions.

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

Provision has now been made, for the first time, for a formal grievance procedure which will provide for consideration of grievances by:

(1) the immediate supervisor of the aggrieved employee and, failing satisfaction, by

(2) the director concerned, and failing satisfaction, by

(3) the staff board and, failing satisfaction, by

(4) the Clerk of the House of Commons,

all with pre-determined time periods for each step in the procedure. It is hoped that this will eliminate the presentation of grievances direct to the Speaker or to individual members of parliament.

RESTAURANT AND CAFETERIA

With guidance and advice from the joint committee on the restaurant and under the capable and energetic leadership of the hon. member for Winnipeg South, steps are being taken to improve further the services provided to members by the restaurant, cafeteria and the coffee shop.

The manager, maitre d'hotel and chef recently underwent a most valuable two-week internship in one of Canada's leading hotels. They have returned with a great many useful suggestions which are now in process of implementation.

Working conditions of the restaurant and cafeteria staffs—to which the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam and other hon. members have referred—are also being studied with a view to improvement. For example, plans have been approved for alterations and renovations to the staff washrooms which will be carried out on the very first occasion when the house recesses for a sufficiently long period to permit the work to be done.

ACCOMMODATION

Space in the centre and west blocks for the essential needs of parliament continues to be an extremely difficult problem. Every effort is being made to accommodate the

requirements of party leaders, ministers, members and staff as equitably as possible. We are also trying to discourage the use of accommodation on parliament hill for non-parliamentary purposes.

The long term solution, of course, will require additional space and this will probably have to await the availability of the east block for parliamentary use.

As part of the accommodation problem, there is the difficult and long-standing question of the parliamentary press gallery. Conditions in the space occupied by members of the gallery are entirely unsatisfactory and represent a very serious fire hazard. The dominion fire commissioner has been insistent that the corridor adjoining the office space must be cleared just as soon as possible.

I am concerned, not only with the overcrowding, the unattractive appearance and the serious fire hazard, but with the fact that gallery members are not accommodated in the manner that senior newspapermen reporting the parliament of Canada should be. I am most anxious to find a solution that will provide to members of the gallery adequate, attractive and efficient accommodation free from the hazard of fire. In this connection, I have made a specific proposal to the executive of the gallery and it is now under consideration.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

Tourists

The activities of our parliament, and in particular of this house, are probably attracting greater public attention than at any previous time in Canadian history; this may be an understatement. This is a development to be encouraged, for parliament is the central hub of our public life and should be the embodiment of our dignity as a nation and a people.

I am able to report that a record number of people visited parliament hill during the past tourist season, and that visitors from other countries no less than Canadians themselves have been showing an unprecedented interest in our parliamentary buildings, our traditions, our history, and our proceedings.

To date this year, more than 660,000 persons have visited the building—an increase of 100,000 over last year's total. In the peak months of July and August we had nearly 300,000 visitors—296,880, in fact—and on the long week end in May there was a three day total of 33,221. The record for a single day was on Sunday, May 17—during the tulip festival—when no less than 15,600 persons visited the building.

Student Guides

Many of these visitors were conducted around the parliamentary buildings by the special student guides who were appointed for the summer to augment the regular protective staff. These students—many bilingual and drawn from a dozen Canadian universities—performed their duties with outstanding success, and I should like to take this opportunity of commending them for their excellent work.

I may say that student guides were appointed on the recommendation of the heads of their respective universities.

So successful was this experiment that I plan to have the program expanded next year. I hope that in time we will be able to draw students from all the universities of Canada and build up a corps d'honneur of parliamentary guides. In bringing these young people together, and in bringing them into contact with the public, we can promote better understanding, the exchange of ideas, and a greater awareness of our common heritage as Canadians.

New Seating Plans

The recruitment of these guides has done much to promote the public relations of parliament. However, this is an area in which much more needs to be done. One of the best ways of doing this is through the provision of attractive informational material.

The new coloured seating plan folder, which was produced on the initiative of the special committee on procedure and organization, is a first step in that direction.

The new seating plan has now been in circulation for five months and has been very well received. A copy is automatically given to every visitor to the building. Members may like to be reminded that they are entitled to receive on request to the Sergeant-at-Arms up to 1,000 copies each year free of charge for distribution to their constituents.

The importance of good public relations was brought home to me very forcibly during my visits to London and Washington last January, where I found a wide range of high quality material, including books, brochures and postcards, available for purchase by the public. This surely is the way to bring home to the people the significance of parliament and the representative system. It is not commercialization; it is education for citizenship.

Publications Sales Desk

With this end in view, we plan to establish within the building a sales desk where suitable material on parliament can be sold at reasonable cost to the public by the queen's printer. It will be of dignified design and located in the short corridor on the west side of the hall of honour leading into the reading room. Here we hope to make available postcards and slides, of which a wide and impressive range can be produced from the excellent photographs available; published works relating to parliament; appropriate material already available through the queen's publisher; and booklets especially commissioned on behalf of this house.

I propose to take a special responsibility for the last-mentioned category, and to make every effort to ensure that the quality of their writing and presentation is of the very highest standard.

Christmas Cards

Members will be aware that this year, for the first time, a special parliamentary Christmas card—in six different designs—is available for their use at the very economical price of four cents a card, excluding the envelope. Its sale is being restricted to members and the senior officers of the house. Like the seating plan, it was initiated by the procedure and organization committee, and the bulk of the work involved was very capably undertaken by the hon. member for Northumberland.

I understand that orders for the Christmas cards have reached the impressive total of 120,000 to date.

May I congratulate the hon. member for Northumberland and her colleagues on the committee for the excellent taste shown in the selection of photographs.

RESEARCH FOR MEMBERS

One of the matters to which my colleague, the Speaker in the other place, and I have given a good deal of thought during the past year is the provision of improved research facilities for hon. senators and members. Let me add at once that we are fully conscious of the excellent services provided to both houses by the library of parliament and its staff. Within its sphere of operation the library is a model of efficiency and conscientious dedication, but no library can provide individual research service to 265 members and 102 senators.

In order to determine whether the high quality service of the library might be still further improved, a complete study of its organization—similar to that carried out for the House of Commons staff services—is now under way. In the meantime there is the evident need for a research staff.

It is a truism to say that the responsibilities of members increase with every passing year. The demands upon their time and their commitments in a multitude of spheres make for a very full and busy life. They are expected to be well-informed on all matters concerning the public interest, but this is easier to expect than to achieve.

The fact is that few of us can hope for an extensive knowledge of matters outside the areas of our own interests and we must rely on other sources of information. In these days the affairs of government extend into almost every area of human activity, and there is no limit to the range of subjects on which members are likely to require information.

It seems to me that the answer to the problem is to have trained research workers available to do this essential work on behalf of members. Such people would be able to undertake tasks which the present library staff, because of the pressure of their own work, are unable to do.

Those members who have visited the library of congress in Washington will no doubt be familiar with the legislative reference service which operates there, and of which our United States colleagues are so justly proud. While I do not envisage so ambitious a scheme for the Canadian parliament at this early stage, I certainly believe that steps should be taken which might lead eventually to the development of such a service.

To that end, I hope that next year will see the establishment of a small research unit under the jurisdiction of the library, and that it will provide the nucleus for something more ambitious in the future. By the way, it is planned to start with about five research officers.

PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATIONS

The work of the various interparliamentary associations has grown tremendously and the importance of these associations will continue to increase. Two of the associations—the NATO parliamentary association and the commonwealth parliamentary association—have just concluded most successful annual conferences in Paris, and Kingston, Jamaica, respectively. Hon members all know how important the NATO association is to Canada as

an inter-parliamentary link—particularly at this time—and I need not dwell on this.

I do want to say a special word about the commonwealth parliamentary association—one of our most important activities in this field. As hon. members will recall, the commonwealth prime ministers, at their conference last July, collectively emphasized the importance of the work of this association, as did the Prime Minister of Canada in his statement of July 17 last to the house, following that conference.

Within the past year, important steps have been taken to strengthen the work of these various interparliamentary groups and other delegations. We now have a room especially designed for the reception of distinguished visitors and its formal opening will take place in the very near future. I may say it is hoped to dedicate this room when Prime Minister Wilson comes to Ottawa. We have also appointed a full-time officer to act as co-ordinating secretary for the various parliamentary associations and he is now fully occupied in planning for the next meeting of the Canada-U.S. interparliamentary group, to take place in Canada next February, and for the 54th conference of the interparliamentary union which will bring some 600 delegates from up to 75 nations to Canada next September.

Planning has also been commenced for the important month-long general conference of the commonwealth parliamentary association which will take place in Canada during 1967.

While much of the staff work can be done by the co-ordinating secretary and other officers of the house who have worked with these associations, it will be the contribution in time and energy—and ideas—from hon. senators and members that will make these conferences a success and a credit to Canada.

These, then, are some of the highlights of the past year covered by the funds provided in the Speaker's estimates which, I hope, will commend themselves to the committee.

I would not wish to conclude this brief review without a special word of appreciation to the Clerk, the parliamentary librarian, the Sergeant-at-Arms and all the officers and employees of the house for their loyal and effective service. May I mention in particular the Clerk, Mr. Raymond, who under very difficult circumstances in this longest of all sessions in Canada's history, has been my constant adviser. I should also like to express my appreciation to my colleagues on the special committee on procedure and organization, especially to Mr. Deputy Speaker and the Deputy Chairman of Committees, and to all members of this house for their confidence and good will.

Item agreed to.

The Chairman: This concludes the study of the estimates under legislation.

SECRETARY OF STATE

Atlantic development board—

20. Administration and operation, $508,300.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I am in order in asking this particular question of the minister, and I intended to ask it this morning when reference to the subject was made by the hon. member for Northumberland, but when the Atlantic development board amendments were passed by this government the minister indicated that the $100 million made available would only be a floor. Does that mean there will be further funds available to the premier and government of Newfoundland for the development of the Hamilton falls project?

Mr. Pickersgill: There have been no funds made available for the Hamilton falls project out of the moneys of the Atlantic development board. I think what the hon. member has in mind is the grant toward the development of the Baie D'Espoir project in Newfoundland. I do not think it would ever be contemplated that the Atlantic development board with its scope could have any relationship to such a large project as the Hamilton falls project.

Mr. MacInnis: I am completely satisfied with the answer given by the minister, but what I had in mind was the transmission lines which will in all likelihood go through the maritime provinces. Will funds be made available as assistance to this particular development?

Mr. Pickersgill: I cannot imagine, sir, that if a project of that magnitude should come before parliament in any way it would be done through the Atlantic development board. Of course there is other legislation under the minister of northern affairs through which aid for transmission lines is given. This whole matter is hypothetical. I hope it does come about, as I know the hon. gentleman also hopes, but it is still in the planning stage and until it gets beyond that stage it would be premature for me to attempt to suggest how it will be done.

Mr. MacInnis: The minister suggests that this is still in the planning stage. Is that statement in any way in support of the statement made by Mr. Lesage last evening to the effect that what Premier Smallwood has said is not true, but a false statement?

Mr. Pickersgill: I do not think that has anything even remotely to do with my estimates.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a question that does have a great deal to do with the minister's estimates. I am wondering whether the minister can, with his usual precise brevity, indicate just what is in prospect for the province of Prince Edward Island under the Atlantic development board projects. I am confident there is more than one project in prospect covered by the $100 million. Has the minister any report to make about discussions that may have been taking place by the Prince Edward Island people and others, so as to give us a clear picture of what lies ahead for our province?

Mr. Pickersgill: As the hon. gentleman is aware, the biggest project in prospect at this time for Prince Edward Island is covered by a grant for the laying of a power cable across Northumberland strait which will involve the expenditure of an amount in the neighbourhood of $6 million to $7 million. Speaking from recollection, but I think I am right, the province has indicated that in principle it is favourable toward this project. I hope that the discussion going beyond the principal stage will advance as rapidly as possible, because all the information available to me leads me to believe that if this power project were carried out there would be a substantial reduction in the cost of power to users, and particularly industrial users in Prince Edward Island, and that is of course of real interest to the Atlantic development board in its efforts toward developing the economy.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I assume that the experts on the Atlantic development board have considered the comparative costs of transmittal on the causeway if it should be erected. Do I understand also from what the minister has said that the discussions of principle have been final and have now reached the stage of working toward something concrete? May we in fact count this as one of the things in which the Atlantic development board is going forward?

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

Mr. Pickersgill: It would be very wrong for me to speak for the government of the province of Prince Edward Island, but I am bound to say that I have had nothing but the most amicable relations with all the ministers of that government with whom I have had any contact. I had a conversation with the acting premier, Mr. Matheson and with Mr. Rossiter, the minister of industry—I may not have his precise title correct, and I apologize for not having all these things at my fingertips—last Saturday morning regarding certain projects. Considering that we are not of the same political complexion, I do not think we could have had more friendly relations than have existed between me and the ministers of the government of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong our consideration, but the amicability of the ministers of Prince Edward Island, or of the people there, is not in question. Is this project one which is definitely slated or slotted for Prince Edward Island?

Mr. Pickersgill: The Atlantic development board has recommended it strongly, and it has been accepted in principle by the government of Canada. I do not think there will be any delay beyond the point when the government of Prince Edward Island, or a company in Prince Edward Island designated by the government, is ready to receive the power. After all, the government of Prince Edward Island or a power company will be the recipients of the power. I am sure the hon. member will realize that it would be impertinent on my part to try to intervene in any way in provincial consideration of this matter.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Plourde: Mr. Chairman, can the minister tell me whether negotiations are now under way with the authorities of the city of Quebec, in order to deviate, as was asked many times, toward Charlesbourg, the railway line which now crosses the northeastern part of the city.

[*Text*]

The Chairman: Order, please. I do not think the subject referred to by the hon. member has anything to do with vote No. 20. Perhaps the minister has some information for the hon. member for Quebec West.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether we could carry item 20 and move on to a consideration of my other estimates.

Mr. Nasserden: I am not sure whether my remarks should be made at this time in relation to this item.

Mr. Pickersgill: Item 20 covers the Atlantic development board. If we carry that item we can then move on to the estimates of the Department of Transport.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

Marine services—

5. Administration, operation and maintenance including fees for membership in the international organizations listed in the details of the estimates, pensions, grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, the payment of expenses, including excepted expenses, incurred in respect of Canadian distressed seamen as defined in section 306 of the Canada Shipping Act and, in respect of the Canadian coast guard service, authority to make recoverable advances for transportation, stevedoring and other shipping services performed on behalf of individuals, outside agencies and other governments and authority, notwithstanding section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, to make commitments for the current fiscal year not to exceed a total amount of $23,774,400, $38,249,400.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether this is the right item to which I should relate this matter which has to do with the Hudson Bay route, but perhaps this is as good a place as any.

Mr. Pickersgill: Perhaps we could go on to the next item, which is railways and steamships, as I do not think the Hudson bay railway has much to do with marine services.

Mr. Nasserden: Marine services might be the right item under which to discuss an icebreaker in the system, but if I am wrong I will wait until we reach the next item.

Mr. Pickersgill: If the hon. gentleman wishes to speak about an icebreaker, now is the time to do so.

Mr. Nasserden: Thank you. I am sure the minister is aware that the officials of the bay route association would like to determine whether consideration will be given to extending icebreaker services in the bay and in the strait during certain seasons of the year. I mention this now in an attempt to ascertain whether the minister will give some indication of the government's view about this request.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad in one sentence to say that my colleague, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and my colleague the Minister of Veterans Affairs, and I, had a very pleasant meeting with representatives of what I still call the "On to the Bay Association", because I belong to the old guard and another generation. It is now called the Hudson bay railway association. These representatives still have the same stars in their eyes that I had in my eyes when I was a boy living in northern Manitoba. I am extremely sympathetic toward the whole idea and I will do everything I can to further it.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask one question in this regard, and I will do so as briefly as I can. I am sure we have all received communications from the delegation on this matter of the Hudson bay route. Can the minister tell us whether or not it is correct that the closing of the season in Hudson bay is set by whether or not the insurance companies will give shipping companies insurance? Then, will he say whether or not what we were told is correct, if any ship wants to come in you will supply icebreakers? I ask those two questions.

Mr. Pickersgill: I could not possibly answer those questions, even if I had a lot of technical advice. However, I will undertake, right here and now, to look into all the aspects of the questions and give the hon. gentleman or any other hon. gentleman who wishes, the best memorandum I can have prepared on the subject. It is a complicated subject. Since it deals with policy, I do not believe it would be possible to answer it at this moment.

Mr. Nasserden: There is one other observation I should like to make. Is the minister giving consideration to the feasibility of extending some kind of incentive to steamship lines that might be operating in this area by providing icebreaker service?

Mr. Pickersgill: Well, that is a big question also which we are considering.

Item agreed to.

Civil aviation—

35. Administration, operation and maintenance including the administration of the Aeronautics Act and regulations issued thereunder, $38,008,600.

Mr. Lambert: I have one point I should like to take up again with the Minister of Transport. It is something I have raised with his predecessors and something I have raised with his officials. I believe our international airports are highly deficient in one aspect. It is a small thing, but if there is anything that is cold it is the welcome we give to those landing in Canada at international airports. There is not one blessed sign that says, in French or English and it should be in both languages,

"welcome to Canada". We have directions in three languages to the comfort station, but that is something that is already provided on the aircraft. There have been suggestions in the past that this sort of thing should be done by local chambers of commerce. Well, I disagree. I do not believe local chambers of commerce have any business being at our international airports with signs saying "welcome to Canada".

These vast termini that we have now have all the room in the world in which to put up a suitable sign. We see them in other countries, and it gives you a feeling of welcome. You know, there is a difference between certain modes of transportation, a difference between private and public, but the one that is going to succeed is the one that welcomes you on board. I say to the minister that if the Department of Transport wishes to put these huge buildings to some greater use, then let us see what we can do. I think with a few thousands of dollars spent across the country, perhaps at half the cost of one of those very controversial murals or pieces of sculpture that we have at these terminals, we could erect these welcome signs and make Canadians and strangers alike coming here feel welcome.

Mr. Pickersgill: I am going to do something I do not believe I should do, but happily I have no officials in front of me. I am going to say that if I can warm the cold heart of the President of the Privy Council I will do what the hon. gentleman has suggested.

Mr. Hales: I should like to add to what the hon. member for Edmonton West had to say. I have returned recently from the commonwealth parliamentary association conference. I was speaking with members who had travelled practically all over the world. They rather embarrassed me by saying that the terminal in New York, I imagine it was at Kennedy airport, operated by Air Canada had the poorest service, was the most run-down airport and most in need of repainting, of any airport they had seen in their travels. I merely pass this on to the minister.

Mr. Pickersgill: I will pass it on to where it may do some good.

Mr. Hales: I have one other point in this regard. Has the minister made any provision to establish a medical review board, similar to that operated in the United States, whereby a pilot who has had his licence cancelled as a result of some physical ailment, and has recovered, may apply to have the licence renewed? Have we made any progress in this regard?

Mr. Pickersgill: I understand some progress is being made. I have not got the details in front of me but I will give the hon. gentleman the information.

Mr. Balcer: When I was minister of transport, unfortunately I could not warm the heart of our treasury board. I could not get it warm enough to get any favourable decision on rolling sidewalks at Montreal airport. I know this would be a very popular move if it could be done. It is a splendid airport, but unfortunately it is a tremendous walk for older people, children and tired passengers from the plane to the terminal. I should like to ask the minister if he has had any more success with his treasury board than I had with mine in this regard?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I will do my best.

Mr. Winch: It had been my intention originally to make a half hour speech on this one subject. However, in view of the circumstances I will reduce it to a question. I have been in continuous and close contact for over one year now with the pilots and private owners of aircraft in Vancouver and British Columbia in attempting to get some study of their problems. It seems to me that they do have a wonderful case and good reason for complaint. Instead of making a speech, may I ask the minister this question: What is he going to do to meet with them and with his officials in order to see the situation as it relates to landing fields, regulations, and so on?

Mr. Pickersgill: As soon as there is a recess of parliament I will try to make arrangements to see them, without any undue delay.

Mr. Lambert: There is one other point which is a carryover from the previous discussion. What steps have been taken to work out safety measures with the respective authorities, whether they are hydro commissions or private power companies, in these mountainous areas of Alberta and British Columbia where we have transmission lines going through the valleys and presenting tremendous hazards to low flying aircraft doing charter work as they move along these mountain valleys? This has caused a number of accidents, and according to correspondence with the minister's deputy I know a suggestion was made to mark or identify high transmission lines to make them visible to the

pilots of low flying aircraft. What progress has been made in this regard?

Mr. Pickersgill: In the present state of my personal knowledge all I can say is that I shall inquire into it at once and, if I can give it a push, I will do so.

Mr. Lambert: Would the minister write me a letter?

Mr. Pickersgill: Yes.

Mr. Macquarrie: I do not want to encroach on the territory of the charming and attractive member for Westmorland but I would like to point out that a great many Prince Edward Islanders spend a lot of time at Moncton waiting for planes and trains. I think the new railway station there much too small and there is a great danger that the terminal for air passengers will also be far too inadequate. I hope the minister, in his mood of benevolent exertion, will look into the situation. I believe the C.N.R. has somewhat fouled up its Ocean Limited schedule and, willy-nilly, is pushing more passengers on to Air Canada. Moncton is still the hub of the maritimes, and though the minister has paid tribute to us as a genial people, we do not like standing up for hours on end.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. member said too inadequate. I hope the facilities will not be inadequate at all. The hon. member for Cumberland raised the same question the other day and I may tell my hon. friend we are making a very careful examination of this point.

Mr. Balcer: I should like to make a plea on behalf of the flying clubs in Canada. Practically every modern country in the world had a surplus of pilots in the past, but the first generation of bush pilots have now reached the age of retirement and most pilots who earned their wings during the war are, like the rest of us, getting older. We have somewhat neglected our flying clubs and the great training work they did in the past which helped keep public interest alive in aviation and assisted us to supply pilots to practically every air line in the world.

We have the best pilots in the world and this is a reputation we should maintain. I hope the minister will study the matter to see if he can financially help the flying clubs of Canada which at present are all operating in difficult financial circumstances and are all making great sacrifices.

Mr. Pickersgill: I shall be glad to study the matter.

Mr. Nasserden: Could the minister outline what assistance is available to municipal airstrips in centres with populations of 15,000 or less?

Mr. Pickersgill: There is a printed document on the subject and I hope the hon. member will be agreeable to my sending it to him.

40. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment with respect to national airports (as determined by the Minister of Transport) and related facilities; contributions toward construction done by local or private authorities with respect to such airports, amounts to be paid in settlement of claims for compensation by persons whose property is injuriously affected by the operation of a zoning regulation made under authority of paragraph (j) of subsection (1) of section 4 of the Aeronautics Act and authority, notwithstanding section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, to make commitments for the current fiscal year not to exceed a total amount of $29,418,400, $26,359,000.

Mr. Knowles: Can the minister make any progress report with respect to the proposed structural renovations at the international airport in Winnipeg? We have a stairway situation there that is a bit awkward. Escalators were to be provided but they have not been installed. The minister said there would be a structural arrangement whereby people would enter aircraft from the second floor of the building. What progress is being made?

Mr. Pickersgill: I shall have to ask for a report and give it to the hon. gentleman.

Item agreed to.

50. Administration, operation and maintenance including the administration of the Radio Act and regulations issued thereunder and Canada's share of the costs of the international radio, telegraph and telephone organizations listed in the details of the estimates, $25,884,800.

Mr. Hales: Some time ago the minister advised the house that he proposed to bring in legislation concerning CATV operators by means of an estimate. Is it included in this part?

Mr. Pickersgill: I think it is the supplementary "C" and I do not think that is an item it would be fair to embark upon in view of the undertaking made about 2.30. But if there are other items in my estimates that no one wants to discuss they might be carried in a minute or two and we could make some progress.

Otherwise I think we shall have to revert to justice.

Mr. Cowan: Supplementary to the point raised by the hon. member for Wellington South, the minister says let us pass on. Will we return to supplementary estimate 50c? Will there be sufficient time to discuss the matter or will it be jammed through at the end of the day?

Mr. Pickersgill: I cannot say what the committee will do, but so far as I am concerned I am very anxious to have it discussed.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, is this where you call item 50c?

The Chairman: The committee is on vote No. 50. Shall vote number 50 carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Item agreed to.

The Chairman: Is it agreed that vote 50c stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Item stands.

Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada—

80. Administration, operation and maintenance, $1,302,900.

Mr. Nasserden: Has the government made up its mind to set up an inquiry into the rail rates and their effect upon traffic from the port of Churchill to inland points, as compared with the rates charged on other rail lines?

Mr. Pickersgill: Since I received the delegation the other day I asked to have this matter looked into at once.

Item agreed to.

Canadian maritime commission—

95. Capital subsidies for the construction of commercial and fishing vessels in accordance with regulations of the governor in council, $28,000,000.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): What is the explanation for the reduction of $12 million in this item as compared with the previous year? Is it because of a lack of demand for these subsidies, or is it a reduction that is imposed?

Mr. Pickersgill: When these subsidies were originally instituted the rate was 40 per cent for a certain period. Since then it went down to 35 per cent. That is one of the elements in the situation, and there has not been quite the same high demand as there was earlier. This is a matter on which I would be very happy to give the hon. member some detailed information.

Mr. Coates: I should like to ask the minister whether any decision has yet been reached with respect to the subsidy being made available to the wooden shipbuilding industry.

Mr. Pickersgill: My colleague the Minister of Fisheries and I have had several discussions about this. We hope to have something definite to announce quite soon.

Item agreed to.

National harbours board—

100. Advances to national harbours board subject to the provisions of section 29 of the National Harbours Board Act to meet reconstruction and capital expenditures during the calendar year 1964 as detailed in the estimates, $2,113,500.

Mr. Simpson: I believe this is the general vote relating to the national harbours board. I understand that the delegation which recently came to Ottawa representing the Hudson Bay route association met with officials of the national harbours board to discuss the question of further dredging at the harbour of Churchill. It is my understanding the delegates were told that the board considered the dredging program which has gone on for the past few years to be complete and that no further dredging was being considered next summer.

Nevertheless it is my understanding from the authorities at Churchill that there is still a certain amount of dredging to be done. So there is a conflict of opinion. Could the minister have this matter looked into, and if further dredging is necessary to complete the program will he see that it is done next year?

Mr. Pickersgill: I will look into the matter as quickly as I possibly can.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Chairman, for a few moments I should like to draw the attention of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) to the disastrous situation in which the Chicoutimi harbour now finds itself.

As you know, the Saguenay river has but two ocean ports, that of Port Alfred, fortunately operated by a private industry, Alcan, which makes it quite important, and that of Chicoutimi, which is completely neglected and in a deplorable condition. The amount spent by the Department of Transport on the improvement and maintenance of those facilities is extremely low, if not non-existent.

I wish to bring to the minister's attention the fact that this year operations in the port of Chicoutimi are showing a substantial growth and, in my opinion, the minister should

give favourable consideration to all representations made in the past by the Chicoutimi authorities, whether to the present government or the previous one. Important improvements are necessary at the port of Chicoutimi to facilitate transshipment of goods as well as its warehousing facilities.

I suggest that this is a very important point and that the Minister of Transport should give a little more attention to the port of Chicoutimi.

[*Text*]

Mr. Pickersgill: I am trying, whenever I can get a little spare time, to visit each of the national harbours and I am very anxious to visit Chicoutimi myself. I intend to do so at the first opportunity. I will discuss the whole matter with the harbours board as soon as I can get a little time in a place other than this.

Mr. Winch: I do not wish to take up the time of the committee, but this is the only opportunity I have to raise a question which is of serious concern not only to myself but to all members from Vancouver.

Is it possible, now, for the minister to give us some definite information as to the situation in the harbour at north Vancouver where four established industries are to be displaced? I have been in communication with officials in the department and I understood they were trying to arrange a meeting between the harbours board and all those who are concerned about this plan put forward by the Saskatchewan wheat board, including the unions. I want to ask the minister this: Is there any way whatsoever in which this $800 million new wheat elevator can be established without the loss of the industries we already have?

Mr. Pickersgill: I understand a meeting has been arranged for next Monday by the chairman of the harbours board. This delegation will present its views at that meeting. I have made it known that I would be happy to see them as well and discuss the whole problem with them. That will probably be Tuesday, rather than Monday. At any rate, it will be at the beginning of the week.

Mr. Winch: Do I understand the meeting will be held in Vancouver?

Mr. Pickersgill: No, here in Ottawa.

Mr. Winch: It will be a meeting with the union representatives, the industries involved, and all concerned?

Mr. Pickersgill: The information I have is that those persons who wanted to make representations are sending a delegation to Ottawa for the purpose.

Mr. Winch: Next Monday?

Mr. Pickersgill: Next Monday.

Mr. Fisher: I want to ask the minister whether all the loose ends have been tied up in connection with the Jacques Cartier bridge.

Mr. Pickersgill: Not yet.

Mr. Fisher: May I ask how the claims stand as far as the city of Montreal and the provincial government of Quebec are concerned with regard to the moneys—if I may put it this way—they did not contribute toward the bridge in years past?

Mr. Pickersgill: We are now in the midst of negotiations with the government of Quebec about this matter. I feel it would not be very helpful to the progress of those negotiations, which relate not only to the Jacques Cartier bridge but to the Champlain bridge, if I were to attempt to make any statement. I hope we shall find a solution to this problem quite soon.

Mr. Fisher: May I ask the minister whether we can expect not only a solution but thorough explanation of the results of the negotiations and any *quid pro quo* which may have been necessary?

Mr. Pickersgill: We certainly will provide one.

Item agreed to.

St. Lawrence seaway authority—

105. Operating deficit and capital requirements of canals and works entrusted to the St. Lawrence seaway authority with the approval of the governor in council, and to authorize, notwithstanding the Financial Administration Act or any other act, the disbursement by the authority of revenues derived from the operation and management of such canals and works, $2,838,000.

Mr. Lambert: I should like to hear from the minister when he intends to make a full statement to the house and to the country with regard to the operations of the seaway. There are a number of outstanding problems. There is the matter of the tolls on the Welland canal. There is a sort of suspension in mid-air. There is also the question of the long range prospects of the seaway—whether its operations are likely to be financially successful. The record indicates there is some doubt about this. In view of the fact that the cost to the country of this project amounted

to some $350 million, I think we should hear progress reports from time to time. I can readily understand that in the early stages there might have been some difficulty about this; the operation was still shaking down; the wheels were probably not running as smoothly as they might. But the seaway has now been in operation for five years and I think it is time we had a full and comprehensive report, together with a forecast. After all, when the minister was on this side of the house he was a great one when it came to calling for these forecasts. I now ask him to follow the old adage "Physician, heal thyself", in this regard.

Mr. Pickersgill: I am sure you will agree, Mr. Chairman, that there is no more important subject than the St. Lawrence seaway authority and I will seek the first opportunity, when we have a little time available in the house, to make a statement of the kind suggested.

Meanwhile I should like to say that the traffic has increased enormously this year. I only wish we could cope with it and get it moved, particularly through the Welland canal, a little faster—though this year we have made great progress in that direction as well.

Mr. Macquarrie: Perhaps I may add to the imposing catalogue which the hon. member for Edmonton West mentioned a few moments ago. I am sure that the minister, with his new found interest in Newfoundland and elsewhere, will consider too that it is incumbent upon him to resist all those who in this age would move in the direction of trying to create of the St. Lawrence seaway an all-season route, because this would be a disastrous thing to very important parts of the country, namely the winter ports, the aspect of which was one of the great things which the maritimes brought into confederation. Often one hears the siren sounds of those who would advocate a different course. I am not going to speak any longer on this matter, Mr. Chairman, because I know that the minister's heart is in confederation and he knows this sort of thing would be most inappropriate.

Item agreed to.

The Chairman: This leaves one item, No. 50c, which has been allowed to stand by the committee. Save for this particular item, all items of the Department of Transport have been adopted. Do I understand that the committee now wishes to revert to vote No. 1 of the Department of Justice?

[Mr. Lambert.]

Mr. Coates: Before we revert to that item, Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I could ask the Minister of Transport one question. I happened to be out of the house when the Atlantic development board item was passed. Would the minister clarify for me what he had to say about the fund for the board and whether new funds would be available to the board should they expend the $100 million available to them at the present time?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman, who is an old and experienced member of the house, like me, knows that this is a question of policy which I could not announce without full discussion with my colleagues and a decision by the government. But I think he knows where my heart is.

Mr. Hales: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister of Transport when we might expect item 50c of these estimates to be brought before the committee.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman would address himself to some of his colleagues on the other side of the chamber I think he could find out even better, because I believe the house leader has the hope of bringing it back just as soon as possible.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal and other services—

1. Administration including the office of the superintendent of bankruptcy, grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, gratuities to the widows or other dependants of judges who die while in office and authority to make recoverable advances for the administration of justice on behalf of the governments of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory, $2,109,600.

The Chairman: Vote No. 1, Department of Justice.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Chairman, on Monday when the member representing Halifax saw fit to jump to the defence of his Minister of Justice and to the defence of contributions from Hal Banks, he made certain remarks that I took exception to at the time and about which I tried to raise a question of privilege. However, the ruling of the Chair was to the effect that I could disbelieve what the member for Halifax was saying, but could not raise it as a question of privilege. The member for Halifax, in his ignorance of what went on in the house prior to his arrival here—and I say his complete ignorance of what went on—has shown a complete disregard for the truth; a complete disregard for the truth.

An hon. Member: You don't have to repeat it.

Mr. MacInnis: With a head like yours, I think it has to be repeated several times. The member for Halifax followed the member for Bow River and made quite an attack on that member.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacInnis: The member for Halifax has great opinions of himself; and if you do not believe me, just ask him. He has such an opinion of himself that he has taken to classifying his own backbenchers. For instance, in the course of his remarks about the hon. member for Bow River he said how much better his party would be with the member for Bow River on that side of the house. Of course, he is not going to take anything away from us without giving us something in exchange; he would be perfectly willing to give us the senior member representing Halifax—he would start with him, and he would throw in the member for Kootenay East, and he went so far as to throw in the member for York-Humber.

The Chairman: Order. I think the hon. member will agree that what he is now saying is somewhat removed from vote No. 1 of the estimates of the Department of Justice.

Mr. MacInnis: I contend, Mr. Chairman, that my remarks at this time are no further removed from this particular item than were the remarks of the hon. member for Halifax on Monday last. I would say that his honourable colleagues from Halifax, Kootenay East and York-Humber would be highly insulted by his words, which may be considered as some token of the fact that, although perhaps he does not consider he is being complimentary to the very efficient member we have for Bow River, he certainly does not reject the activities of the hon. member for Bow River, if he is prepared to offer that kind of exchange.

An hon. Member: What a horse trader.

Mr. MacInnis: Yes, a real horse trader. He has classified this to the extent that he cannot understand why he should have to sit in the back benches with this class of member with whom he is associated. He has attempted to defend the idea that a member of parliament is within his right in accepting contributions from labour leaders. Nobody argues with the fact that labour leaders are entitled to make contributions to campaign funds, but I would remind that hon. member and all hon. members on the other side of the house that to accept contributions from someone of the calibre of Hal Banks, especially while he was under investigation by a royal commission, is something they should reconsider. In reconsidering it they certainly should not take exception, as the member for Halifax did, to their own Prime Minister; because the Prime Minister indicated—I am not saying that he in any way came out completely and said there were these contributions—that there have been such contributions; and at the same time the Prime Minister indicated that he would not accept contributions from a man such as Hal Banks. Yet the member for Halifax rose in the house and defended the idea of accepting such contributions.

In accepting contributions from a labour leader of that calibre, who was at that time under investigation by a royal commission, these members, if they examine their conscience, will know very well—I refer to the contributions that were accepted, for there has been no indication that there were not and we have the word of the Prime Minister that there were—that they did wrong. The hon. member has said that they did not in any way commit themselves. Any member of parliament who accepts a contribution by way of cash, cheque or otherwise, is certainly putting himself in a compromising position. It is my experience and the experience of other men here that in your campaigns you have somebody to look after such things as that, and any member of parliament who at any time has permitted such payments to cross his hands is making a very, very bad mistake.

Mr. Matheson: Do you know of any?

Mr. MacInnis: The member for Leeds asks whether I know of any.

An hon. Member: Make a charge.

Mr. MacInnis: The member for Leeds is coming up with the same old "make a charge" business. I say to the member for Leeds, if you have a question to ask me about whether I know of anybody or not, you would be well advised to speak to your Prime Minister, who indicated on television that there is reason to believe such payments were made, not to the Liberal party but to Liberal members.

Mr. Matheson: That is not true.

Mr. MacInnis: You will have your chance to get up and say whether or not it is true. If you did not follow the remarks of your own Prime Minister on T.V., at least you can get the transcript of what he had to say. At the same time the Prime Minister indicated that he would never place himself

in the position of accepting money from Hal Banks. I might say that it is very well known that a fairly highly placed member of the Liberal party has indicated that he was offered a contribution and refused it. Why didn't the rest of the Liberal members refuse them?

Mr. Matheson: Who accepted such a contribution?

Mr. MacInnis: Go and ask your Prime Minister.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Chairman, on a question of privilege, the member for Cape Breton South is certainly misrepresenting very badly anything that I said in this house, and I do not think that is proper. I do not believe the member for Bow River needs anyone to defend him, but the member for Cape Breton South is so sensitive to criticism, as displayed by the manner in which he carries on his political campaigns with his fists—

The Chairman: Order. There is no question of privilege in what the hon. member for Halifax is now saying. Certainly what he has been saying up to this point indicates only that he disagrees with what has been said by the hon. member for Cape Breton South, and that is no reason for raising a question of privilege at this time.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Chairman, realizing how pressed we are for time this afternoon I intend to go no further than to stuff down the hon. member's throat what he said. He said I have misrepresented the facts. I would call your attention to the last column on page 10405, where the hon. member for Halifax is reported as saying this:

> The trained seals opposite had nothing to say during those six years on this subject.

Hon. members opposite used to be referred to as the Pearson team. If this sort of thing continues—and in all likelihood it will catch on—it is more likely to be called the Pearson gang. The hon. member for Halifax had this to say:

> Not one backbencher had anything to say about Hal Banks.

I say this is complete disregard for the truth.

When I came here in 1957 I was aware of the fact that representations about this had been made. I see the hon. member for Kootenay West present in the committee, and he has indicated to the house in the last month or so that he, along with other members of parliament, had been making representations on this matter as early as 1956. So that again I say that the hon. member for Halifax with complete ignorance showed utter disregard for the truth of this matter.

Mr. Regan: I rise on a question of privilege. I would point out that as reported at page 10405 of *Hansard* I had started to say that not one backbencher had had anything to say about Hal Banks, but at that point in his usual manner the hon. member interrupted me. I then completed what I had started to say when I next had the opportunity, and as reported on the following page I said they did nothing about Hal Banks and said nothing that was constructive and produced results. That is what I intended to say had I not been interrupted by the hon. member for Cape Breton South.

The hon. member has also misrepresented the situation regarding the time of the alleged contributions. There was no royal commission under way at the time of the alleged contributions, which was during the 1962 campaign. It was only after that. The hon. member also said I suggested that it was all right for contribution to be made by labour leaders direct to members. I never said that or never intended to say such a thing. Naturally I meant contributions made in the usual manner to the campaign funds of a candidate.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has just made an interesting observation. He said there was no royal commission set up at the time of the alleged contributions, and then he referred to the date of the contributions, 1962. That is rather ambiguous, because I am led to believe that there were actual contributions, and that has now been admitted.

Mr. Regan: Alleged.

Mr. MacInnis: I said alleged. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the fact that although I referred to page 10405 of *Hansard* there were a number of remarks made after the hon. member for Halifax made his statement, and I would respectfully ask the Chair to rule on his question of privilege, as it did on mine last Monday.

The Chairman: The hon. member will admit to the Chair that he had completed his remarks. The hon. member for Halifax had the right to rise. Whether he prefaced his remarks with the statement that he was raising a question of privilege is rather immaterial. He has the right to speak and he took his right to speak.

I might say that if I were requested to rule I would recognize that there was no question of privilege here but simply a rectification of what the hon. member considers were inaccurate statements made by the hon. member for Cape Breton South.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Chairman, you used the phrase "inaccurate statements" made by me. I am sure the Chair did not intend that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, I have only one question to put to the Minister of Justice. Even if some members on the other side of the house seem a bit surprised, I am not going to let it distract me.

Since 1958, it has been decided that a penitentiary would be built in the municipality of St. Pie de Bagot. To this end, four plots of land were bought at a cost of $83,000; work has been performed by various experts at a cost of over $20,000. In addition, the cost of plans prepared by an architect for the institution in question amounted to $50,000. As you can see, at least $150,000 in taxpayers' money has been spent.

According to the statements made by the Minister of Justice, conditions at the present time in penitentiaries are said to be unsanitary, and living conditions almost indescribable. But, owing to the political partisanship of the predecessor of the present Minister of Justice, Hon. Lionel Chevrier, the construction of the penitentiary at St. Pie was immediately cancelled after the 1963 election.

I do not hesitate to say, Mr. Chairman, that this was a measure of reprisals against the riding of St. Hyacinthe-Bagot which had elected a Conservative member of parliament.

I want to ask the minister what he will do with the lands which were bought, because the farmers who owned those lands left them and also removed the buildings which were on them.

I would also ask the minister to tell us why the construction of that institution in the riding of St. Hyacinthe-Bagot was cancelled, if not through reprisals because its population elected a Conservative to the House of Commons—

Mr. Deschatelets: The reasons have been given ten times already. That will be the eleventh time.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Public Works interrupts while remaining in his seat but he does not have the courage of getting up to tell the house why the project has been cancelled. The Minister of Public Works is unable to deny categorically that this change was motivated by political considerations on the part of the former minister who was known throughout Canada as the minister of injustice.

You are unable to do so.

An hon. Member: Order.

Mr. Deschatelets: Mr. Chairman, naturally I did not intend to participate in the debate on these estimates. However, since the hon. member has challenged me to give the reasons why the construction of a maximum security penitentiary at St. Pie de Bagot has been cancelled, I feel I have to state those reasons.

I told him a while ago, and I repeat it, that those reasons were given to him at least ten times. First of all by the previous minister of justice, Mr. Chevrier; then I myself gave him an answer once or twice on the orders of the day and, if my memory serves me right, the present Minister of Justice also gave him a reply.

We are the owners of the land that we bought and we keep it. We have already told the hon. member that it is quite possible that we may use that land to build a federal building.

We are now considering such a possibility but I would not want him to take my remarks as a certainty. However, such a thing is under consideration.

In the second place, it was said a number of times following the whole revision of the penitentiary program, that such a penitentiary should not be located on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, but rather on the north shore, and that is the only reason why the penitentiary would be built at Ste. Anne des Plaines. Such a decision was taken and we must carry it out, whether it pleases the hon. member or not.

As far as the retaliation referred to by the hon. member, we would not like to give the hon. member more weight than he carries.

We will rely on the voters of St. Hyacinthe-Bagot county.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Public Works has just shown his ignorance in this matter.

He is talking about a maximum security penitentiary, while the decision was that a minimum security penitentiary would be built at St. Pie in the county of St. Hyacinthe-Bagot.

Mr. Deschatelets: That does not matter.

Mr. Ricard: Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Choquette: Him again.

Mr. Ricard: I will point out to the hon. member for Lotbinière that he can resume his seat to make the remarks which he did not have the gumption to make otherwise.

There you see how inaccurate the Minister of Public Works can be. He does not know what he is talking about. When he rises to make statements in connection with matters he knows nothing about, when he says he will let the voters of St. Hyacinthe-Bagot county decide the fate of the one who now has the floor, I extend to him an invitation to come to my county. The former minister of justice came twice to my county and each time my majority increased by 1,000 votes. When the incompetent who interrupted a moment ago comes into my county, my majority will increase not only by 1,000 but by 2,000 votes.

[*Text*]

Mr. Coates: Mr. Chairman, we have witnessed during the past 18 months a series of crises in which the government of this country has found itself. Almost every week something new is divulged that is of the greatest significance to the nation as a whole, and of the greatest concern to the people of this nation, relating to the manner in which this country is being run. Certainly what has transpired this week gives no one any justification for the feeling of security as to the manner in which justice is being administered. This week we have witnessed perhaps the greatest crisis that this government has had to face, yet we have been denied the presence in this chamber of the leader of this government, the Prime Minister of this country. We have not had an opportunity to ask him the questions which are foremost in the minds not only of us but of all the people of Canada, in relation to his obligations to this nation and to the administration of justice in this nation.

It is indeed very significant that the Toronto *Globe and Mail* on Thursday of this week had as its lead editorial one which stated that his place was in Ottawa. I am going to place this editorial on record because it is the type of editorial which indicates the degree of concern shown by responsible people in this country toward the attitude of the Prime Minister, as evidenced by his complete disregard for his responsibilities as the leader of this nation.

The editorial reads as follows:

> Events of the last 48 hours in Ottawa have both bewildered Canadians and given them cause for deep concern. A judicial inquiry has been ordered into the involvement in a narcotics extradition case of two executive assistants to cabinet ministers and a member of parliament who was parliamentary secretary to Prime Minister Lester Pearson.
>
> It is true that the shadows will not be lifted until this judicial inquiry has sat and sifted the whole of the evidence and made its report. But it is equally obvious that the existence of the inquiry will not dispel the interest of the opposition parties in related issues, or prevent them from calling into question the integrity of men in the government and their servants.
>
> Mr. Pearson has left the House of Commons and gone to fulfil a prearranged schedule of engagements in Saskatchewan, leaving the nation in the hands of external affairs minister Paul Martin, justice minister Guy Favreau and an aroused opposition. He may have felt that by so doing he would communicate a feeling of confidence to the people. But in these troubled days the presence of the Prime Minister, not only in the house but in his party caucus, would be a reassurance to Canadians. Mr. Pearson should come home.

Mr. Chairman, if the Prime Minister left this house at the time he did with the intention of keeping pre-arranged meetings on matters of great significance to the future of this nation, I am certain no member of parliament or citizen of Canada would argue about the merits of his doing so. However from what I have read in the newspapers, both since and prior to his departure, I have gained the impression conveyed by these stories that the Prime Minister was going to western Canada to feel the pulse of the people of that part of this nation, with the possibility in mind of calling a general election, and to determine how the funds are flowing. I imagine that many sources of funds have dried up in the past week and that the Prime Minister will have to stay there for some time in an attempt to sink some new wells to replace the dry holes he has drilled this week.

Mr. Chairman, we have a Prime Minister who can be compared to the famous Roman emperor Nero who fiddled while Rome burned. The Prime Minister is out west endeavouring to find oil somewhere to salve his conscience and the conscience of his supporters because of the manner in which justice is being administered at the present time. He could have come back to this house today, giving the opportunity to members to pose questions which, because of the growing concern across this country, should be answered. Since I have been in this House of Commons no government has been under such an aura of suspicion as now exists because of the way justice is

being administered. I think all members of the house feel it was the duty of the Prime Minister to be in his seat. Certainly, from the look of things, Canadians do not have to worry about the government calling any elections for some time to come. Certainly the Prime Minister will find other times when he will see more enthusiasm in the greetings of his supporters than at the present time. Canadians are shocked. They are bewildered. They do not really believe such a thing could have happened in this nation. They hope for, and fear, the results of this inquiry, and certainly all members as well are fearful of the results.

I say that a great deal more in the way of information should have been forthcoming from the government and would have been forthcoming if the Prime Minister had remained in this house and answered questions honestly and emphatically, in the way he should have answered them with regard to this situation. The fact that the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister found it necessary to resign his position because of his involvement in this affair, and the fact that at the same time the Prime Minister would feel he could get up and walk out to go on a barnstorming tour for political funds, is just unbelievable and beyond the comprehension of most Canadian people. I say that the Prime Minister's position has reached a new low in this nation as a result of the action he has taken this week in leaving the House of Commons in the atmosphere in which we find it at the present time.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, I wish to place our position on the record with regard to the amendment before embarking on further remarks. The amendment was introduced last October 7, and will be found on page 8849 of *Hansard*. I believe it would be worth while for me to read my remarks immediately preceding the presentation of that amendment into today's *Hansard*. I quote:

> The S.I.U. do not provide these facilities for nothing. Because of the manner in which the government has failed to act on this matter; because the minister has shown a singular lack of understanding of the function with which he is charged in carrying out the responsibilities of his office; because of the degree to which the law, good order and justice in this country have been dragged in the mire by the inaction of the minister and of the government as a whole, it is both my belief and the belief of a good many of us on this side that the minister is no longer fit to hold the portfolio of Minister of Justice. Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Cape Breton South:
>
> That vote No. 1 of the estimates of the Department of Justice be reduced by the sum of $16,999. That will leave by way of salary for the minister $1 per annum.

Mr. Winch: Question.

Mr. Nielsen: I hear hon. members calling for "question", and I will be brief, I can assure them, if I may speak without interruption. These remarks are as applicable now, indeed the more so. I believe the minister is unfit to hold his portfolio. He has shown deplorable conduct in the handling of matters to which I referred in this house last Monday and during subsequent days of this week. The minister has shown a singular lack of common sense, of good judgment, indeed a singular lack in my view—perhaps after I have completed my remarks, in the view of others—of a knowledge of the law applicable in the circumstances which were brought before him on August 14. There was a particular course he should have followed on August 14 which he did not follow and which has not yet been discussed in the house. I intend to raise it this afternoon.

One point should be raised before I proceed. The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona was speaking this afternoon and the minister replied in French. I have since that time been supplied with a copy of the translation of the phrases which he used. I do not vouch for its accuracy, but if it is accurate then it raises some question in my mind and in the minds of others. The minister, I believe, in reply to the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona, said this in French:

> "As soon as the final report—not the final but the last report available in the files was received, I made him—

Referring to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

> "—aware of it and together we discussed this affair. We took together a decision relative to his executive assistant. So far as the other question, that is the legal procedure, is concerned, naturally I took it myself."

Now, that is the English translation I have of the minister's words. If it is accurate I feel it again shows a deplorable lack of good sense, of good judgment and a departure from what the responsibility of the minister was. In the light of the circumstances, he should not have taken it upon himself to make any decision with regard to this matter with the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. The first course to follow, I do not want to belabour the point, was to have referred the whole matter to the independent scrutiny of and to have obtained the opinion of the law

officers of his own department. But it raises this question, if the translation is accurate, what decision was taken by the two ministers? What decision was taken by the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration at that time?

Mr. Favreau: If the hon. gentleman will allow me to interrupt I must say in all fairness to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration that, so far as he was concerned, the only matter with which he dealt in relation to the report was a matter of internal administration, and his relationships with those of his department with his own executive assistant. So far as the question of deciding whether or not to lay an information on the state of the evidence available at the time, I must take full responsibility therefor. Of course, it was not the duty of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to take any decision in this respect. He did not, and that is why I made this distinction this morning.

Mr. Nielsen: What is the final report the minister had reference to in his reply to the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona, the final report which he discussed with the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration? Yet he has been referring throughout to an open file. I think the minister has some explanations to go into in this regard. These and other questions, of course, occur to all.

Throughout, Mr. Chairman, this has been an extremely serious matter. Since I raised it on November 23 I have tried to be meticulously and scrupulously certain of every fact which I have placed before the committee. None of these facts has been denied by the minister. I want to be meticulously and scrupulously certain not only of the facts but I want to continue to be sure that the manner of stating those facts leaves no room whatever for any misunderstanding or misinterpretation.

I am sure there are a lot of questions occurring, not only to members of the treasury benches but to all members of the house with regard to how I came into possesion of the information which I have disclosed, the information I have. I have seen many people and I have been outside Ottawa in search of this information. I want to assure all members of the house that I have no knowledge of any matters relating to this affair that are not in the police report.

I want to say that I have done nothing unlawful in any of my activities in connection with the obtaining of the information which I have obtained.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): We will find out.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

Mr. Nielsen: I want also to tell the house that I have shared with no one the whole of the knowledge that I have.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): I thought there was no secrecy in your party.

Mr. Nielsen: In reply to the hon. member who so flippantly interjected, I am sure all members will admit quickly that the information which I have carried about with me was weighty material to say the least. I wanted no one to share the responsibility, and I mean of the whole of the information which I did carry, and which I still carry and intend to do so unless by lawful requirement I am required to disclose it.

I have a high regard for all judicial bodies, judicial bodies which I feel were thwarted in this case, and no one will find me reluctant to comply with the letter of the law in this or any other matter. But I want to say immediately I consider the content of the material I have of such an explosive nature that I did not want to share that responsibility with anyone else.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Not even your leader?

Mr. Nielsen: I have told hon. members that I have shared the knowledge with no one and it was in consideration of others that I did that.

Mr. Winch: Would the hon. member allow a question at this point?

Mr. Nielsen: Yes.

Mr. Winch: In view of the emphasis the hon. member has now placed repetitively—I think four times in the last five minutes—in view of the weight of burden he has been carrying, the knowledge which he has not yet disclosed, is it the hon. member's intention to share this weight of knowledge and facts with the royal commissioner who has been appointed to investigate all phases of this matter?

Mr. Nielsen: I suggest to the hon. member for Vancouver East that he read carefully my remarks in *Hansard* and he will find that I answered that question just a moment or two ago. And again I am being extremely careful of what I say in the house and I want to be meticulous in that regard.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: I would suggest to hon. members opposite who moan and groan that they should do the same.

I want to say a word too, before leaving the matter, about Mr. Lamontagne, the counsel

for the United States government who was acting, and is still acting in this matter, the matter of Rivard, that I feel words are not adequate to express my admiration for this—

An hon. Member: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nielsen: Again I hear flippant grunts over on the other side.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Where do they come from? Identify them.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Lamontagne, I might add, is a loyal—and I use the present tense—loyal member of the Liberal party. I cannot find adequate words to express my admiration for the integrity, the professional integrity of this young member of the bar.

It is extremely refreshing to me to find someone of his calibre who is able to resist not only the offers and pressures which were brought to bear prior to last Monday on him with respect to this matter, but subsequently as well, and when I say subsequently I mean the barrage of questions which must have been directed at him by members of the press and by others.

I think one of the hon. members on my left referred to the harassment and embarrassment that he has subjected himself to by reason of his confirmation, in substance, of what I placed on the record on the 23rd of this month. It took courage, it took integrity, and this young gentleman had both in good measure.

I want now to deal for a moment with the law, law of which the minister should be aware, law which he should have followed with respect to this case and law of which I can only assume he must be unaware. I am going to read to him first a very short paragraph from volume 8 of "Halsbury's Laws of England", the most recent edition, the third edition, at page 12 under the heading "Obstructing officers of the court":

> Contempt by obstructing an officer of the court is punished, not for the purpose of vindicating the dignity of the court or the person of the officer, but to prevent undue interference with the administration of justice.

I want now to refer him to the most recent case of which I am aware, dealing with matters of this nature, to be found in volume 40, 1963, of the "Criminal Reports". It is a case coming from the minister's own province, a case decided on June 5, 1963. It is in the Quebec court of queen's bench, the appeal side, and three eminent judges, Mr. Justice Bissonette, Mr. Justice Owen and Mr. Justice Rivard sat on the matter. It is entitled "Sommer *v.* the Queen."

Briefly the facts in that case as stated by Mr. Justice Owen are these, and they are relevant so I put them on the record:

> This is an appeal from a conviction for contempt of court. While a judge exercising criminal jurisdiction was conductng the hearing on a writ of habeas corpus, the object of which was to obtain the release of one Ripple from a mental institution, the appellant wrote letters attacking the presiding judge and the courts. The letters were produced and, on a verbal motion by the attorney for the mental institution, a rule *nisi* was issued by the presiding judge. This rule was served upon the appellant who was thereby ordered to appear at a fixed time before the presiding judge to show cause why he should not be held in contempt of court and sentenced accordingly. The appellant appeared as ordered, was interrogated under oath by the presiding judge, was convicted summarily, and was sentenced immediately to three months in prison.

I draw the procedure to the attention of the minister, if he is not aware of it; that procedure being summary procedure, procedure under which no information is necessary to be laid and which allows a judge to require the presence of a person accused in circumstances such as these, summoning him immediately before the court and interrogating him under oath and immediately thereafter giving a decision as to whether or not there has been contempt. By way of explanation I think I should put on record that this procedure is a rare one. It is set up for the purpose of protecting the integrity of the courts, to prevent any undue interference with the administration of justice. As reported at page 429 of the case I have cited, Mr. Justice Owen, in the course of his judgment, used the following words:

> But when we consider the process of summary punishment for contempt, the position is different. Here the power to award punishment is inherent in the court, as already stated; not in the judge and jury, but in the court itself, and being so inherent, it has to be adequate to meet the conditions which call for its exercise. Thus, it is conceded that the person charged not only does not have the right to put forward the testimony of witnesses on his behalf, but is even exposed to have to answer interrogatories. Neither has he the right to a trial by jury.

It is an extraordinary power, but it is one which is necessary, as I have said to protect the courts from undue influence or interference in matters affecting the administration of justice. The point I am making is that in this case, as was quite proper, the Quebec attorney general brought the matter to the attention of the judge concerned at the moment the offence was committed. The judge dealt with it summarily and immediately passed sentence. The report I read from was

the report of the appeal court where the decision of the judge in the lower court was upheld.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Excepting as to sentence.

Mr. Nielsen: Excepting as to sentence.

The minister has by now, I am sure, no longer any doubts as to the suggestion I have been implying thus far. I intend to make it clear, now, by asking him this question. He is an eminent member of the Quebec bar and, as such, he is an officer of the Quebec court. Why did he not bring this matter immediately to the attention of the judge? Why did he not at least bring the matter to the attention of the provincial attorney general of Quebec and let him deal with it as he dealt with the matter in the case I have cited? The very least the minister should have done was to have informed the Quebec attorney general fully as to the situation. I repeat, he should have been fully informed. I might also add that the minister will also find a reference in the report I have read to the effect that if an accused person is a lawyer he loses his status as counsel when he appears before the judge under an order compelling him to appear in circumstances of this sort. So he is not treated as a lawyer at all, and all the privileges which counsel usually have in the courts are lost to him.

The remaining question with which I intend to deal concerns the terms of reference of the order in council. Now these have been finally defined—I assume this is the case—I have made up my mind to allow the judicial inquiry to take its course without hindrance from myself—

An hon. Member: Bully for you.

Mr. Nielsen: If hon. members will allow me to complete my words without interrupting—

Mr. Fisher: Will you assist?

Mr. Nielsen: I will assist the judicial inquiry in every way I can. I did not mean to be presumptuous by my previous statement and if hon. members opposite had allowed me to complete it they would not have found it so. I intend to be of every assistance to the judicial inquiry if I am called before it. I also wish to say with respect to the inquiry that if I were to deal any further with the questions which have been referred to the inquiry then, certainly, I would have grave doubts as to whether I would be doing the proper thing. Having those doubts, I have resolved them in favour of silence in the house and I will follow that course now.

I am sure this matter will be dealt with fully by the judicial inquiry and I am just as certain that all the details will be before that inquiry as soon as it sits. I am sure all such witnesses will be called before it as are necessary to fulfil the terms of reference contained in the order in council and I am sure the first thing the judge will call for will be the police report in order to familiarize himself fully with the details it contains, because that report is the source from which he will derive the most useful information upon which to base his decision as to which witnesses should be called and which information he should seek in order to fulfil his function as the commissioner appointed under the order in council.

Having said these things, I believe I have covered those aspects with which I intended to deal this afternoon. I regret, as many other members have so expressed themselves, the conditions and the circumstances which made it necessary to reveal and expose this whole situation to the committee but I feel, without intending any injustice to the officials involved in the R.C.M.P. and in the department, that had I not brought these matters to the committee's attention they would in all probability not have seen the light of day.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mackasey: Would the hon. member permit a question? I ask this question in the light of the hon. member's statement that he wishes to be meticulously fair.

I just want to ask the hon. member a question in order to clear up an inference that I sincerely believe it was not the hon. member's intention to create in his various speeches during this debate.

At page 10534 of *Hansard* the hon. member for Yukon is reported as having said, referring to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration:

> I challenge him to rise now and tell the house where he was when the bribe was offered.

Then he repeated this and said:

> I challenge him to rise now and tell us where he was when the bribe was offered.

Eliminating some of the interjections, the hon. member went on to say:

> I ask the Minister of Justice to deny that it is not in the police report that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration was in his office at the time.

Last night, based on these assertions by the hon. member for Yukon, in my speech I raised the question that possibly Mr. Lamontagne could have taken advantage of the fact sought to be established by the hon. member for Yukon in his earlier remarks, and I referred to the proximity of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to the events, to Mr. Lamontagne and to Mr. Denis at the time of the alleged bribe. In all fairness to the hon. member for Yukon, he immediately rose and said:

> If the hon. member will permit me to interject, I at no time suggested that the alleged bribe offer was made in the same office.

I immediately presumed that it was a question of semantics; that in the earlier part of his statement the hon. member for Yukon had not defined what was an office and meant, perhaps, an outer office. In all fairness to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration I would like the hon. member for Yukon to explain to us what he meant when he referred to "into the minister's office".

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, I believe I have already made myself clear with respect to discussing the facts surrounding this affair. There has been a very real suspicion raised in my mind. I do not intend to do the hon. member any injustice, nor do I wish to imply or leave anything by innuendo because of the question that I am about to put to him, which is this, that some of the things he said last night, particularly the reference to "20 days", leads me to believe that he may well either have seen the police report himself or have had passed on to him information from it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Chairman, I still have not had an answer to my question. I am just wondering—

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Macdonald: Mr. Chairman, I am going to be quite brief in this matter and refer to only two of the points made by the hon. member for Yukon in the speech he has just completed. The first of these—and I hope the hon. member will correct me if I in any way inadvertently misrepresent what he said—is that he indicated to the committee that he was in exclusive possession of all the information he has laid before the house during the present week. The deduction is my own; I do not think the hon. member said that. I think he implied that he had arrived at his own conclusion that there was at least a prima facie case established, from the material he had in his hands, that criminal offences had occurred, and he has taxed the minister very much for failing to take action both in his public capacity and in his private capacity as a member of the Quebec bar or the bar of any province of Canada. He has taxed the minister for not bringing these matters to the attention of the proper authorities, for failing to take action on them.

The question which is raised in my mind, and which must have been raised in the minds of all other members is this: Why, if the hon. member had this material; why, if he had these feelings—and I am naturally basing my conclusion on the fact that he must have thought there were criminal offences involved here—did he not himself bring this material to the attention of the commissioner of the R.C.M.P.?

Some hon. Members: Oh.

Mr. Macdonald: Hon. members say "Oh".

Mr. Churchill: What is the minister for?

Mr. Macdonald: I hope that I did not draw from that reaction that there is any imputation on the character of the commissioner. Or why did not the hon. member himself, as any private citizen can, lay an information and bring it to the attention of the public and the authorities in this way? This is a question which I hope the hon. member will take the opportunity of making clear.

The second matter I would like to refer to is with regard to the question of law as raised by the hon. member for Royal last night and the remarks of the hon. member for Yukon today. I have reference to the function of the attorney general, either of a province or of Canada, with respect to evidence which is brought to his attention through the police authorities and in respect of which it appears that a question of criminal conduct might be brought into issue. I do not intend to put my own views in this respect before the committee; I would like to put before the committee the views of Lord MacDermott, Lord Chief Justice of Northern Ireland, put forward in the course of the Hamlyn lectures of recent years. The book from which I shall read is entitled, "Protection from Power under English Law". Lord MacDermott there makes reference to the obligations of an attorney general in certain circumstances. I am saying, on the advice of law officers of the crown, that the conclusions set out here accord with their

understanding of the role of the attorney general of Canada. I refer more particularly to page 25 of this book—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Does the hon. gentleman say that he consulted the law officers of the crown to see what power should be exerted by the attorney general?

Mr. Macdonald: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I consulted the law officers of the crown, as the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues did not with regard to the beating of Captain Walsh at the instance of Hal Banks.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is pretty late to be consulting the law officers.

Mr. Macdonald: I quote as follows:

> The power to prosecute may be abused in ways which have nothing to say to the procuring of evidence and the procedure at the trial. If it is important that the accused should be protected while he is a prisoner, it is also of importance—(a) that the executive should not be free to prosecute or refrain from prosecuting in order to serve its political ends, and (b) that prosecutions which are vexatious or without evidence capable of supporting them or against the public interest, should be stopped as early as possible. If it is wrong that accused persons should be unfairly treated in connection with their trial, it is also wrong that those against whom no proper case can be made should be subjected to the distress and expense which a prosecution may entail.
>
> It is in the discharge of what are now the firmly established traditions and functions of his office that the attorney general protects the subject from both these dangers.

Further, at page 33 of the same lecture it is said:

> The considerations which weigh with the attorney general in deciding whether or not to prosecute go beyond the existence of evidence proving the commission of the offence in question. He must also regard wider issues, such as the effect of a prosecution on the public interest and any special circumstances which may have a bearing on the justice or rightness of a decision one way or the other. In all this he must exercise his own judgment and his own discretion—

I emphasize that:

> —but he is entitled to inform himself of the relevant facts and probable consequences and, in doing so, to seek from his ministerial colleagues such help as they can give him. This sort of consultation may sound a delicate business, but once the underlying rule is accepted, the line separating the functions of the consulting ministers can be easily drawn and maintained in the right place. Mr. Attorney, for example, should never ask or be told whether or not he should prosecute. But he can ask and be told with perfect propriety what effect a prosecution would have on the common weal.

Mr. Leboe: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, are we not now arguing something that is going to be taken up before a commission?

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Mr. Macdonald: Mr. Chairman, I would say that if what the hon. member for Yukon had to say about the conduct of the minister was relevant and permissible, surely it is also permissible to reply in this way to what has been said. I will be guided by the Chair in this regard. I would therefore point out that it is a long established tradition, and in fact a tradition which all members of the bar in this house and elsewhere recognize, that there is an element of discretion and judgment which must be taken by the crown—in this case I am referring to the attorney general of Canada—with respect to any charges.

I presume, although we have not had the full description of this, that that is the same element of discretion which was exercised by the former attorney general in connection with the conspiracy to assault Captain Frank Walsh, for which Hal Banks was ultimately convicted. The witnesses at the trial, which was held in 1963, indicated that they had put their evidence earlier before the government of the day, and I presume the former attorney general of Canada, Hon. Davie Fulton, exercised that same discretion on his own initiative without referring it to the law officers of the crown, as I am advised was the case—the same initiative and discretion which every attorney general has and which has been set out by Lord MacDermott in the passage I have just quoted.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, could I ask a question before the hon. member resumes his seat. Is it not normal, when a point of information is laid in a given jurisdiction, that that point of information, though it be investigated beyond the jurisdiction, requires evidence to be presented to the crown attorney responsible for the jurisdiction in which the offence took place?

Mr. Macdonald: I appreciate that the hon. member is not a lawyer, and when he refers to an information, which might have a special meaning I do not think he is using the expression in this sense. I have just indicated that in this particular case the evidence connected with the particular transaction, as was the case here, was laid, as was the evidence of the beating of Captain Frank Walsh, before the ultimate attorney responsible, the man ultimately responsible to parliament and the country for the administration of justice, namely the attorney general of Canada. That evidence was presented to him, just as at a lower level the evidence would be presented to the local crown attorney who would make

his own judgment on it. I would say that this is an exact parallel with the normal situation.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Could I ask the hon. gentleman a question, because he is thoroughly conversant with this case from beginning to end. Would he tell the committee how many days it was after Mr. Lamontagne alleged he had been offered a bribe, or that threats had been made to him, that he brought this question to the attention of the Department of Justice?

Mr. Macdonald: I would first say, Mr. Chairman, that I cannot claim to be thoroughly familiar with this case; I have not examined the police report. But even if I were, I would think the proper answer is that that particular police report, as the hon. member for Yukon has requested, will be made available to Chief Justice Dorion, and that evidence will be immediately available to him.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Then let me direct this question to the Minister of Justice. Last evening the hon. member for Verdun made a very good presentation, and I like to see young members making good presentations. But among other things he asked: What if the fact is that Mr. Lamontagne waited 20 days after the alleged bribe before he said anythink about it? Was that information passed on to the hon. member for Verdun and has it any basis in fact?

Mr. Mackasey: I should like to answer that.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am asking the Minister of Justice. When I want information from the Minister of Justice he is the one from whom the information should come.

Mr. Mackasey: This information did not come from the Department of Justice. I will reveal my source of information if the hon. member for Yukon will reveal his.

Mr. Diefenbaker: This is a very important matter, something which has been kept from the committee, and I should like to get this information from the Minister of Justice. There is every indication in the remarks of the hon. member for Verdun that Mr. Lamontagne had been derelict in his duty, had he waited 20 days.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, if it is the purpose of the right hon. gentleman to elicit information which might have a bearing on the comportment of the Montreal lawyer who originally referred the allegation to the R.C.M. Police, I am not willing to do something in connection with a matter which is within the purview of the terms of reference of the commissioner.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, that is the same old smokescreen with which the Minister of Justice has surrounded himself from the beginning. All this week he has gone through this attitude of hiding and concealing and only revealing when he could do no other. The answer of the hon. gentleman now is convincing evidence that there was no dilatoriness on the part of Mr. Lamontagne whatever. This brings me to ask the minister why it was he did not bring the information to the attention of the attorney general of Quebec or the judge presiding over the application for bail. In light of the case referred to, the Sommers case, why did the minister not proceed by way of contempt of court proceedings for interference with the course of justice, which would have placed these alleged wrongdoers in the position of being brought before the court? The Sommers case is very clear in this regard. In this case there would have been contempt of a gross order, which would be bad enough if committed by ordinary persons, but when committed by a parliamentary secretary or executive assistant in the government it is that much more serious. Why did he not give the information so that proceedings could be taken for contempt?

Under proceedings for contempt—such proceedings do not take place very frequently because this kind of thing never comes to light—what happens is that the alleged wrongdoer is brought before the judge. He is required to take an oath. He tells his story and the court listens to his story. It is always possible there will be lack of corroboration and the like with respect to bribery or intimidation or threats. All of these matters would have been immediately placed before the court had the attorney general of Canada discharged his responsibilities. These people would have had the opportunity of telling their stories on oath, and if there was no basis for the alleged wrongdoing they would have been cleared immediately. What is more, the Department of Justice would not have been placed under the cloud of suspicion which now hangs over it because of the failure of the minister, coupled with the co-operation of another minister, to bring to light a matter which should have been fully revealed.

The Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Nielsen) negatived: Yeas, 30; nays, 111.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the minister one or two questions on a topic unrelated to what we have been discussing. Can the minister tell me whether the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and in particular a team of officers named McCarthy and Boutel, have been interrogating persons including Mr. O'Toole and Mr. Sheehan about events that took place on July 29, 1954, which was the day the then minister of citizenship and immigration approved an order which permitted Mr. Hal Banks to remain in this country?

Mr. Favreau: The matter is under investigation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Fisher: I did not hear the minister.

Mr. Favreau: I am informed by the commissioner that this matter is under investigation.

Mr. Fisher: I assume that the R.C.M.P. and the government have decided that this whole question should be investigated in view of various rumours that may exist. Can the minister state whether he or any of the members of the R.C.M.P. have had conversations or discussions with a man by the name of Mr. Dan Riley, who I believe has a position with one of the provincial governments of this country, and who at one time was a Liberal candidate?

Mr. Pickersgill: He was a member here for awhile.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, I am informed by the commissioner that he will have to check on this, but I can say that I personally have not had occasion to discuss this matter with the commissioner. I do not think it would be proper for me at the moment to discuss an investigation which might be pending.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, I have no wish to press a matter that is under discussion, but because of the interest that has been displayed by members of this house in the past, particularly over the issue of the order which permitted Mr. Banks to stay in Canada, or the order which quashed or killed a deportation order, will the minister undertake to provide the house with a résumé of the investigation when it is completed?

[The Deputy Chairman.]

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, at the time the investigation is completed and the report received, at which time matters may be disclosed, I shall make the necessary disclosures.

Mr. Fisher: I have one other question I should like to ask the minister relating to what seems to be rather a mystery about the question of where the vouchers may be which would indicate that payments were made to Liberal candidates. Certain individuals have indicated the existence, in the files of the Department of Labour, or in the papers of the Norris inquiry, of these vouchers. Yesterday the right hon. Leader of the Opposition asked a question about the working papers or records kept by Mr. Watson in connection with this case. Can the minister indicate where the responsibility for searching for these vouchers in the files or records falls, and is a search being undertaken by the Department of Labour with any assistance from the Minister of Justice?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, since it is a matter about which hundreds of investigations are obviously made at the same time, I cannot be informed of their day to day progress.

When I spoke in English a little earlier, I think I used the wrong expression when I said that when the time came and the report I was referring to had been completed, I would make "the necessary disclosure". Of course what I meant and the word I should have used—and I think the hon. member for Port Arthur will admit that such should have been the case—was "decision". I will make, at such time, the necessary decision.

[*Text*]

Mr. Fisher: I understand the minister to mean by "disclosure", that he will tell us the results of any investigation carried out. I assume he means he will determine whether he can make any decision to institute an action as a result of an investigation. Is that what the minister means?

Mr. Favreau: Yes.

Mr. Fisher: Therefore the minister is not leaving me with any suggestion that he will at a later time let us know the results of an investigation, and whether any information is turned up that would be of interest to members of the house, or whether nothing has been found at all?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Favreau: I must say, Mr. Chairman—and I believe it is understandable—that I should, when the time comes, make the required decisions with regard to any revelation which might be made according to the nature of the file, according to my information, but one thing is certain at the present time, at least in the mind of the hon. member, and that is that the matter is being investigated.

[*Text*]

Mr. Fisher: I should like to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that he in a sense indicated that there were hundreds of inquiries taking place. Many members of this house are particularly interested as to whether these vouchers are going to be found. I want to point out to the minister, and this has been touched upon by other members, although I do not know whether anyone has put it this clearly before, that there is one citizen in Canada, Mr. Bob Reguly, who writes for the Toronto *Telegram*, who has stated in at least one story, and I believe in two, that he has seen records which indicate that such vouchers exist, including vouchers which relate to payments to at least six Liberal candidates in an election two years ago.

Now, the point I want to make to the minister—

Mr. Pickersgill: I wonder if the hon. gentleman would allow me to ask him a question at this time? Is he accurate in what he has said? I have not read the particular article, but I did read one article which said something about agents. I have never seen anything in print in any way about candidates.

Mr. Fisher: The minister is correct.

Mr. Pickersgill: It makes quite a difference in law.

Mr. Fisher: I had forgotten the names, but they were agents, anyway, and one was for the hon. member sitting right there. What I want to point out to the minister is that we have every indication from Mr. Reguly, and I suggest he check with Mr. Marc Lalonde, who was counsel, and Mr. Watson, that these cheques exist. Then we would get a complete picture of the whole matter of these vouchers. It seems very odd to some of us that the particular file which confirms this information should not be available. If the minister or the Minister of Labour cannot provide the actual vouchers, then certainly the house and I think almost any court, would be willing to accept the record that was kept by either Mr. Lalonde or by the firm of Allan Watson.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, I should like to clear up the confusion which may have resulted from my remarks.

As I understand it, the hon. member's question deals with two points.

The first of these is the Sheehan case which, as I said, is being investigated and about which I shall have to decide whether a statement should be made eventually.

The hon. member also spoke of the receipts or documents that he calls "vouchers". Let there be no misunderstanding on that point. No investigation has been carried out by the R.C.M.P. in that connection because no one alleged that a theft or some other criminal offence has been committed.

I understand that the Minister of Labour and his department are the ones who requested the investigation which is being carried out at present.

[*Text*]

Mr. Fisher: Well, I assume the minister is suggesting to me, in effect, that the responsibility for providing the information to the house in respect of this particular matter rests with the Minister of Labour. I wanted to draw to the attention of the minister that if the search, as early indications show, proves that the information is not available, we have the indication from Mr. Reguly that the information exists or a record of the information did exist, so I think it would be worth while for the minister or his officials or the Minister of Labour to get the information that Mr. Reguly has put before the public. I have every confidence that this is accurate information. I could also provide a name privately to the minister of a gentleman who is prepared—I have not asked him this but I am sure he would be prepared—to swear to the existence of the record covering these vouchers. There are at least two people with whom I have talked personally who say it existed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, there are just one or two questions I want to ask the minister, and they are disconnected. I want to make it clear that, because of the application of the guillotine tonight, some of these questions may be asked later on orders of the day since no opportunity is now given to ask about various matters that would otherwise have been carefully examined.

The first has to do with the appointment of counsel to the Dorion commission. This

commission will have a very difficult and trying experience. I should like to find out from the minister if consideration has been given to the appointment of counsel. I would think that under the particular circumstances, with all the political suspicions and implications that are inherent in this matter, a counsel free from active political partisanship would be of the essence. I know how desirous the minister will be that the fullest possible information be secured, that nothing be withheld or anything done that would lead to a suggestion that something improper was done. Things do happen, you see. You take these cheques in the Banks case. It is an unusual thing, but apparently these documents have legs; they just naturally walked away. I would have thought there would have been great care in the preservation of these documents. Certainly, they were of great importance to some members of parliament, yet apparently there is nothing in the record to show that the files were removed, either in the Department of Labour or the Department of Justice. When files are removed, a receipt is always acquired. There should be no difficulty, if those records are available, in ascertaining who was the last person to secure them. In the event they are not available, the originals have gone, then as the hon. member for Port Arthur has said, copies should be available and would have the same probative value. The first point I raise is in connection with counsel to the commission.

The second point has to do with a matter that has hung fire for months and months. The minister has been a very busy man. One has seen something of his activity in connection with the matter we have been discussing the last several days. It is a matter that has taken up a great deal of time. But surely that is not the explanation for the fact that two mounted police officers, Superintendent Belec and Inspector Poitras, were recommended for dismissal away back in July. I know the consequences are serious when men who have served for years, one of them I believe served for almost 34 years, should have visited upon them the obloquy of dismissal. It has to be pointed out that they received a trial within the law under Royal Canadian Mounted Police auspices and regulations. There is a right of appeal to the Minister of Justice. It is a re-examination which is, in effect, a right of appeal because the matter comes to his attention and he is not altogether in the position of being a rubber stamp. What is the reason that August, September, October, November—four months —have passed by and there has yet been nothing said regarding the disposition made in the case of these two officers?

Mr. Favreau: Does the right hon. gentleman mean that four months have passed by since I was seized of jurisdiction in the matter?

Mr. Diefenbaker: As I recall it, and I am speaking from recollection, as far back as July 18 the minister was asked whether the matter was before him. That is my recollection. I think *Hansard* will generally establish that; but now the minister indicates he had not the matter before him. I do not have the *Hansard* copies here but it is my recollection that in July and August these questions were asked, and the minister said the matter was receiving his attention then. If I am wrong, then my recollection of what I thought was in *Hansard* is simply an error in memory. But I do not make many of those errors in memory, and I seem to recall it was about July 17 last. I am simply asking why the delay? Why have this hanging about all these months? If it was a man in the mounted police with the rank of constable, corporal or sergeant, delays like that are not common. What is the reason that the minister has had this matter before him for so long? I will let him fix the date himself of when the matter came to his attention.

If there had been the same degree of acceleration in connection with this matter as there was in connection with the narcotics matter, there would have been action long ago. Possibly the minister wants to answer at this time, and then I shall go on to another matter.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, the right hon. Leader of the Opposition just gave us a clear illustration of the danger involved in supposing something which has not been verified, in giving the impression that something shady, irregular or inaccurate exists, and then asking questions. Starting from an erroneous statement he just formulated, in a few minutes he managed to ask five or six times: Why this, why that?

Now, here are the facts: When I answered—

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Let us have the answer and no evasion. We have had enough evasion this week.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Favreau: Wait. I believe that it is extremely important to show to what extent this system can be obnoxious and vicious.

When I replied to the question, the case was being appealed. After August, or rather after September, two investigations were held in this matter because two persons were involved.

The inquiry was held before an investigating commissioner appointed by the R.C.M.P. commissioner, and he was chosen at Edmonton to preside over this case in Montreal. The investigation was held and two reports were submitted—one for each inquiry.

In accordance with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, if a report is brought down against an officer or a member of the R.C.M.P., an appeal may be lodged with the commissioner. In the meantime, the minister must set up a revision board consisting of three members of the R.C.M.P. who will review the file and submit any recommendation to the commissioner. Then, it is up to the commissioner to maintain or refuse the appeal or to amend the decision rendered in the first instance.

The commissioner, after studying the report of the revision board in each of those two cases, rendered his own decision and submitted his report which I received on September 8, 1964.

Since September 8, 1964—because there should not be one single doubt and because doubts seem to arise so easily and so unjustly —I had other matters to look after, and I think everybody knows it—well, as it involved, in one case, one of the officers of the R.C.M.P. who had an honourable record and who, after 31 years of service, was to have been retired in four years time, and, in the other case, an officer with 15 years of service, each with a family, I was called upon, of course, in view of the seriousness of the circumstances, as Minister of Justice who would finally make recommendation to the cabinet, to perform my duties in the most responsible way.

I therefore asked for the report containing the evidence, the whole file. I asked my law officers to prepare a report on the whole matter. I reached my decision, and a preliminary draft of my recommendation and submission to the cabinet was ready 15 days ago, and my recommendations are now before the cabinet. It is as simple as that, and I think the right hon. Leader of the Opposition will agree that, under the circumstances, all necessary precautions had to be taken.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, I mentioned very clearly and definitely that after 34 years service—I was wrong in that, it is 31 years service—naturally one would expect that, but I also expect and anticipate no one will criticize me when I say that a decision made by the commissioner of the mounted police, with the years of his experience, having those same feelings and regard for length of service, and no doubt personal knowledge of the persons in question—such a decision or recommendation on his part would not be made on loose grounds and without the fullest consideration.

When I mentioned that the matter was brought up first on July 17 I was speaking from memory but it so happens, as recorded at page 5625 of *Hansard* for that date, the question was asked whether or not—

> —two members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police had been tried and sentenced for an offence concerning the misapplication of funds, and that their sentences are under review.

The minister said on that day, July 17, that the matter had not yet been before him. I simply say that in the interests of justice and of efficiency in the force, and for the welfare of the individuals in question, a delay of two months since the matter came to the attention of the minister does not reveal that regard for the seriousness of the situation that should actuate him. I am not going to say any more about it. He says the matter is before the cabinet, and that is the end.

Now I come to the third matter. We have endeavoured for some time to ascertain from the minister what is the plan of the government in connection with the technique to be followed in order to bring about the patriation of the constitution. This is something which comes peculiarly within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Justice. It was he who presided over the conference with the provinces, at which the provinces and the federal government agreed on the patriation of the constitution.

I do not intend to argue as to the terms. I hope we shall have an opportunity, because I want to say immediately that no decision and no action in this regard should be taken by this government without the fullest consideration and examination, the most careful scrutiny by this house. In other words, a matter as important as the terms upon which our

constitution shall be patriated and amended are of such consequence that this house must have the fullest opportunity to consider and examine them. Indeed I would say there should be a committee of parliament set up to look into the implications. It is not for me to argue the terms at the moment, but certainly there is a difference between the terms presented by Hon. Davie Fulton and those presented by the Minister of Justice. Indeed, the Minister of Justice himself said in this house in September that the reason Quebec had not agreed to the constitutional plan which was placed before the provinces had to do with section 91(1) of the British North America Act. Under the plan agreed to by the federal government and the provinces, it has been removed. In addition, two other sections have been added—sections 6 and 8. I am not entering upon a discussion of the facts except to say this—that Quebec and Saskatchewan would not agree in 1961. Quebec gave reasons. Now Quebec is in agreement, once a change has been made.

The minister has admitted in the course of a television appearance, when he was asked whether or not this new formula would permit the setting up of associated states, that it would "to a degree".

Mr. Favreau: On a question of privilege, this is about the seventh time this has been untruly stated. I never said that. The right hon. gentleman was not there to look at the program. He read the transcript and the way he read it in the house and elsewhere was completely wrong and false. I never said that the delegation formula or any part of the amendment formula could lead to the application of the associated states theory. All I said, tongue in cheek—and it is awful to have a statement made in that fashion interpreted in the terrible way in which the Leader of the Opposition has interpreted it throughout the country—all I said, tongue in cheek, was: Yes, but if the other nine provinces decided to delegate the same powers at the same time and Quebec did not, it would leave Quebec in a special position.

The Chairman: May I suggest there will be an opportunity for the hon. gentleman to make his comments after the Leader of the Opposition has made his statement.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, I can well understand that the finer sensibilities of the minister have been exacerbated, because I heard him make the statement when he was asked whether or not this new formula would permit the setting up of associate states. His words were: "To a degree, yes". I simply point that out, and I will produce the record. Deny it as he may, that is the statement he made and he has been running for cover ever since because he is anxious to get away from it. I do not have to take any other interpretation. I can read what the Liberal press has to say in that connection. I did not intend to do this until I was forced to bring it up in this connection.

On October 20, the Toronto *Star*, which has never been noted as being one of the papers in this country which gives slavish adherence to the Conservative party, said this:

> It may be nothing short of a national disaster if parliament rubberstamps the agreement reached last week between the federal and provincial premiers regarding the amendment of Canada's constitution.

It ends:

> The agreement as it stands, in fact, represents a triumph for the extreme "provincial rights" faction which wishes to exalt the role of the provinces and reduce that of the federal government to a minimum. It could be a milestone in the break-up of confederation.

Again, in another issue, the same paper says this:

> The national debate over strong central government versus greater provincial autonomy has become lopsided in favour of the provincial position largely because Prime Minister Pearson prefers to stand above the battle, smiling encouragement at both sides.

Then it goes on to indicate—quoting, here, from one of the parliamentary secretaries—

> Canada is not a concept in the air. Canada is a collective identify of all those who fulfil this everyday living of the Canadian fact.

We want to know the facts. Parliament has a right fully to discuss this matter. I am simply pointing out, now, that we cannot accept a suggestion on the part of the government that it can enter into an agreement relative to a matter such as this, without parliament. Let that be very clear. That is what we are asking—that parliament shall decide. It is all very well to try to build a smokescreen and say the Fulton formula is much the same.

Mr. Favreau: It is identical.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is not, with section 91 removed.

Mr. Macdonald: Mr. Fulton says so.

Mr. Diefenbaker: And whether it is or not, back in 1961 the Lévesques, and those people, were not talking about associate states in Canada and dividing this nation.

An hon. Member: There is the truth.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We were talking about one nation then, not two nations within a single state—

Mr. Prud'homme: What have you got against Mr. Lévesque?

Mr. Diefenbaker: One nation—Canada.

I did not hear the hon. member's intervention. I have no doubt it is as intelligent as those in which he usually indulges.

Mr. Prud'homme: I will repeat it. I just asked the right hon. gentleman what he has against Mr. Lévesque?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Nothing at all, except that the parliament of Canada shall decide. I notice that the other day Mr. Lévesque received the approval of one of the ministers of this government, I think it was the Secretary of State, who said he "stands for great things". Mr. Chairman, he stands for an associate state and a nation within a nation, something this confederation cannot accept and which would not permit the continuance in the next hundred years of this country in all its strength and its power.

Mr. Pickersgill: Would the right hon. gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, absolutely.

Mr. Pickersgill: Is the right hon. gentleman now admitting that the power of delegation which he recommended two years ago showed so little foresight that it would make it possible to have an associate state?

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have mentioned that there was delegation. But there has been change.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: There is nobody more helpful than the Minister of Transport, because he just blindly gets up and blurts something out; he has no idea what the answer will be. He is a wonderful fellow.

Mr. Pickersgill: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I can tell the right hon. gentleman that I know there would be no direct and honest answer to that question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I know the care that the hon. gentleman always exercises in what he says. I am not going to deal with it today, but I will have the opportunity soon of quoting some of his remarks regarding some hon. members of this house, and I am sure he will be ashamed that he ever made the statements.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Does the minister ask what they were?

Mr. Pickersgill: No.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, no, he does not.

Mr. Pickersgill: I am not interested in any Pickersgill regurgitations.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I recall that on March 28, 1963, in Sudbury he spoke of the hon. member for Red Deer, the leader of the Social Credit party, and said, "He has got nothing. He is the most pathetic creature I have ever seen in parliament in my days. He has nothing but a Pepsodent smile and is able to comb his hair". That is what he said about one whom today he draws to his bossom in political embrace. I could go on, Mr. Chairman, but that is just one sterling example of the changed attitude of the hon. gentleman between March, 1963 and November, 1964.

I say this, Mr. Chairman, that in so far as this formula is concerned, we want it examined. We want to know from the government what we have not been able to secure information on, namely, do they intend to take the British North America Act as it now is, bring it before parliament and re-enact it as a Canadian statute? Do they intend to give us the opportunity to deal with it section by section? What is the plan the government has in this regard—for I warn the government now that in so far as any agreement is concerned respecting repatriation, this parliament is going to have the right to give it the fullest consideration.

I do not know why the minister has been so evasive in this regard. He has been asked several times, "What is your plan? What do you intend to do? Do you intend to bring the act as a whole before parliament?" I ask him now, let us know. I know he has been very busy in recent days, weeks and months; but this is something regarding which Canadians have a right to know the course of action being followed. We want to know whether in the amendment of the constitution we are to be assured by the government that this nation shall be preserved on the basis of the principles of an equal partnership between the English and the French, at the same time with equality for all Canadians over and above the constitutional rights. I ask the minister, what is the plan?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister, who has been dealing with this matter in the house, if my memory serves me correctly, stated some days ago to the house

that the final plans with regard to the manner in which the matter of the constitutional amendments would be brought into the house would not be announced until such time as the agreement of the provinces to the formula had been obtained.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Has not the government of Canada any plan? Why should parliament be kept in the dark? Is the plan submitted to parliament going to be different, depending on whether or not the provinces express their views in this regard? What is the reason for delay? Why cannot we be told? I would like to know, why all the concealment? It seems that the Department of Justice has, under the present minister, developed to the highest degree possible the techniques of keeping under cover the things that parliament has the right to know. Surely there must be some plan; or are we to take it from the evasive answers that have been given that what the government has in mind is to bring about this change and not allow parliament a section by section examination of the British North America Act and the changes that have been agreed upon?

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

1. Departmental administration, including grants to military associations, institutes and other organizations as detailed in the estimates and authority, notwithstanding section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, and subject to allotment by the treasury board, for total commitments of $2,289,221,625 for the purposes of votes 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 42, 45 and 50 of this department regardless of the year in which such commitments will come in course of payment (of which it is estimated that $799,648,500 will come due for payment in future years) and authority to make recoverable advances under any of the said votes and, notwithstanding the Financial Administration Act, to spend revenue received during the year in respect of assistance rendered to the United Nations, any party of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or any provincial or municipal government, $3,917,825.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, there are two matters I would like to raise with the minister at this time. I spoke on this item initially but there are two matters I wish to bring to his attention. First of all, yesterday the minister answered in sort of a discursive fashion questions relating to the state of the navy in Halifax concerning six ships which had been laid up under skeleton crews because of the lack of skilled technicians. Then we find further disclosures have been made to the effect that the net loss to the navy of trained personnel is about 75 men a month, and there have been examples of people leaving the navy in such large numbers that almost the whole, if not the whole, of a class of trainees left on graduation or did not sign on for a further term of service.

There is something radically wrong within the service if this is the condition that exists. I am making these remarks because of my sincere worry and concern for the navy, because the Department of National Defence should be taking care to provide training for its men. They have devoted a tremendous amount of money to bringing forward these trained men, and yet we see them disappearing from the service. The minister himself will agree that there must be something wrong with a state of affairs that produces this result. These men are going out into industry. Certainly there will be a certain amount of wastage, and this applies to the air force and to the army; but to the extent that it applies at the moment to the navy there must be something radically wrong. It certainly is not only limited to questions of pay allowances; there must be some worry on the part of these men about their future in the service. I have had this opinion expressed to me by men who left the air force this year. They were offered extensions of commission and they said, "Not on your life"; there was too much uncertainty to induce them to remain in the service. These are men with relatively few years in the service; they are young men who have been trained at a cost of thousands of dollars. Yet they have not confidence enough in the service to remain in it. There is something fundamentally wrong when numbers of men leave the service, be it the army, the air force or the navy.

I have one particular question in this connection. We would like to hear a fuller explanation from the minister than was given in the question period yesterday, and we want more than what seemed to be a script of apology that was given by some correspondent, on behalf of the navy, last night over the news system.

The second point I make is on behalf of the hon. member for Oxford, and it is a matter into which I should like the minister to inquire because something is fundamentally wrong. I should like to refer to question 1,745 and parliamentary return No. 2,572, dealing with four questions asked by the hon. member for Oxford concerning a certain Department of National Defence vehicle bearing Ontario licence plate number 27120F and its performance between the hours of 10.30 a.m. and 11.30 a.m. on Monday, August 17, 1964. The hon. member for Oxford asked what the vehicle was doing at

those times, under whose charge it was, and so on. The answer to the second of his questions was:

This vehicle was assigned to and under the control of a member of the privy council office, assigned as office manager in the secretariat of the third commonwealth education conference at the time in question.

The answer to the third question was as follows:

Two assignments were carried out during the hours of 10.30 a.m. and 11.30 a.m.—

Then (a) is not pertinent because it concerns a trip to the queen's printer in Hull. The answer continues:

(b) The driver, accompanied by a messenger, proceeded to a local business establishment to obtain supplies for the commonwealth education conference.

This is the official reply given to the hon. member for Oxford. He cannot be here today but he tells me that he was an eye witness and saw this vehicle at 11.15 a.m. outside the national Liberal headquarters on Cooper street, and certain personnel were removing boxes and parcels of papers or documents, in any event stationery of some kind—pamphlets or something of that nature. These documents were loaded into this army vehicle at precisely 11.15 a.m. I am wondering whether the euphemistic phrase "a local business establishment" has been substituted for the exact establishment. It would be interesting to know why this vehicle which was assigned to an officer in the privy council office would call at the national Liberal headquarters to take documents from that location to whatever destination they were taken.

I would ask the minister to look into this matter very carefully because I do not think we can stand army vehicles being used for the transportation of party literature or documents from any location at all. I do not think the minister would tolerate this if he knew about it, and I should like him to look into it.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, on the first question raised, as I said yesterday there are many factors in respect to re-engagement rates and I believe it is the case that they are not satisfactory. One of the factors, probably the most important factor of all, is the question of opportunities in the civilian economy. It just happens that there are many opportunities at very good salaries and wages for highly trained technical personnel, and consequently when terms of re-engagement are considered and opportunities are available in private life which pay more money with equal security it is not unnatural that a number of people take advantage of the situation and go to other employment. So that you will find if you plot re-engagement rates over a long period of time that there is a direct correlation here, and probably the most important factor is the opportunities existing in the civilian economy. Particularly does this apply to technical personnel—electricians, electronic engineers, and so on—who are in most short supply.

There are also other factors affecting the situation. It is difficult to gauge the proportion of one factor to another because it is a subjective analysis, but certainly in the Halifax area housing is an important consideration and has been for a number of years. There is inadequate housing for naval personnel, particularly at rates that ratings can afford. Consequently this has a direct bearing on any decision they might make to go into civilian employment as against remaining in the Royal Canadian Navy. I have no doubt that the reorganization which is taking place is another factor, and this is inevitable. We have made no attempt to hide the fact that in a major reorganization of the kind now in process you cannot avoid some dislocation and uncertainty. I think this is regrettable but it is the fact; you cannot achieve what we are trying to achieve without there being an element of uncertainty, at least for a period of time.

Having said that I again reassure the hon. gentleman and the committee that every effort will be made to overcome as many factors as can be overcome. The shipbuilding program, which may have some bearing on the sense of insecurity which members of the navy may feel, will be announced as soon as we can get governmental approval.

Mr. Lambert: Will it be destroyers?

Mr. Hellyer: The type will be announced in due course. The housing situation is being reviewed at the moment to see whether something can be done in that area. I am sure that the civilian employment situation is something which hon. members will applaud —the fact there are opportunities available in the civilian economy. But this means that we have to compete with and offer more than those opportunities.

With respect to the question of uncertainty we will make every effort to end this uncertainty, or as much of it as we can, as early as we can; it is a matter under active study. I agree with my hon. friend this is a matter of concern, but I say again it is not a new

problem. However, it is one we must face, and every reasonable step will be taken to overcome the shortage.

In respect to those particular ships which have been put in alongside, this is not a matter of too great importance, because as my hon. friend knows they do not add very much to our operational capability. They are old and long in the tooth. But that does not mean that we must not take every step to see there are crews available for our first line fighting ships in the future.

With respect to the second point raised, about the car, I am as surprised as is the hon. gentleman. I can assure him that if his allegation is true, and I certainly do not doubt the word of an hon. member, I not only do not condone it but I will issue instructions that it must not happen again. I was informed that this car was under the control of the privy council office. I think it is one permanently assigned to that office. I am afraid I cannot give any more satisfactory explanation than that at the present time, but I will undertake to look into this question and if any instruction is necessary I will see it is given.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman, there are a considerable number of matters I should have liked to go into in detail, but in the very few minutes remaining it is obviously impossible to do so. Therefore I will briefly touch on two or three.

The minister has just told us something about the difficulties involved in maintaining a sufficient number of technical personnel as far as the navy is concerned. During the past year or so I have expressed concern on a number of occasions about what has been an apparent decline in the efficiency and effectiveness of our naval forces. Again only yesterday an announcement was made that six more naval vessels are being tied up at Halifax because of an inability to man them with technical personnel. I think this is conclusive proof of the extremely serious decline which has taken place in our naval strength and effectiveness.

Only a little more than two years ago, at the time of the Cuban crisis, all six of those vessels now tied up were at sea, plus nine other vessels which have since been taken out of commission. Those vessels were all crewed at that time with sufficient technical and other personnel to enable them to carry out their jobs. The minister is shaking his head, indicating that is not the case. I was the minister at the time and received good reports about all of these ships. I am willing to admit that there has always been some shortage of technical personnel, but we had a sufficient number of men to man those ships and enable them to carry out their tasks effectively. I do not think there is a senior officer now in the navy who will say anything else.

In two years time we find that over 16 ships, which were manned two years ago, at sea and prepared to do whatever was required in the event the Cuban crisis developed as it was feared it would at one time, cannot now be manned and are being tied up. The excuses given by the minister as to the difficulty involved in maintaining a sufficient number of personnel are inadequate. They are excuses which will not hold water.

The basic reason for this drop in the number of technical personnel, and I think the minister is aware of this, is the decline in morale in the navy resulting from the discouraging things this government has done. One of the most important of those discouragements is the cancellation of the shipbuilding program and the failure, at least to this date, on the part of the government to replace that program. The minister has spoken of a shipbuilding program, but he has been speaking along those lines for several months, and nothing has come of it. If the minister does have a shipbuilding program in mind, the time is long overdue for an announcement so that the program can get under way. After a decision has been made it will take four or five years to put the ships into operation at sea. The time lag in this regard is already serious, but the excuses given by the minister relating to the lack of technical personnel are inadequate.

The housing problem, to which he referred, is no worse now than it was two, three or four years ago, and in fact I suspect it is better now than it was at that time. The opportunities for employment in civilian occupations has been a factor in this regard throughout the time period I mentioned. No real change has taken place in that regard. The real change which has taken place is the result of what the government has done or failed to do. This has been discouraging to naval personnel and has broken down their morale, causing the personnel to feel that there is little use in continuing in the navy because there will likely be no future for them, and that they had better get out while the getting is good. That is exactly what has been happening.

I want to make one last plea to the minister to make some changes in the announced plan as far as reserve forces are concerned, and to continue to maintain some of the squadrons and companies in rural areas, which have throughout our history been among the best sources for militia men. It is essential that these units continue in operation in those areas, and I might mention particularly the Hastings-Prince Edward regiment, whose outside companies are disappearing, and the New Brunswick Hussars, which was the best armoured militia regiment for a number of years. I doubt very much whether any money will be saved by doing away with these detached companies and squadrons, and I make one last plea to the minister to reconsider some of these cuts, and to maintain some of these rural units and companies.

One other matter I should like to deal with relates to a return which I received, dated October 28. My question had been on the order paper for some three months, and was related to the number of officers of the rank of commodore and above in the navy, and officers with similar ranks in other forces that have ceased to be members of the permanent force, or have been given notice that they would be retired, or who have sent in their resignations. In each case I asked for the name of the officer, the appointment held and, where applicable, the number of years and months the officer would have to serve until normal retirement age. In each case I asked that an indication be given as to whether the officer retired on reaching normal retirement age, whether the officer put in a resignation on his own volition, or whether he was asked to retire.

I must complain bitterly about the return I received in this regard, Mr. Chairman, because it is a false return. The retirement age of a lieutenant colonel is laid down as 51 years of age; of a full colonel, 53 years of age; of a brigadier and major general, 55 years of age. However in this return, and I am not going to take the time to read it all, the majority of officers retired below the full age of 55; yet under the heading "Remarks" appears the notation that they were normal retirements. One air commodore retired at age 53, which is two years earlier than normal retirement age. Yet under the remarks appears the notation that this is a normal retirement and there was no length of time left until normal retirement age, and no extra payment made. There is no indication as to whether this was a voluntary retirement or whether the officer was asked to retire.

Another air commodore, who was chief of telecommunications, retired at age 53, and in this case the notation is that it was a normal retirement.

Another air commodore retired at age 51, four years before normal retirement age, and the notation in this case is that it was a normal retirement. He was the deputy commander 29 region NORAD.

Another air commodore retired at age 52, and the notation is that this was a normal retirement. I have just given a few examples to indicate that this is not a correct return. If the officers had retired at normal retirement age, they would have retired at age 55, and if they retired younger than that, there should have been some notation as to the number of years still to be served until normal retirement age, and whether the officers retired voluntarily or as the result of a request. I object strenuously to this kind of incorrect information being provided to members of parliament.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I may be permitted to answer that allegation at once. First of all, may I just say one further word in respect of naval technical personnel. For some time, when the hon. member was minister and since then, ships have been manned by taking naval technical personnel off ships, as soon as they tie up for refitting, and putting them into another crew on a ship on its way out to sea. This has created a serious condition of overwork for naval technical personnel. It has contributed also to a considerable decline in morale amongst them.

Now, the new cyclical use of ships crews eliminates that practice. This will improve morale, but at the same time it means that we do not overwork the technical personnel to the extent that they have been overworked in the past. Consequently more technical personnel are required in order to keep the ships operating. I think my hon. friend will appreciate this.

In respect of his allegation that the information contained in the return is incorrect or false, this is not right and I deny both allegations. The information given was correct. The question asked for information as to the names of all officers of brigadier or equivalent rank who, since January 1, 1964, have ceased to be members of the permanent force or have been given notice that they would be retired or have sent in their resignations. In each case, the name of the officer was asked for, the appointment held by him, his age and where applicable the number of

years and months to go to normal retirement age. Information was asked also as to whether each officer retired on reaching normal retirement age, put in his resignation of his own volition or was asked to retire.

In answer to this question, information was given as to name, rank, age, appointment, length of time to normal retirement and remarks, that is normal retirement by notice of voluntary retirement. The age given was the age of the officer at the time the return was prepared. The length of time to normal retirement age was interpreted as the time to go between actual retirement date and the date at which the officer would reach compulsory retirement age.

An example given by the hon. gentleman, I do not think he named him, was that of Air Commodore Timmerman. He will reach compulsory retirement age on February 12, 1966. He will start his retirement leave on August 19, 1965. He was informed to this effect on June 1, 1964. It is normal practice in the Royal Canadian Air Force to notify, whenever possible, all officers from 12 to 14 months prior to the date of terminal leave.

The other relevant point is that air commodores on the general list of air crew are retired at the age of 53, whereas air commodores and brigadiers on the other lists are retired at the age of 55. This rule has been in effect for a number of years. I can give the hon. gentleman, if he wishes, the names of four air commodores who were retired at the age of 53 when he was a minister. I do not know if he wants me to put those names on the record or just to send them to him. In February, 1961; in January, 1962; in May, 1961, and in February 1962, four air commodores of the pilot branch were retired at the age of 53. They, too, would have been given notice many months in advance when they were 52 or 51, depending on the length of notice the Royal Canadian Air Force had given them. This return, therefore, is correct in that detail. It is not misleading and there was no attempt whatever, nor was there in fact, any misrepresentation with regard to it.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman, I do not accept that explanation as being correct in these cases. As I say, the normal retirement age is 55 for all these people, and to say that a man is given notice when he is going to be retired after six months leave and then take this case which was mentioned at age 51 and try to have it appear as a normal retirement, I do not believe stands up. I asked for the ages of these people. I think it is quite clear that the age that was required was the age when the man retired. To put another interpretation upon it is to try to twist the sense of the question and twist the information which was required, out of context. In my view, this is an incorrect return.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with the question of the Canadian militia. I will try to be brief. It is only because of the pressure of time that the minister is fortunate enough to escape a thorough discussion of his estimates which should normally take about three days. We have had just one day on them. I had hoped that the militia alone would have been the subject of a full discussion because it is an important branch of the service in Canada. I expected there would be some criticism of the minister's action with regard to the Canadian militia. The hon. member for Calgary North, when he was speaking, expressed the hope the minister would take another look at what he is doing to the reserve forces of Canada.

I do not expect the minister will take another look. In the over a year and a half that we have been dealing with him, I do not know of any suggestion from our side of the house which he has adopted. He has obstinately refused to change his position. This is most unfortunate. There is some value in getting advice from all sides of this house. I suggest that the minister should review his action with regard to the militia, but I hold out no hope to militiamen across this country, as I have told several of them, that he will do that. His record with regard to the militia is not good, nor is the record of the party he represents. I speak from the experience of 15 years of service in the militia. I know what I am talking about in this regard.

I know how desperately the militia, in the interwar years, was in need of assistance and how niggardly was the response to that need, particularly in the years 1935 onward when it was obvious to everybody who had any sense at all that we were facing an outbreak of war. I am surprised that the minister has dealt with the Canadian militia so carelessly. When we were dealing with the estimates before, I mentioned that the minister had said not one word about the Canadian militia. It was a subject uppermost in the minds of the members of this house, and uppermost in the minds of the militia across Canada. There was not a word, not even a word of thanks to the regiments that were being disbanded. I think that this is not right.

Surely, the government of this country has a duty to people who will give militia serv-

ice. It is not an easy service. People have to sign on in the full knowledge that, having signed on for service in the militia or in any reserve unit in this country, they are obligated to go wherever trouble occurs, to stand up and be counted or be shot at. It is a serious decision that men make when they enter the militia of this country. It is not just a casual occupation. It is not a social club, as I have been told by some people. I have never known that in all the years I served in the militia. There was not one word of thanks from this government to regiments that are being disbanded. Almost worse than that, there has been a massive silence across this country with regard to these changes in the militia; there has been indifference and apathy.

I have been shocked at the response in Canada to the changes made in the militia regiments, the changes that will occur in cities and towns because of the disbandment of regiments. Even those people who do such a good job from day to day disseminating news and editorial comment have published nothing in their papers but obituary notices concerning regiments being disbanded. In the newspapers and magazines I have not seen any series of articles dealing with the importance of the militia to Canada and the history of the militia. The history of the Canadian militia extends over three and a half centuries. It is an honourable one which should be known to everybody, and as Canada is approaching the 20 million population figure the militia, rather than being reduced in size should be enlarged to give young people an opportunity to serve their country.

The minister is wiping out the Winnipeg Grenadiers and the Victoria Rifles, two regiments about whom the conscience of Canada should be bothered. These were the two that went to Hong Kong on that forlorn expedidition that was so disastrous, and now they are being wiped out, 25 years later. If there are any two regiments that should be maintained these are they, at least so far as the present generation is concerned. Do we owe a debt of gratitude to these regiments? I say we do, and that they should be maintained in the order of battle.

By question and short answer we have dealt with the Irish Fusiliers and the Irish Rifles. It is most unfortunate that the minister has taken such a stubborn stand with regard to these two important units in the militia, with such great tradition behind them. Indeed I am surprised that the people in the cities where they are located have not impressed upon the government the mistake that is being made. The minister is also wiping out the Princess Louise Dragoon Guards of Ottawa, a regiment that has 92 years history behind it. I do not name all of those which are being disbanded but I say the minister is giving the militia disgraceful treatment.

He and his advisers do not appreciate the work of the militia. I wonder if he and his advisers served in the militia and put in those evening drill periods, those week ends, and summer camps year after year. Militiamen do this, though there are things of greater interest to them that they might be doing.

One recommendation of the Suttie commission that I hope will be followed deals with a publicity operation with regard to the militia, to let the people of the country know the service being rendered by thousands of young men. This has been one of the serious weaknesses in the militia. Even at this time of crisis to the militia its officers and men are prohibited from publicly stating their case. They are under military orders, and so it is left to the civilians to protest the mistake. The officers and men cannot do that. They are dependant upon their outside supporters within communities, and that is why I am now speaking on behalf of the militia.

I shall not take up any more time of the committee except to refer it, and the newspapers of the country, to a book published a few years ago by the Macmillan Company, "Canada's Soldiers 1604-1954," written by George F. G. Stanley of the Royal Military College of Canada. It gives the story of Canada's soldiers right from the beginning of the country, and deals with the importance of the militia. I conclude by reading the last paragraph in the book in which is expressed very ably the debt that we owe to Canada's militia:

> For three centuries and a half Canadians have borne arms. Essentially a civilian people, an unmilitary people, they have, through historical necessity, fought to preserve their freedom and their identity. No men have fought better: no men have as quickly discarded the skills of war to return to the farms and factories of peace. During their 300 years and more, Canadian soldiers have tramped over the white snows of Canada, the quiet countryside of England, the rugged mountains of Italy, and the muddy polders of Holland; they have battled the Indians, the British, the Americans, within and on the frontiers of their own country; they have fought the Germans and Italians in Europe, and the Japanese in Asia; they have left their dead behind them from the Arctic to the Mediterranean. Canada's soldiers! They are the farmers, the traders, the mechanics, the labourers, the doctors, lawyers, and teachers of peacetime. Very few of them have ever been professional soldiers.
>
> But, militiaman and regular, they have carried the torch of Canada's military tradition. A brave buckskin, the white, the red and the khaki

tunics. Their deeds are our history; their names are forgotten, but their achievements are commemorated in the very existence of Canada as a nation. This military story of Canada is a bold and mighty thing, and yet it is a bald tale and unadorned, a tale of those simple virtues of courage, endurance and self-sacrifice which war, for all its horrors and wanton destruction, seems to evoke in men inspired by a common sense of purpose. Perhaps out of this comradeship of arms, this memory of heroic past, will some day come that sense of inward unity which is born of perils shared and victories won.

Mr. Alkenbrack: I would like to congratulate the hon. members for Calgary North and Winnipeg South Centre on coming to the aid of the militia. It seems ironic that at this season, long dedicated to remembrance of the fallen, and indeed within a few days of the date solemn to their memory, which we celebrated at our cenotaphs, that one should be obliged to speak in defence of the traditions for which these men stood, and for the facilities and system that made their service possible. I believe it is an accurate statement now, as it has been for many years past, that Canada's defence is based on this hypothesis: a small but intensively trained regular army acting as an instructional cadre to the citizen-soldiers who form a well-trained and competent militia, which is brought quickly to full strength and training in time of war.

Modern weapons and their technology have complicated the soldiers' equipment and drills, but surely the will and the skill to defend is still the most important defence and deterrent the nation possesses. How can we foster these talents without a continuous attention to and emphasis upon the proper training of our youth within their various localities and in conjunction with home and school, as a healthy and normal activity?

Surely all will agree that for many years past our local militia units and the armouries in which they train have amply illustrated and stood for that will and that skill. Indeed they have been our only means of translating the nation's determination to action in the hard shock of war. Now I am given to understand that in my own constituency two militia units, those at Picton and at Napanee, are to be disbanded and if I interpret the verdict correctly their respective armouries are to be disposed of, with the likelihood that these valuable buildings will be torn down and sold to the highest bidders. I think they are worthy of a better fate than that. These units, their influence and their quarters, are simply to disappear. Is that true, Mr. Chairman?

It is well recognized that military reorganization is necessary from time to time, that some units must merge with others or that units must change from one corps to another and be designated to other tasks. No one would dispute this. There would be no serious disruption if this were the case. What has caused the storm of protest is the appalling news that not only are the units to be disbanded but that the very armouries are to go as well. I have received 150 letters from the riding of Prince Edward-Lennox protesting against this measure taken by the present government—150 letters from ordinary people across the riding whose sons, yes and whose daughters, have made use of the training afforded by these two installations for the past 50 years in Picton and Napanee. The tragic news is not only that the units are to be disbanded but that the armouries are to go as well.

I wonder whether the full implications of this policy are really understood by all members of this committee—whether they can really appreciate what this will mean to small communities where communal activity of many kinds, civilian as well as military, centers around these noble and historic buildings? In cities, where a number of military formations exist, each with a headquarters to house it, an armoury might be removed without greatly disturbing the over-all efficiency of training and the life of the society, but to a small and largely rural community it is a disaster of no small proportions. The fact is that the rural communities contribute the greatest military potential per capita of any part of the country. Though people fail to realize it, no matter what condition may exist, and no matter what the reasons behind the decision may have been, if these armouries are destroyed, military training and all that it means is forever destroyed with them. I say to the minister: if he destroys the volunteer will to defend this country he will have to establish another system in its place in case of emergency, possibly conscription; and hon. members know how distasteful conscription is to certain parts of this country. He would do better to maintain the militia force, which has been of such value to this country in the past. If the armouries are destroyed, military training and all it means is forever gone. It is a dead issue and it cannot be revived.

The most serious aspect of this is the fact that the tradition of voluntary military service vanishes with it. Let there be no mistake: The voluntary participation by our young men in military service—the characteristic feature of Canadian defence—starts first in

these small towns, in these armouries across the land. If this spirit does not start with the volunteers it will not exist on the day war is declared. What will happen to these young men who are now engaged in military training, if present plans are carried out? On my last visit as a spectator on training night at Napanee armoury I counted a total of 34 young men of all ranks on parade. That was on November 5, one of the last drills being held by the 47th medium battery artillery R.C.A., Napanee. I submit that 34 men out to drill on a mid-week evening represents a very good turnout for a town of that size.

The Chairman: Order. Pursuant to the special order passed by this house on November 18 last it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every vote outstanding in committee of supply—

Mr. Lambert: On a point of order. I put it to you, Mr. Chairman, that the terms of the order as drafted and as they appear in *Votes and Proceedings* indicate that not later than November 27 all main estimates and supplementary estimates A, B and C shall be dealt with as well as the necessary appropriations bill at all stages. There is no time indicated.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lambert: I put it to Your Honour that certain items in the main estimates have not been dealt with. There is a mandatory order which says they shall be dealt with and I put it to you, in the light of the progress which has been made—I understand certain items may be withdrawn—that in half an hour or so the whole of the estimates and the appropriation bill could be dealt with. But in any event I do suggest to you that the wording of the order which is an order to this house, would supersede standing orders. There is no time limit, except for the date and, therefore, the hour of six o'clock set for the termination of our business in the standing orders would not govern our proceedings today.

There is a further point. The order directs the committee to deal with all the main estimates and supplementary estimates. If Your Honour rules that the discussion shall now cease, I put it to you that we are disregarding the order inasmuch as we shall not have dealt with the items, which will not even have been called. The list which is before Your Honour will not be dealt with because there are still a few items left. I put it to Your Honour that there is an order of the house to deal with this particular business, and that this supersedes any standing order. Therefore I would suggest to Your Honour that we carry on so that we can complete the business that is before this house, by order of the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caron: I believe that the hon. member who has been in the past Speaker of the house and who has just resumed his seat, is wrong.

It is true that we agreed on November 27 as to the date for concluding the debate on the estimates, but normally the sitting on that day ends at six o'clock.

Standing order 6, paragraph 4, says:

[*Text*]

When it is provided in any standing order that the business under consideration at the ordinary time of adjournment be forthwith disposed of or concluded, Mr. Speaker shall not adjourn the house until the specified proceedings be completed.

[*Translation*]

What we have to do now is to vote the items and, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, you cannot but maintain the decision that is before you.

[*Text*]

Mr. Leboe: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a word or two here. I think it was the understanding that we were going to make an honest effort, as a bunch of parliamentarians, to get the job done. I think we could go on for half an hour, as has been suggested, and get these items passed. I do not believe it will take us all night to do the job. Furthermore, if we did complete these estimates it would be some evidence to the country that we can discipline ourselves and get the work through this house. I suggest we should not hold up the business on technicalities. The spirit of this motion was that we would finish these items tonight. We decided that this would be done. I say, therefore, let us continue for a while and get the job done. There may be a few remarks to be made by some hon. members; let us not deny them this opportunity to say a few words. I think we should sit for half an hour or an hour and there would not be any problem at all. I do not believe we should be technical in this regard.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, as I understand the order, it is an order of the house made last Wednesday and becomes one of the many orders in the rule book. I suggest that the order has to be read in conjunction with the order setting the hours of sitting, and the order setting the hours of sitting deals with the hour of adjournment on Friday. Also, Mr.

Chairman, standing order 6(4) sets out very clearly the duty of the chairman at that point in the proceedings. Therefore the situation, as I see it, is that it is clear under the rules that the obligation of the Chair at six o'clock is to put every question required to complete the whole business in this connection. Having said that, and if it is agreed that this is the correct position under the rules, I am not going to insist that it is now six o'clock; and if it is 30 minutes to six o'clock—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): It is 25 minutes to six o'clock.

Mr. McIlraith: If it is 25 minutes to six o'clock now, that is quite agreeable to me. But I do not want there to be any misunderstanding about my position as to the order of the house, namely that it should be carried out and that the position is clear, if read in conjunction with the other orders. Having taken that position, Mr. Chairman, I am quite agreeable to its now being 25 minutes to six o'clock.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I think the record had better be clear for the purpose of any future reference in a situation like this. I do not accept the statement of the minister that standing order 6(4) is applicable under the present circumstances at all. Just because the special order of the house of November 18 was not as accurately drawn as it should have been, he cannot now say that it has to be read in conjunction with standing order 6(4), which talks about standing orders. This is a special order of the house with which we are dealing, and it says these items will be dealt with. It also says "November 27", and there is no terminal hour in that special order. If we are of the opinion that some of the items should be discussed at greater length, there is nothing to prevent our going on for another two or three hours.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: I believe we cannot be placed under any restriction by the minister.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I could ask the hon. gentleman a question?

The Chairman: Order. Arguments have been submitted by hon. members in connection with the interpretation of the order with which the Chair and the members of the committee have to comply. I am afraid that I cannot in any way accept the contention of the hon. member for Edmonton West to the effect that a day means any hour of the day. The order that has been made has the effect of a standing order—the hon. member knows that very well—and it has to be interpreted in the light of all other standing orders. According to our standing orders, this day is a day that ends at six o'clock. This is definitely the opinion of the Chair.

On the other hand, I quite appreciate that hon. members may wish to continue beyond the hour of six o'clock. However, the ruling of the Chair is that we have an order of the house, and the order is that the question on all votes should be put at six o'clock. This is an order of the house, and for that reason requires the unanimous consent of the house to be dispensed with. My suggestion to hon. members is that if there is not unanimous consent to our continuing the proceeding after six o'clock, the Chair has no alternative but to put before the committee for approval the question on those matters that are still unfinished.

Mr. Winch: Let us give unanimous consent now.

Mr. Caron: I do not give that consent, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: The question is on vote No. 1—

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question before Your Honour proceeds. We are placed in this position. Your Honour is insisting that because unanimous consent was not given by the government side of the house each vote remaining uncalled should be called, there shall be no discussion on those votes and closure will be applied.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: It is to this, sir, that I object.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Churchill: I am on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. We made an agreement on November 18 setting an allocation of time, by way of trial, on the main estimates, and no one could foresee just how that would work out. It has so happened that on Tuesday of this week we sat through the supper hour except for 20 minutes, we sat late on Monday night and on Tuesday night; and today, by agreement—which we did not have to give—we sat through the lunch hour. We have co-operated with the government to that extent, and now the government is saying that the remaining estimates must be

forced through this house without the opportunity for us to say anything on them.

Mr. Caron: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Churchill: I am still on a point of order and I am not yielding the floor to the hon. gentleman who has refused to give unanimous consent.

Mr. Caron: I want to explain why.

Mr. Churchill: He wants to impose closure and use the big club, and we are not going to subject ourselves to it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: You can shout all you like but I have the floor. I am suggesting we have played our full part in this. The suggestion to allocate time and the seven days came from me. We have co-operated by sitting these extra hours after ten o'clock and during the lunch and supper hours. I suggest to the government let them do the same thing and give us the opportunity, if we so desire, to discuss the estimates which have not yet been discussed, because we are still dealing with some millions of dollars.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, let me make one point quite clear. The hon. member referred to using a club, and I think after reading *Hansard* he might wish he had not said that. There is an order of the house in this regard. What he said about his originating the suggestion is quite correct. But it is not a question of an agreement; an order of the house was made by agreement. When requests were made to sit extra hours on my part, on some occasions the committee agreed and on other occasions representatives from the hon. gentleman's party did not agree. I think that was the case last night. On one occasion I think it was an hon. member in the N.D.P. who did not agree. In any event I think the experiment has been interesting, useful and a proper experiment. I do not recede from the stand I take on the interpretation of the rules, but if it is not six o'clock now I am happy to have some agreement to sit a little longer as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Leboe: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, I would point out that this is an experiment in disciplining this house. Surely we are not going to see the spectacle, after we have tried to co-operate with the government, of the government not keeping its own members in control so that we can get co-operation from the other side of the house. The situation is as plain as anything to anybody. We were co-operating with the house first to get the estimates passed, so we would not see the spectacle of having a flag debate extending to heaven knows when, and then having to go into interim supply in the new year. We now find we do not get unanimous consent from someone on the government side who is failing to co-operate with the house as a whole. If the hon. member wants to go home, let him go home, but let us continue with the business in a way that is in the spirit of the agreement we came to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caron: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

I was called "a trained seal" this afternoon because I spoke to a member on the other side. I do not intend to consider myself a trained seal. We have rights, standing orders.

A house order has been issued to the effect that we should terminate our work at six o'clock and, consequently, we should abide by it.

The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) now talks of closure, while we are simply asking that the standing orders be respected.

I claim that no one has the right to speak as he has just done, saying "If the hon. member wants to go home, let him go." That is not the point. I want to comply with our standing orders which provide for adjournment at six o'clock.

Mr. Chairman, I ask you to declare that it is six o'clock.

[*Text*]

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

The Chairman: Well, I am wondering whether much can be served by hearing the hon. member on the point of order. The point of order was originally raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West and views have been expressed by different members. I have listened to both sides and I do not think any hon. member assailed the interpretation of the rules made by the Chair. From my interpretation of them it would need unanimous consent of the committee to sit beyond six o'clock. If there is not unanimous consent obviously we cannot continue.

Mr. Lambert: I will accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but I do not agree with it.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, since this party has not yet had a spokesman on this

matter I wonder whether I might say a brief word on the point of order. Hon. members will not be surprised if I say that I agree with the interpretation the Chair has placed on the position in which we find ourselves. But I also want to say that I was glad the house leader took the position he did, namely that notwithstanding the rules he thought we should go on.

Since some secrets have already been disclosed I want to confirm that it was the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre who proposed at the house leaders' meeting that we have this seven day experiment in time allocation and I commend him for that. I now make a personal appeal to the hon. member for Hull. Like him I am concerned about the rules of the house. I think this is an important experiment we are making in parliamentary procedure. It will be a shame if a bad taste is left at the end of our first allocation of time on estimates, and in the interests of good parliamentary procedure and good will in this house I ask the hon. member for Hull whether he will give his consent to sitting till, say, seven o'clock—six o'clock Winnipeg time—to see whether we can have any discussion on the estimates that is desired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caron: Mr. Chairman, I do not accept the suggestion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. He talks of closure with only 12 Conservative members left in the house, and there were only 30 when the vote was taken this afternoon, and that is after four days' discussion. Time has expired.

[*Text*]

The Chairman: Shall vote No. 1 carry?

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I should like to speak on vote No. 1.

The Chairman: The hon. member cannot speak on vote No. 1. My interpretation of the rules is that each vote has to be called. The hon. member can vote against it if he wishes, but it would certainly be contrary to the interpretation I have given to the rules if we have debate on each single vote which comes before the committee, unless of course the hon. member has the unanimous consent of the committee to be heard and for the committee to proceed beyond six o'clock.

Mr. Caron: No.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a further appeal in this regard to the members of the committee.

Mr. Caron: It is no use.

[Mr. Knowles.]

Mr. MacLean (Queens): The committee has voluntarily set a limit on the time it proposes to spend on estimates. We are fulfilling the spirit of that undertaking to have the estimates completed today. When I was first a member of this house it was common for unanimous consent to be given to complete any items we were considering, perhaps even a department. The committee frequently sat until at least midnight and occasionally later. Surely the government side will not insist on the letter of the law, even if the interpretation put on it is correct, which I am not questioning at all. Surely the government will agree to a few minutes. As far as I understand it, it is not the intention to have prolonged discussion on any of the remaining items, but surely we can allot ourselves two or three minutes on each one and proceed in an orderly fashion.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Chairman, I would pair with the hon. member for Hull if he wants to get out.

Mr. Caron: The hon. member can get out if he wants; I will stay here and do not want to go anywhere else.

Mr. Peters: Then will you read the votes, Mr. Chairman?

Item agreed to.

Canadian army—

20. Operation and maintenance including grants of $1,800,000 to the town of Oromocto and construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and major equipment including authority, notwithstanding the Financial Administration Act and section 11 of the Surplus Crown Assets Act and subject to the approval of treasury board, to spend revenues received from the sale of surplus materials, supplies and equipment, $425,894,000.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, may I have permission to speak on this item, the Canadian army?

The Chairman: The special order made by the order does not permit it unless the hon. member has unanimous consent.

Mr. Caron: No.

Mr. Churchill: Closure by the Grits.

Item agreed to.

20a. Operation and maintenance and construction for acquisition of buildings, works, land and major equipment, $349,000.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether you would read the full text of the items.

The Chairman: The hon. member has the text before him.

Mr. Nasserden: I think it is very important that this be put on the record.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

35b. Grants, contributions and subsidies as detailed in the estimates, $1,000,000.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, now that we have passed the defence estimates surely we can dispense with the reading of the other items.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, I am quite agreeable to that suggestion, and I certainly did not intend to place an extra burden on the chairman today but I did want to indicate what could happen when members want to be unreasonable, as have hon. members across the way.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Peters: You be quiet over there or we will call for a division on each one of them.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

Telecommunications and electronics—

50c. Administration, operation and maintenance including the administration of the Radio Act and regulations—To extend the purpose of vote 50 of the main estimates, 1964-65, to include, in the case of a licence to establish and operate a new station performing a commercial broadcasting receiving service, or the amendment of a licence to establish and operate a station performing a commercial broadcasting receiving service to permit such station to receive signals from broadcasting stations other than those specified in such licence, authority to specify in any such licence the broadcasting stations from which the licensed station may receive signals, where the Minister of Transport is satisfied, having regard to any recommendation which may be made by the board of broadcast governors in that behalf after such public hearing, if any, as the board deems necessary, that the specification therein of such broadcasting stations is unlikely to inhibit the development of television broadcasting services performed by stations in Canada established or likely to be established to serve any area that includes in whole or in part the area that is served or that is proposed to be served by the licensed station, $1.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted, I will ask the committee for leave to withdraw this item, because it would be quite wrong, since it is controversial, to ask parliament to pass it without debate in view of the fact it is new legislation. I would ask permission to withdraw it and to have the necessary consequential changes made in the bill. With permission I will be happy to do so, because I think it would be quite wrong to pass it without debate.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Item 50c withdrawn.

Ways and Means

Resolutions adopted in committee of supply this day reported and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS

The house in committee of ways and means, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

Mr. McIlraith moved:

Resolved, that toward making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1965, the sum of $1,053,832,908.69, be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. McIlraith (for Mr. Gordon) thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-140, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1965.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

On clause 1—

Mr. Knowles: Are copies of the bill available?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, a copy of the bill is available.

Mr. Churchill: Could we have copies of the bill before we rush through things like this? There is nothing in the rules preventing us from having a copy of the bill, is there?

Mr. McIlraith: A copy of the bill is available.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Schedules A to D inclusive agreed to.

On the title:

Mr. Lambert: Just a moment, Mr. Chairman, I want to be sure that this one item has been omitted from the bill.

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, the bill has been amended. I had that done.

Mr. Knowles: That is why I asked to see the bill—and it has been done.

Mr. McIlraith: I had that done in anticipation an hour or two ago, and this is a corrected bill.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported and read the third time and passed.

It being thirty eight minutes after six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Supply—Items Passed

[The following items were passed in committee of supply this day:]

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal and other services—

5. Combines Investigation Act—Administration, $719,000.

Correctional services—

10. Administration, operation and maintenance including compensation to discharged inmates permanently disabled while in penitentiaries, $24,008,700.

12a. Payment in the current and subsequent fiscal years of pensions in respect of the late W. C. Wentworth, J. E. R. J. Tellier, J. H. Joynson, M. E. Jenkin and R. E. Farrell, all former penitentiary officers who were killed while on duty, to commence (a) in the case of the late W. C. Wentworth and J. E. R. J. Tellier as of the date of the death of the late W. C. Wentworth and J. E. R. J. Tellier, respectively, and (b) in the case of the death of the late J. H. Joynson, M. E. Jenkin and R. E. Farrell as of April 1, 1964, and to be paid at the same rates as if each of the aforementioned deceased was, immediately prior to his death, a person described in subsection (1) of section 27 of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Act holding the rank of inspector in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police but (c) in the current fiscal year, each of those rates shall be reduced by the appropriate rate, as determined by the treasury board, at which a benefit payable at an annual or monthly rate has been and is being paid pursuant to the Government Employees Compensation Act, chapter 11 of the statutes of 1914, the Appropriation Act No. 6, 1926-27 and the Appropriation Act No. 5, 1959, as the case may be, and (d) in each subsequent fiscal year, no amount shall be paid in respect of each of the aforementioned deceased pursuant to the Government Employees Compensation Act, chapter 11 of the statutes of 1914, the Appropriation Act No. 6, 1926-27 and the Appropriation Act No. 5, 1959; additional amount required for 1964-65, $10,840.

13b. Payment in the current and subsequent fiscal years of a pension in respect of the late E. J. Masterton, a former penitentiary officer who was killed while on duty, to commence as of the date of his death, and to be paid at the same rate as if deceased was, immediately prior to his death, a person described in subsection (1) of section 27 of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Act holding the rank of inspector in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, but in the current fiscal year the rate shall be reduced by the appropriate rate, as determined by the treasury board, at which a benefit payable at an annual or monthly rate has been and is being paid pursuant to the Government Employees Compensation Act, and in each subsequent fiscal year no amount shall be paid in respect of the aforementioned deceased pursuant to the Government Employees Compensation Act; amount required for 1964-65, $644.

15. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $16,110,000.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

National police services, federal law enforcement duties and provincial and municipal policing under contract—

1. Administration, operation and maintenance, including grants as detailed in the estimates and pensions to families of members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who have lost their lives while on duty, $60,554,894.

5. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $3,811,000.

LEGISLATION

The Senate—

Members of the Senate—

1. Allowance in lieu of residence to the Speaker of the Senate, $3,000.

5. General administration, $932,600.

House of Commons—

Members of the House of Commons—

10. Allowances in lieu of residence to the Speaker of the House of Commons, and in lieu of apartments to the Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons; allowance to the deputy chairman of committees, $6,500.

15. Expenses of the Canada-United States interparliamentary group, of delegates attending other inter-parliamentary conferences, expenses connected with visits of delegates from other legislatures, Canada's fee for membership in the interparliamentary union, Canada's share of the expenses of the commonwealth parliamentary association including subscriptions to publications of the association, and a grant of $19,000 to the Canadian North Atlantic Treaty Organization parliamentary association, $62,720.

20. General administration, $4,266,700.

Library of parliament—

25. General administration, $399,700.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

B—Atlantic development board—

20. Administration and operation, $508,300.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

A—Department—

1. General administration, including grants as detailed in the estimates, $12,114,500.

Accommodation services—

5. Maintenance and operation of public buildings and grounds including the W. Clifford Clark memorial centre in Ottawa, the acquisition of office furniture and furnishings for government departments and authority to provide the international civil aviation organization with office accommodation at less than commercial rates, $55,284,400.

10. Acquisition of equipment and furnishings other than office furnishings, $1,454,000.

15. Construction, acquisition, major repairs and improvements of, and plans and sites for, public buildings (including expenditures on works on other than federal property); provided that no contract may be entered into for new construction with an estimated total cost of $50,000 or more unless the project is individually listed in the details of estimates, $29,967,000.

15a. Construction, acquisition, major repairs and improvements of, and plans and sites for public buildings (including expenditures on works on other than federal property); provided that no contract may be entered into for new construction with an estimated total cost of $50,000 or more unless the project is individually listed in the details of estimates, $665,000.

Harbours and rivers engineering services—

20. Operation and maintenance, $6,602,900.

25. Construction or acquisition of equipment, $1,056,100.

30. Construction, acquisition, major repairs and improvements of, and plans and sites for harbour and river works (including expenditures on works on other than federal property); provided that no contract may be entered into for new construction with an estimated total cost of $50,000 or more unless the project is individually listed in the details of estimates, $20,821,000.

30a. Construction, acquisition, major repairs and improvements of, and plans and sites for, harbour and river works (including expenditures on works on other than federal property); provided that no contract may be entered into for new construction with an estimated total cost of $50,000 or more unless the project is individually listed in the details of estimates, $1,700,000.

Roads, bridges and other engineering services—

35. Operation and maintenance including authority to make recoverable advances in amounts not exceeding in the aggregate the amount of the operating expenses of the New Westminster bridge, $321,800.

35a. Operation and maintenance, $30,000.

40. International, interprovincial and other bridges and related works listed in the details of the estimates, provided that the amount within the vote to be expended on individually listed projects may be increased or decreased subject to the approval of treasury board, $2,870,000.

45. Northwest highway system—maintenance, operation and reconstruction, $10,000,000.

Trans-Canada highway—

50. Construction through national parks, $307,000.

Testing laboratories—

55. Operation and maintenance, $1,079,000.

B—National capital commission—

60. Operation and maintenance, general administration and interest charges on outstanding loans that were made for the purpose of acquiring property in the national capital region, $5,420,000.

65. Payment to the national capital fund, $4,500,000.

68a. To authorize the disposition and acquisition hereafter of property by the national capital commission in accordance with orders in council P.C. 2476 dated October 4, 1938, P.C. 1662 dated June 29, 1939, P.C. 5209 dated January 5, 1948, P.C. 639 dated February 4, 1952, P.C. 3376 dated June 23, 1952, P.C. 1953-95 dated January 22, 1953, P.C. 1953-277 dated February 26, 1953, P.C. 1957-722 dated May 27, 1957, P.C. 1958-241 dated February 11, 1958, P.C. 1958-923 dated June 28, 1958, P.C. 1958-1445 dated October 22, 1958, P.C. 1958-9/1740 dated December 29, 1958, and P.C. 1959-106 dated January 29, 1959, and all acquisition and disposition of property prior hereto by the national capital commission or federal district commission in accordance with the said orders in council is hereby ratified and confirmed, $1.

C—Canadian corporation for the 1967 world exhibition—

70. Toward federal share of the cost of construction of an ice control structure, $4,000,000.

Loans, investments and advances—

National capital commission—

L35. Loans to the national capital commission in accordance with section 16 of the National Capital Act for the purpose of acquiring property in the national capital region, excluding property being acquired for the purpose of establishing what is commonly referred to as the "Greenbelt", $9,700,000.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE

Customs and excise—

1. General administration, operation and maintenance including authority, notwithstanding the Financial Administration Act, to spend revenue received during the year from firms and individuals requiring special services, $44,388,500.

Taxation—

5. General administration and district offices, $42,703,000.

Tax appeal board—

10. Administration expenses, $149,000.

DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY

1. Departmental administration, including grants as detailed in the estimates, $1,381,000.

3. Construction of extension to research laboratory in Pointe Claire, Quebec, for use by the pulp and paper research institute of Canada, $600,000.

5. Contributions to the provinces in the amounts and subject to the terms specified in the details of estimates, $7,910,000.

5a. Contributions to the provinces in the amounts and subject to the terms specified in the details of estimates, $500,000.

Forest research—

10. Operation and maintenance, $2,246,000.

10a. Operation and maintenance, $50,200.

15. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $396,000.

15a. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $97,000.

Forest entomology and pathology—

20. Operation and maintenance, $3,829,000.

25. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $1,441,000.

25a. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $150,000.

Forest products research—

30. Operation and maintenance, $1,224,200.

35. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $425,500.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

A—Department—

Marine services—

5. Administration, operation and maintenance including fees for membership in the international organizations listed in the details of the estimates, pensions, grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, the payment of expenses, including excepted expenses, incurred in respect of Canadian distressed seamen as defined in section 306 of the Canada Shipping Act and, in respect of the Canadian coastguard service, authority to make recoverable advances for transportation, stevedoring and other shipping services performed on behalf of individuals, outside agencies and other

governments and authority, notwithstanding section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, to make commitments for the current fiscal year not to exceed a total amount of $23,774,400, $38,249,400.

5a. Administration, operation and maintenance, $375,000.

10. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land, vessels and equipment including payments to provinces or municipalities as contributions toward construction done by those bodies, $31,942,000.

10a. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land, vessels and equipment including payments to provinces or municipalities as contributions towards construction done by those bodies—To extend the purposes of vote 10 of the main estimates, 1964-65, to authorize, in respect to aids to navigation, notwithstanding section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, the making of commitments for the current fiscal year not exceeding the total amount of $4,785,000, $1.

Railways and steamships—

15. Payments to the Canadian National Railway Company (hereinafter called the company) upon applications approved by the Minister of Transport made by the company to the Minister of Finance, to be applied by the company in payment of the deficits, certified by the auditors of the company, arising in the operations in the calendar year 1964 in respect of the following services: Newfoundland ferry and terminals; Prince Edward Island car ferry and terminals; Yarmouth, N.S.—Bar Harbor, Maine, U.S.A., ferry service, $13,132,300.

20. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works and land, dock and terminal facilities, and of vessels and related equipment as listed in the details of the estimates provided that treasury board may increase or decrease the amounts within the vote to be expended on individually listed projects, $8,338,700.

20a. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works and land, dock and terminal facilities and of vessels and related equipment as listed in the details of the estimates provided that treasury board may increase or decrease the amounts within the vote to be expended on individually listed projects, $2,497,000.

25. Payments in respect of the Maritime Freight Rates Act and for supplemental pension allowances to railway employees in the amounts and subject to the terms specified in the sub-vote titles listed in the details of estimates, $15,045,400.

Air services—

30. General administration, $6,242,300.

Civil aviation—

35. Administration, operation and maintenance including the administration of the Aeronautcs Act and regulations issued thereunder, $38,008,600.

35a. Administration, operation and maintenance, $2,568,700.

40. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment with respect to national airports (as determined by the Minister of Transport) and related facilities; contributions toward construction done by local or private authorities with respect to such airports, amounts to be paid in settlement of claims for compensation by persons whose property is injuriously affected by the operation of a zoning regulation made under authority of paragraph (j) of subsection (1) of section 4 of the Aeronautics Act, and authority, notwithstanding section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, to make commitments for the current fiscal year not to exceed a total amount of $29,418,400, $26,359,000.

45. Contributions to assist in the establishment or improvement of local airports and related facilities, payments to the other governments or international agencies that are detailed in the estimates for the operation and maintenance of airports, air navigation and airways facilities, including authority to pay assessments in the amounts and in the currencies in which they are levied, notwithstanding that the total of such payments may exceed the estimated equivalent in Canadian dollars, and other grants as detailed in the estimates for the development of civil aviation, $674,900.

45a. Contributions to assist in the establishment or improvement of local airports and related facilities, $28,300.

Telecommunications and electronics—

50. Administration, operation and maintenance including the administration of the Radio Act and regulations issued thereunder and Canada's share of the costs of the international radio, telegraph and telephone organizations listed in the details of the estimates, $25,884,800.

55. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $10,612,000.

55a. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment—To extend the purposes of vote 55 of the main estimates, 1964-65, to authorize, in respect to radio aids to air and marine navigation, notwithstanding section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, the making of commitments for the current fiscal year not exceeding the total amount of $15,270,000 and to provide a further amount of $3,147,400.

60. Payments to the Canadian National Railway Company of the difference between revenues and expenses in the operation and maintenance of telecommunication facilities as detailed in the estimates in accordance with agreements entered into with the company with the approval of the governor in council, $230,000.

Meteorological—

65. Administration, operation and maintenance including Canada's assessment for membership in the world meteorological organization and $100,000 for grants in aid of meteorological research in Canadian universities, $19,751,000.

70. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $2,600,000.

70a. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment—To extend the purposes of vote 70 of the main estimates, 1964-65, to authorize, notwithstanding section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, the making of commitments for the current fiscal year not exceeding the total amount of $2,800,000, $1.

B—Air transport board—

75. Salaries and other expenses including the Canadian delegation to the international civil aviation organization, $704,200.

C—Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada—

80. Administration, operation and maintenance, $1,302,900.

82. Amount to be credited to the railway grade crossing fund, in addition to the amount to be credited to the fund under the Railway Act in the current fiscal year, for the general purposes of the fund and, notwithstanding section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, to authorize an in-

crease to $33,967,000 in the commitments (in addition to any commitments in respect of which amounts are appropriated under this or any other act) that may be made in the current and subsequent fiscal years, $100,000.

84a. To provide for balance of payments to companies subject to order number 96300, dated November 17, 1958, of the board of transport commissioners for Canada in respect of the period April 1, 1963, to March 31, 1964, payable to said companies for such diminution in their aggregate gross revenues during the said period as in the opinion of the said board is attributable to such companies maintaining the rate level for freight traffic at an 8 per cent increase instead of 17 per cent as authorized by the said officer, $400,000.

84c. To provide payments to companies subject to order number 96300, dated November 17, 1958, of the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada of an aggregate amount of $20,000,000 in respect of the period April 1, 1964 to March 31, 1965, to be paid in instalments at such times as may be determined by the said board for the purpose of reimbursing the said companies for such diminution in their aggregate gross revenues during the said period as in the opinion of the said board is attributable to such companies maintaining the rate level for freight traffic at an 8 per cent increase instead of 17 per cent as authorized by the said order; and to provide payments to the said companies of an aggregate amount in respect of the calendar year 1964 of $50,000,000 to be paid in instalments at such times and in accordance with such methods of allocation as may be determined by the said board for the maintenance by such companies of the rates of freight traffic at the said reduced level, $70,000,000.

D—Canadian maritime commission—

85. Administration of the commission and the degaussing of Canadian government ships and Canadian-owned merchant ships, of 2,000 gross tons to 20,000 gross tons, of Canadian registry or of United Kingdom registry if subject to re-transfer to Canadian registry under special inter-governmental arrangement, $341,900.

90. Steamship subventions for coastal services, as detailed in the estimates, $8,974,680.

90a. Steamship subventions for coastal services as detailed in the estimates, $1.

95. Capital subsidies for the construction of commercial and fishing vessels in accordance with regulations of the governor in council, $28,000,000.

95a. Capital subsidies for the construction of commercial and fishing vessels in accordance with regulations of the governor in council, $4,000,000.

E—National harbours board—

100. Advances to national harbours board subject to the provisions of section 29 of the National Harbours Board Act, to meet reconstruction and capital expenditures during the calendar year 1964 as detailed in the estimates, $2,113,500.

100a. Advances to national harbours board, subject to the provisions of section 29 of the National Harbours Board Act, to meet reconstruction and capital expenditures during the calendar year 1964 as detailed in the estimates, $1.

103a. To authorize expenditures by the national harbours board, either by itself or on behalf of or in co-operation with others, for certain purposes relating to the Canadian universal and international exhibition, Montreal, 1967, and to provide, notwithstanding sections 28 and 29 of the said National Harbours Board Act, for an absolute grant to the board for such purposes to be credited to the national harbours board special account, $5,237,800.

103b. To authorize expenditures by the national harbours board, either by itself or on behalf of or in co-operation with others, for certain purposes relating to the Canadian universal and international exhibition, Montreal, 1967 and to provide, notwithstanding sections 28 and 29 of the National Harbours Board Act, for an absolute grant to the board for such purposes to be credited to the national harbours board special account, $1,502,000.

F—St. Lawrence seaway authority—

105. Operating deficit and capital requirements of canals and works entrusted to the St. Lawrence seaway authority with the approval of the governor in council, and to authorize, notwithstanding the Financial Administration Act or any other act, the disbursement by the authority of revenues derived from the operation and management of such canals and works, $2,838,000.

Loans, investments and advances—

E—National harbours board—

L39b. Loan to the Nanaimo harbour commissioners on terms and conditions approved by the governor in council to defray the cost of additional berthing facilities at Nanaimo assembly wharf, $300,000.

Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation—

L40. Loans to the Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation in accordance with section 14 of the Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation Act for additions and betterments to facilities, $5,550,000.

L40a. Loans to the Canadian overseas telecommunication corporation in accordance with section 14 of the Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation Act for additions and betterments to facilities, $1,522,000.

National harbours board—

L45. Advances to national harbours board, subject to the provisions of section 29 of the National Harbours Board Act, to meet expenditures applicable to the calendar year 1964 on any or all of the following accounts:

Reconstruction and capital expenditures—

Trois-Rivières	$ 1,110,000
Montreal	6,924,000
Vancouver	1,847,000
	$ 9,881,000

Less—Amount to be expended from replacement and other funds, $6,811,000, $3,070,000.

L45a. Advances to national harbours board, subject to the provisions of section 29 of the National Harbours Board Act, to meet expenditures applicable to the calendar year 1964 on the following account:

Reconstruction and capital expenditures—

Vancouver	$ 710,000

Less—Amount to be expended from replacement and other funds, $709,999, $1.

St. Lawrence seaway authority—

L50. Loans to the St. Lawrence seaway authority in such manner and subject to such terms and conditions as the governor in council may approve, $10,300,000.

Supply—Items Passed

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal and other services—

1. Administration including the office of the superintendent of bankruptcy, grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, gratuities to the widows or other dependents of judges who die while in office and authority to make recoverable advances for the administration of justice on behalf of the governments of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory, $2,109,600.

1a. Administration including grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, $26,000.

1b. Administration including grants and contributions as detailed in the estimates, $40,000.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Production and marketing—

Plant and plant products—

35b. Grants, contributions and subsidies as detailed in the estimates, $1,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

Fisheries management and development—

5b. Operation and maintenance including Canada's share of the expenses of the international commissions detailed in the estimates and of the costs of programs and projects shared jointly with the provinces and industry, $453,000.

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND TECHNICAL SURVEYS

A—Department—

Mining and metallurgical investigations and research—

35b. Administration, operation and maintenance, $81,500.

40b. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $201,000.

B—Dominion coal board—

75b. To authorize annual payments not exceeding $18,000,000 in each of the five fiscal years commencing on the 1st day of April, 1965 and ending on the 31st day of March, 1970, to be made in connection with the movement of coal. In accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the governor in council, for the purpose of enabling Canadian coal to be laid down in prescribed markets at a price competitive with imported coal and imported residual oil, $1.

PRIVY COUNCIL

A—Privy Council—

1. Maintenance and operation of the Prime Minister's residence, $32,500.

Privy council office—

Ministers without Portfolio—

5. Payment, notwithstanding anything in the Financial Administration Act or the Senate and House of Commons Act respecting the independence of parliament, to each member of the Queen's privy council for Canada who is a minister for whom no salary or allowance in addition to the allowances under section 33 and section 44 of the Senate and House of Commons Act is provided (the acceptance of which shall not render such member ineligible or disqualify him as a member of the House of Commons) of a salary of $7,500 per annum and *pro rata* for any period less than a year, $7,500.

10. General adminstration including a special grant of $25,000 to the Stratford Shakespearian Festival Foundation of Canada, $995,000.

10a. General administration, $79,700.

15. Expenses of the royal commission listed in the details of the estimates and the expenses of the preparatory committee on collective bargaining in the public service, $2,476,000.

15a. Expenses of the royal commissions listed in the details of estimates, $845,000.

17a. Canadian contribution to the Kennedy Memorial library project, $100,000.

Governor General and lieutenant-governors—

1. Office of the secretary to the Governor General, $297,900.

5. To authorize reimbursement to the lieutenant-governors of the provinces of Canada of the costs of travelling and hospitality incurred in the exercise of their duties up to a maximum per annum for each as detailed in the estimates, $142,500.

SECRETARY OF STATE

Centennial Commission—

20. General administration, including the national conference on the centennial of confederation, $967,800.

25. Programs and projects of national significance including grants toward such programs and projects, $2,500,000.

30. Payment to the centennial of confederation fund to enable grants to be made to the provinces for local projects of a lasting nature (the total of such grants not to exceed $1 per capita of population per province) and other federal-provincial centennial projects, $4,000,000.

30a. Payment to the centennial of confederation fund—To extend the purposes of vote 30 of the main estimates, 1964-65, to enable grants to be made to the provinces for projects included in the federal-provincial confederation memorial program, $1.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

B—Unemployment insurance commission—

30. Administration of the Unemployment Insurance Act including the transfer of labour to places where employment is available and expenses incidental thereto in accordance with regulations of the governor in council, $53,351,300.

A—Department—

1b. General administration, $360,000.

6b. Payments in accordance with terms and conditions approved by the governor in council to provinces and in respect of Indian bands under the municipal winter works incentive program during the 1964-65 and 1965-66 fiscal years of amounts not exceeding fifty per cent of the cost of labour incurred in the period from November 1, 1964 to such day or days in the fiscal year 1965-66 as may be determined by the governor in council, and in the case of projects in designated areas within the meaning of the Department of Industry Act and in areas determined by the Minister of Labour to be areas of high winter unemployment, sixty per cent of such cost; and to authorize payments in those fiscal years to provinces in respect of previous municipal winter works incentive programs, $35,000,000.

8b. Payments in accordance with terms and conditions approved by the governor in council under the winter house building incentive program during the fiscal years 1964-65 and 1965-66 of $5,000 per dwelling unit substantially built during the period November 15, 1964 to March 31, 1965, $15,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

1. Departmental administration, including grants to military associations, institutes and other organizations as detailed in the estimates and authority, notwithstanding section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, and subject to allotment by the treasury board, for total commitments of $2,289,221,625 for the purposes of votes 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 42, 45 and 50 of this department regardless of the year in which such commitments will come in course of payment (of which it is estimated that $799,648,500 will come due for payment in future years) and authority to make recoverable advances under any of the said votes and notwithstanding the Financial Administration Act, to spend revenue received during the year in respect of assistance rendered to the United Nations, any party of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or any provincial or municipal government, $3,917,825.

Inspection services—

5. Operation and maintenance, $7,134,300.

10. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $200,000.

Royal Canadian Navy—

15. Operation and maintenance and construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and major equipment including authority, notwithstanding the Financial Administration Act and section 11 of the Surplus Crown Assets Act and subject to the approval of treasury board, to spend revenues received from the sale of surplus materials, supplies and equipment, $272,892,000.

15a. Operation and maintenance and construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and major equipment, $139,000.

Canadian army—

20. Operation and maintenance including grants of $1,800,000 to the town of Oromocto and construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and major equipment including authority, notwithstanding the Financial Administration Act and section 11 of the Surplus Crown Assets Act and subject to the approval of treasury board, to spend revenues received from the sale of surplus materials, supplies and equipment, $425,894,000.

20a. Operation and maintenance and construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and major equipment, $349,000.

Royal Canadian Air Force—

25. Operation and maintenance and construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and major equipment including authority, notwithstanding the Financial Administration Act and section 11 of the Surplus Crown Assets Act and subject to the approval of treasury board, to spend revenues received from the sale of surplus materials, supplies and equipment, $655,769,000.

25a. Operation and maintenance and construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and major equipment, $839,000.

Defence research and development—

Defence research board—

30. Operation and maintenance including authority, notwithstanding the Financial Administration Act and section 11 of the Surplus Crown Assets Act and subject to the approval of treasury board, to spend revenues received from the sale of surplus materials, supplies and equipment, $25,945,000.

35. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment including authority, notwithstanding the Financial Administration Act and section 11 of the Surplus Crown Assets Act and subject to the approval of treasury board, to spend revenues received from the sale of surplus materials, supplies and equipment, $5,061,000.

40. To foster defence research in Canadian industry by supporting selected defence applied research programs, on terms and conditions approved by the treasury board, $4,150,000.

42. Research satellite program—to provide for the design and instrumentation of a series of satellites to carry out a scientific research program agreed upon jointly by the United States national aeronautical and space administration and the defence research board, $2,933,000.

45. Development, $20,990,000.

Mutual aid—

50. Contributions to infrastructure and the military costs of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the transfer of defence equipment and supplies and the provision of services and facilities for defence purposes in accordance with section 3 of the Defence Appropriation Act, 1950, not exceeding a total of $41,020,000 including the present value of defence equipment or supplies or the cost of services made available by the Canadian forces estimated in the amount of $8,420,000 and provided by appropriations for those forces in the current and former years in respect of which, notwithstanding subsection (3) of section 3 of the said act, no amount shall be charged to this appropriation or paid into a special account; provided by this vote, $32,600,000.

Pensions and other benefits—

55. Civil pensions as detailed in the estimates and to authorize in respect of members of the Royal Canadian Air Force on leave without pay and serving as instructors with civilian training organizations operating under the British commonwealth air training plan who were killed, payments to their dependents of amounts equal to the amounts such dependents would have received under the Pension Act, as amended, had such service as instructors been military service in the armed forces of Canada, less the value of any benefits received by such dependents under insurance contracts which were effected on the lives of such members of the Royal Canadian Air Force by or at the expense of the civilian organization, $7,322.

57a. To authorize the governor in council to prescribe the terms and conditions (including conditions as to interest) upon which a person who, when a member of the regular forces failed, due to erroneous treatment, to make an election in respect of prior service under section 45 of the Militia Pension Act, during the period October 1, 1946 to September 30, 1947, and who subsequently made an election under paragraph (b) of section 5 of the Canadian Forces Superannuation Act, to pay for that service as a period of service described in clause (K) of subparagraph (ii) of that paragraph, shall be deemed to have made such election under the Militia Pension Act within the time prescribed therefor by that act, $1.

58a. To authorize the governor in council to designate by order as a special duty area any area outside Canada in which an officer or man or former officer or man of the Canadian forces is or has been required to serve on or subsequent to the first day of January, 1949; and thereupon the Pension

Act shall apply to and in respect of every officer and man or former officer or man of the Canadian forces in respect of his service in such area on or subsequent to that date while the order is in force in respect thereto or during such later period as the order may specify as though such service were military service (other than service rendered in the non-permanent active militia or in the reserve army) rendered during world war II within the meaning of the Pension Act and as though the service described in paragraph (v) of section 2 of that act included service in such special duty area in any of the services during such period; provided that where a pension is payable by virtue of an order herein in respect of any death or disability, subsection (2) of section 13 of that act shall not apply to or in respect of such death or disability, $1.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, November 30, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

TRIBUTES ON NINETIETH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

Mr. Speaker: Today, as the world knows, a remarkable man has reached a remarkable age. Right Hon. Sir Winston Churchill is celebrating his ninetieth birthday anniversary. Just four months ago today, on July 30, we paid tribute to Sir Winston Churchill on the occasion of his retirement from parliament. At that time the right hon. Prime Minister, the right hon. Leader of the Opposition and the leaders or spokesmen of the other parties in this house acknowledged our "unbounded admiration and gratitude for Sir Winston's services to freedom and to free men everywhere".

In pursuance of a motion agreed to unanimously by the house I transmitted these tributes to the right hon. gentleman. Hon. members will be interested in the acknowledgement which I received in Sir Winston Churchill's own hand, and which I am sure they would want me to read into the record:

28, Hyde Park Gate,
London, S.W. 7
8 November, 1964.

Dear Mr. Speaker,

I am indeed obliged to you for your letter of October 19. I have read with the utmost pleasure the motion passed in the House of Commons and the speeches which accompanied it. I am deeply honoured that this moving and eloquent tribute should have been paid to me by Canadians, whose country I hold in such deep affection and high esteem. I shall always remember your kindness to me.

Yours very sincerely,
Winston S. Churchill.

I am sure that today all members of this house would again want their affectionate good wishes to go forth to him whom historians may well call "the greatest Englishman of the century". I therefore propose sending the following message to Sir Winston on behalf of this house:

It is my privilege to assure you, sir, of the undiminished gratitude, affection and admiration in which you are held by all Canadians as you begin your tenth decade of "days memorable in the history of our race". We fervently wish for you and Lady Churchill many more years of strength, of good health and of happiness in your retirement. From all our hearts and with one voice we say, "Happy birthday."

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the words you have uttered pay fitting and eloquent tribute to the greatest man of our time on reaching his ninetieth birthday, a stage which not many of us are likely to achieve. I think your tribute represents the feeling of us all. He is indeed a man of our century, this terrible twentieth century. He is a man of parliament. He is the man who led the struggle for freedom, and his name will live forever in the hearts of all free men.

Therefore I should like to move, seconded —if I may do so, Mr. Speaker—by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition:

That the message proposed by Mr. Speaker be sent by him on behalf of all members of this house to Sir Winston Churchill.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join with the Prime Minister in this motion. Indeed, one of the fondest recollections I have of the period during which I was prime minister was to have the opportunity, on every occasion that I was in the United Kingdom, to meet and talk with Sir Winston. I was greatly impressed this morning as I listened on the radio by what happened yesterday in front of his home at Hyde Park Corner. Hundreds were gathered there and they were asking that he come outside. Finally he stepped up to the window. Then his wife went outside and said "I am saving him for tomorrow".

That, Mr. Speaker, has been his life history. One follows him in India, the Sudan, during the days of the first great war and throughout the years; often in defeat, always defiant. His record, as the Prime Minister has said and as you, Mr. Speaker, so very eloquently stated, makes him a great citizen, an immortal figure in the present century. We see him now at 90 years of age able to look back on several lifetimes, measuring time on the basis of achievement.

Great author, orator, parliamentarian, artist, historian, only once did he turn to poetry. There is only one couplet in his name:

No more let us alter, or falter, or palter,
From Malta to Yalta,
From Yalta to Malta.

That epitomises his life story. He never paltered; sometimes he did alter his viewpoint with the passing years, but at no time did he falter. I think of one instance which took place in London, I think in 1959, during the occasion of a prime ministers' conference. Prime Minister Harold MacMillan gave a dinner at Downing street to my wife and me. She sat at the table between Mr. Macmillan and Sir Winston, and I sat across the table and some distance down. Beside me sat Mrs. Neville Chamberlain, the widow of the prime minister of the United Kingdom whose place Mr. Churchill, as he then was, took in May of 1940. During the course of the conversation I said "Is it not wonderful that he has lived this long full of alertness, never losing that sense of good humour so necessary to those who are in public life. He is enjoying himself tonight". Her answer was "You know, we would not be here if it was not for him". That to me represents the relationship in public life and in national affairs that gives substance to British parliamentary life.

I join with the Prime Minister in the motion he has moved. This house will never forget that day in December of 1941 when he stood where the Clerk of this house sits and used those words that had greater influence on this nation than any words ever expressed in describing the dark days of June, 1940. He said a French spokesman had stated that the generals believed it would just be a matter of three weeks before the neck of England would be stretched like that of a chicken. Sir Winston then said "Some chicken, some neck." Those are words never to be forgotten.

We salute him today, and in honouring him we honour the parliamentary system to which he gave so much and to which, as a House of Commons man, he devoted his life and his talents.

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, you have expressed warmly and succinctly the appreciation and high standing of Sir Winston Churchill in this chamber and in the country. We join with pleasure in the motion put forward by the Prime Minister.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine pleasure that we in our party support this motion of greeting to Mr. Churchill on the occasion of his ninetieth birthday. I am sure there is no man in the world today who is regarded with just the same affection and respect as is this great man.

I thought it was moving this morning when he appeared twice at the window of his home to receive the cheers and greetings of thousands of people, and when, later on, Lady Churchill appeared and said that he would not be back again because she was saving him for tomorrow. It is our hope and prayer that he will have many more tomorrows.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, we are glad to add our own best wishes to those which other hon. members of this house have already extended to Sir Winston Churchill on the occasion of his birthday.

It gives us pleasure to support the Prime Minister's motion that the message you have read to us be sent to Sir Winston.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUGGESTED CHANGE IN PROCEEDINGS DURING FLAG DEBATE

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, as the opportunity may not be afforded otherwise perhaps the house will now allow me to raise a question of order in connection with the proceedings of this and succeeding days. As the house knows, there are two motions in connection with the flag question which will come up following the presentation of reports by standing and special committees. If we are to follow the course of not calling orders of the day we will find ourselves in the position that so long as the debate on the flag question goes on, we will be unable to have any answers to our questions or, indeed, to ask questions that come within the ambit of those asked before orders of the day are called.

I am sure the Prime Minister does not have such a course in mind at all and through you, Mr. Speaker, I put the suggestion to him that today and each day hereafter orders of the day be called to provide an opportunity for the asking and answering of questions, and that thereafter we revert to motions. To follow any other course would simply be to deny the House of Commons its right of examination and scrutiny through questions. I am sure the Prime Minister has no such course in mind, and that is why I raise the matter at this time.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there is, of course, nothing before the house, but the right hon. gentleman,

with your permission, has brought this matter to our attention. I recall that this question has arisen in the past, and it was felt on previous occasions that we should follow the normal procedure laid down in our rules. I do not think in following our normal procedure at this stage we should anticipate the future. It may well be that we will deal with this report as we deal with other reports of committees, and that it will be disposed of. So I suggest that for this day at least we should follow the normal procedure and see how we stand at the end of the day.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, in regard to the matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition respecting a question period during the time the motion for concurrence in the flag committee's report is before the house, I think we should consider one or two things.

Many days ago I asked the house leader whether any consideration had been or was being given to the matter of having a question period if the debate on the flag committee's report carried on for a long period of time. I think we will have to face up to the fact that even the Prime Minister does not have control over whether or not there will be a question period in these circumstances, because under standing orders unanimous consent by the house is required to change the order of procedure, and of course motions for concurrence in committee reports takes precedence over all other matters.

The other thing to be considered, regarding whether all members of the house would be prepared to give unanimous consent, is that before doing so we would have to reach the stage where the length and pattern of the debate were more of less apparent. We have already had something like 22 days of debate in the house on the flag issue. We referred it to a committee, composed of members of all parties, for the purpose of getting some kind of agreement, and I think if there are a number of hon. members who would like to make contributions to the debate on the committee's report we would do them a service by providing them more time by dealing with the report at the start of the sitting.

So far as I am concerned I do not think it would be prudent at this time to ask for unanimous consent to change the standing orders.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): If I may speak on the point of order that was raised by the Leader of the Opposition, surely, Mr. Speaker, it is not an unreasonable request that something of the normal business of the House of Commons be carried on. I point out to you, sir, that over the years it has been most unusual for the normal business to be interrupted by special motions or by lengthy discussion on the report of a committee. There are few instances that can be called to mind when we have been deprived of questions on the orders of the day, and I think it is generally recognized that questions on orders of the day constitute one of the essential privileges of the House of Commons so that the ministry may be asked important and urgent questions relating to their activities and affecting the lives and welfare of Canadians.

We are also well aware of numerous occasions when the house has changed its order of business, and frequently has reverted to motions for some special announcement or motion to be put before the house by the government. Faced with a recognized controversial item, namely discussion on the report of the flag committee, it may well be that the opportunity for asking questions on orders of the day will not be reached for some time. Therefore we suggest that the government, and the house generally, respond to this normal request that a period be set aside—I would say one hour—for the questions that normally precede the opening of the business of the House of Commons. By doing so we could not interfere at all with the discussion on the report of the special committee and would retain one of the great privileges of the house, namely the right to question the ministry with regard to their activities.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Might I be heard on this matter, Mr. Speaker. The rules are explicit. They say "The ordinary daily routine of business in the house shall be as follows", and it is set out very clearly.

Today at the start of proceedings, by unanimous consent that daily routine was interrupted—I think all members will agree very properly in the circumstances—to deal with a very special matter, namely to move concurrence in a suggested message arising out of Your Honour's remarks concerning that very great former prime minister of Great Britain who led us so outstandingly in the war.

At the conclusion of that proceeding you, sir, permitted the procedure to be interrupted by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition in order to raise a point of order. I point out that there could be no point of order because there was no item of business before the house

at that stage. You had not called any item of business, and none was before the house. But in any event you, and the house, as an indulgence permitted the right hon. gentleman to put forward what he called a point of order which he saw fit to make.

That having been done, other members were heard, and the hon. member for Medicine Hat pointed out that this proposal had been suggested some days ago, to be precise on November 17. On that occasion it was pointed out quite properly that there was no evidence as yet that the motion for concurrence in the flag committee report would take up a long time. Furthermore, the hon. member concluded his remarks by indicating that he was unwilling to give unanimous consent today to the business being interrupted.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It looks like co-operation between the two parties again.

Mr. McIlraith: The right hon. gentleman, who sits beside the *Hansard* reporter, has a habit of putting nasty remarks like that on the record, and may I say I am not guilty of the implication. I have not had the pleasure —and I would regard it as a pleasure—of speaking with the hon. member for Medicine Hat on this matter, but when I do speak with him I would point out he does not make remarks that have an underhand implication.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Not underhand? Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: "Underhand" was the expression used.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Surely we can discuss this suggestion in a calm atmosphere.

Mr. Diefenbaker: To use expressions such as "underhand," that government over there—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —that government should never use that expression after the experience of the last few days.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I thought the right hon. gentleman called the point he raised a point of order and, if that is so, he has no right to interrupt me on a so-called question of privilege.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We are to keep quiet over here and allow you to trample on parliament?

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. member for Medicine Hat having indicated that he is not willing to give consent, I respectfully ask that the business be proceeded with, and the business is as indicated on November 17.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Prime Minister is the one who would not give consent.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): There is a point of order—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: Closure.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think I am entitled to hear a few, a very few, remarks from the hon. member for Edmonton West, as a former speaker of the house.

Mr. Lambert: There is only one point I would like to raise, and it is that if the motion for concurrence, which it is anticipated will come from the hon. member for Humber-St. George's, is proceeded with and the debate should carry on into other days, then I would point out to members of the government that if at any time they should desire to make motions they would be blocked by their own stand in this regard. I say this because once debate on the motion has been started it will have precedence over everything else and no motions or statements on motions would be possible. That is the only point I wish to make.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I make one brief suggestion. It seems obvious that we shall not be able to reach any unanimous agreement on the floor of the house with respect to what is to be done today. I suppose, therefore, that we shall follow the rules. I suggest, though, that later today, or at any rate as soon as possible, the leader of the house should call a meeting of the representatives of the various parties to see whether an agreement can be reached for a later date.

I wonder whether the nodding of the head by the President of the Privy Council could be recorded in *Hansard*.

Mr. Diefenbaker: In which direction? Vertically or horizontally?

PRIVILEGE

MR. WINCH—WINNING OF GREY CUP BY VANCOUVER LIONS

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege because my study of the standing orders this morning leads me to believe this is the only way I can say what I want to say. May I

express our pleasure at seeing the Prime Minister back in his seat in the House of Commons. May I also say how much we appreciate that he lost his $1 bet by supporting the Hamilton Tiger-Cats against the B.C. Lions. I say to the Prime Minister and all others that they should not underrate the intelligence and fighting spirit of British Columbians, be it in sports or be it in politics, and do not forget it.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, perhaps you will permit me to comment on that point because my name has been mentioned in connection with it. The hon. gentleman should not underrate my own intelligence, because while I bet $1 on Hamilton I bet $2 on British Columbia.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Speaker, I say that this completely proves what we have been worried about, that we now have a Prime Minister who plays both ends against the middle.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Hedging.

MR. DINSDALE—SERVICING OF R.C.M.P. CARS IN MANITOBA

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): I rise on a question of privilege for the reasons outlined by the hon. member for Vancouver East and in the light of the discussion which has just taken place.

On Thursday last it was the pleasure of the citizens of western Manitoba to welcome the Prime Minister to Brandon on his official visit there. I think the Prime Minister will agree that it was a fine, non-partisan occasion. In the midst of the visit I was informed that the local R.C.M.P. detachment was under orders to reallocate the servicing of its cars by December 1, for no good reason and without informing those firms concerned.

After confirming this information I contacted the office of the Minister of Justice and was informed there would be no action in this regard. This was confirmed by my colleague the hon. member for Marquette. I am raising this issue at the present time because the action contemplated is contrary to the principle of non-partisan purchasing and servicing of cars which was adopted—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Dinsdale: —which was adopted in recent years by the government of Canada, and I am happy to be able to say that the department of northern affairs was the first department to adopt this policy. Under this system—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must admit I am slightly confused. I do not understand what the question of privilege is. It sounds much more like a grievance to me. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could reach his point quickly.

Mr. Dinsdale: I can; and as I said I take this course because it is the only course open to me under the rules. I was pointing out that this was the system adopted by the department of northern affairs and other departments and I am raising this issue because, under that system, tenders are handled—

Mr. Speaker: Order. If this is a question dealing with tenders and administrative activities in connection therewith I am sure opportunity will be furnished to the hon. member within a short time, or within a few days, to deal with it. Surely this is not a question of privilege to be raised immediately.

Mr. Dinsdale: On the same question of privilege—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Dinsdale: This is an action which will take place tomorrow, and under our rules I see no other way of dealing with it today.

Mr. Speaker: There surely is a much simpler way of settling the question—get in touch with the Minister of Justice and discuss the matter with him.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): This underlines the injustice of the government in putting on a guillotine which prevents grievances being raised in this house as long as the flag motion is before us. That is exactly what is wrong, throttling parliament and preventing members raising these matters.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Would Your Honour rule whether or not there is a question of privilege and if there is not, could we not, with respect, proceed to motions?

Mr. Speaker: I would rule on the evidence I have heard just recently that there is no question of privilege.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Nicholas Mandziuk (Marquette): I feel you have not completely ruled out of order the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris. It is one which concerns us. It concerns this house and it con-

cerns duplicity, back-tracking and double-dealing by a certain government department. I think the proper time to raise it—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Mandziuk: Oh, yes. Stand on your feet and then howl.

Mr. Speaker: Rightly or wrongly the Chair has rendered a decision, and I propose now to call for the presentation of reports by standing and special committees.

MR. NASSERDEN—"HANSARD" REPORT OF SUPPLY COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): On a question of privilege. On Friday last you will recall that the closing stages of the debate—

An hon. Member: Next.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, may I have some order?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: I dislike saying this, but I would appreciate a little more silence on this side of the house.

Mr. Diefenbaker: "This" being the government side.

Mr. Bell: I hope this will get on to the *Hansard* record. When you said "this side" I presume the reference was to the government side of the house.

Mr. Speaker: It certainly is not the purpose of the Chair to get into a debate with hon. members, so let us all assume a little of the blame.

Mr. Nasserden: I must say that the noise was not coming from this side of the house.

My question of privilege relates to the *Hansard* report for Friday, November 27. Your Honour will recall that at six o'clock we reached a stage in our proceedings where a number of items had to be passed without discussion or consideration. I raised the question whether those items should be read into the record. I have consulted with the assistant clerk of the house and he tells me today that an item which is not discussed is placed at the end of the *Hansard* record. As I read this issue of *Hansard* it is difficult for me to segregate those items which no one wanted to discuss from those which, due to the procedure followed, it was not possible for hon. members to discuss because there was no opportunity to do so.

I believe that those items which members had no opportunity to discuss should be so recorded in *Hansard* and I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to take this matter under consideration and see that our proceedings are recorded correctly in this regard.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the hon. member for bringing this to my attention. I will certainly take it under consideration and see what may be done.

MR. MACLEAN—CELEBRATION OF ST. ANDREWS DAY

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): I should like to rise on a question of privilege, one which I am sure is non-controversial. I should like to take a few moments to point out to hon. members that today is St. Andrew's day.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I am sure Canadians generally will join with Canadians of Scottish extraction all over this country in helping them to celebrate the day which is set aside for the commemoration of their patron saint. We hope that when next St. Andrew's day comes around Canada will still be one of the senior countries of the commonwealth where large numbers of citizens of Scottish extraction live and make a great contribution to the development of a country over which their symbol still flies in the national flag.

CANADIAN FLAG

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SIXTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. H. M. Batten (Humber-St. George's) moved that the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964 be now concurred in.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move concurrence in the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag, which I had the honour to present to the house on Thursday, October 29, I do so mindful of the attitude of complete impartiality which I endeavoured to maintain in the deliberations of this committee and as its chairman.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Batten: I shall endeavour to maintain that attitude in the few brief remarks which I have to make on this occasion. The resolution setting up this committee was moved in the House of Commons on Thursday, September 10, and in order that the record may be kept straight I would like to read that motion

again. On the motion of Mr. Favreau, seconded by Mr. Churchill, it was resolved:

> That a special committee of this house consisting of 15 members, to be designated later by the house, be appointed to consider and report upon the flag question; that the said committee be empowered to report from time to time and that its final report be submitted not later than six weeks from the date of its first sitting; and that the appointment of this committee, its power to report and the capacity of this house to act upon the report be not restricted by any motions now on the order paper.

On September 15 this house appointed to the committee 15 members. Those members were: the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Cadieux); the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman); the hon. member for Restigouche-Madawaska (Mr. Dubé); the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming); the hon. member for Winnipeg South (Mrs. Konantz); the hon. member for Mégantic (Mr. Langlois); the hon. member for Lake St. John (Mr. Lessard); the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Macaluso); the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson); the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith); the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Pugh); the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Rapp); the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard); the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott) and myself. This committee held its first meeting on Thursday, September 17, and in pursuance of the resolution passed in this house it was therefore bound to report not later than Thursday, October 29.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a comment regarding the work of the members of this committee. In the years I have been in the House of Commons I, like other members of the house, have had the opportunity of being a member of various house committees. I would like to say to the house now that I have never had the opportunity of being a member of a committee that was so diligent in pursuing the task that had been given to them. For a very large number of the meetings 100 per cent of the members were present. The opinions expressed were strongly expressed; I believe that they were sincerely held. I say to the house now—and I do this on my own initiative—that I would like to commend the members of the committee for the excellent work which they did over a period of time when the meetings were many and the work rather concentrated.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Batten: Following the organizational meeting on September 17, 45 meetings were held. During those 45 meetings 12 witnesses were heard. They came before the committee with the understanding that their remarks would be considered in camera, but I would like to say now—and I know I am speaking for the members of the committee when I say this—how grateful we all are for the contribution which they made to the committee itself. They gave us a great deal of information on Canadian history, heraldry, protocol and flag design; and for the contribution which they made to the work of the committee I am very grateful.

During the deliberations of this committee approximately 2,000 new designs were examined, as well as designs which had been presented to the house on previous occasions. I would also like to thank those who were sufficiently interested in a Canadian flag to submit designs to the committee. All the designs submitted had a great deal of merit, and as the selection process continued it became more and more difficult for the committee to pick the design which it favoured most.

I would like to say a word regarding the method of selection. The flags presented to the committee were divided into three groups; those which had for their main part three maple leaves, those which had one maple leaf, and those which had the union jack or the fleur-de-lis or both. There was then a process of selection, and the committee was finally able to reach the point where there were five flags in each of these groups. From there on the process of selection was carried on by secret ballot. Finally the committee was able to get down to one flag in each of these groups.

Your Honour will recall that on November 18 the house passed a motion proposed by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton ordering that there be laid before the house copies of the final flag designs in categories (a), (b) and (c) as voted upon by this committee. For the convenience in debate of the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton, other members of the flag committee and members of the house in general, I should like now, with the unanimous consent of the house, to table photographic copies of these final flag designs.

Mr. Speaker: Does the house give consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, may I interject, as the mover of the motion, and ask that each member of the

house be furnished with a copy of these photographs.

Mr. Batten: If it is the wish of the house, Mr. Speaker, I should be very pleased to have this done through the distribution office.

Mr. Speaker: Is the house agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Speaker, I have a question on this matter. Would these designs which are to be submitted to members be in colour?

Mr. Batten: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Because of the way these photographs were taken the colour is not particularly good, but all three designs are in colour.

Mr. Chatterton: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member if it is not possible to have them distributed now to members of the house.

Mr. Batten: I do not think it is physically possible to have it done just at the moment, Mr. Speaker, but I think it will be done some time during the afternoon.

I should now like to say that the report presented to the house was read at the final meeting of the flag committee; and while there was not unanimous agreement in the committee as to the final flag selection, there was unanimous agreement as to the wording of the actual report itself. The recommendation made to this house by this committee and contained in the report is as follows:

> Your committee, therefore, recommends that the flag to be designated as the national flag of Canada be a red flag of the proportions two by length and one by width, containing in its centre a white square, the width of the flag, bearing a single red maple, or, in heraldic terms, described as gules on a Canadian pale argent a maple leaf of the first.

I now have the honour, Mr. Speaker, to recommend this report to the House of Commons and to move, seconded by the hon. member for Danforth, that it be now concurred in.

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to say that I appreciate the words of the hon. member for Humber-St. George's concerning the attendance of members of the committee and, as he put it, the sincerity of the members of the committee. I think there was an awful lot of hard work done. I in turn, Mr. Speaker, should like to congratulate our chairman on the fact that he handled a very difficult committee in a very competent manner. I do not often go on record as congratulating a member of the government or a member of the government party, but I must say that he did keep us under control with a kindly but firm approach throughout. During six weeks of very concentrated sittings, and facing a deadline, all of that time tension was increasing and nerves did become frayed; and the chairman deserves full credit, Mr. Speaker, for a job well done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as a member of that committee I feel it is my duty to say a few words at this time. As the chairman mentioned, our first meeting was held on September 17 last. It was not held in camera; it was an organization meeting at which we elected a chairman, a vice chairman, and so on. At the second meeting, which was the first in camera and which was held on the afternoon of Monday, September 21, we discussed, first of all, our general approach to this question with which we were faced. I agree with the chairman that it was probably the best attended committee which has ever sat in this building. There was frequently 100 per cent attendance of that committee from that date on.

At that first meeting held in camera I was encouraged by the way various members sitting on the committee from both sides of the house appeared to be approaching our very difficult objective. There were several who spoke of compromise, mentioning retaining something of the past and suggesting something of what might be considered the new. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I was doomed to disappointment.

The chairman has read out certain terms of the report of the committee, and I should like to read at this time the first four paragraphs:

> 1. Pursuant to its order of reference of September 10, 1964, your committee had before it, for consideration and report, the flag question.
>
> 2. On September 15, 1964, the House of Commons designated 15 members of the committee:—

The chairman has mentioned the names and I do not want to repeat them.

> 3. A subcommittee on agenda and procedure was appointed. The members were—

And so on.

> 4. Your committee held 45 sittings in camera—

I would emphasize those words "in camera".

> —and heard 12 witnesses in the fields of history, heraldry, protocol, art and design. The members of the committee express their gratitude to these witnesses for their efforts in providing detailed information and also to the nearly 2,000 Canadians who submitted flag designs and suggestions.

I agree, Mr. Speaker, with the chairman's words of appreciation to the witnesses who came before us and to those who presented designs for our consideration.

Now I should like to refer back to those words "in camera". First of all I should like to refer to some newspaper articles and quotations therein. I do not have them all by any means, but I should like to point out that to me there has been some inconsistency regarding the real meaning of the words "in camera" and the apparent interpretation given them by certain people.

The first reference I would make concerns a picture of the hon. member for Leeds which appeared in a newspaper under date of September 23, 1964. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that the committee had been meeting since September 15. This picture depicting the hon. member for Leeds appeared in *La Voix de L'Est*, Granby, Quebec, under date September 23, and pictured him holding what at that time had been thought and claimed by the government to be their flag. That was the three maple leaves flag with the blue bars at the end. I do not know when the picture was taken, but it was published in this newspaper on September 23, 1964.

I pass now to an article which appeared in the Montreal *Gazette* on October 5, 1964 headed "Judy regrets harsh things said about proposed flag". This article is datelined Gander, Newfoundland, and goes on as follows:

> Health minister Judy LaMarsh said Saturday the new flag under study in committee at Ottawa may "never recover from some of the outrageous things said about it".

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether this was the tip-off that the government members were going to switch their allegiance from the three maple leaves flag to the one which is now described in the report, and were actually instructed to do so. I would point out that in the first interview which the chairman had with the press—perhaps it was his first press release after the committee's first meeting—the chairman suggested, I believe, that it would be appreciated if there was no pressure put on the members of the committee to reveal what was going on in camera, and I think pretty generally this request was observed by the press, at least up to a certain point.

At this stage I began to wonder how these news items concerning conjecture about what was going on in the committee became published. I have before me a copy of the Toronto *Daily Star* of Monday, October 19, and I should like to refer to an article written by Mr. William MacEachern in which he said the following:

> Indeed, there is some question whether it will be able to make a report at all, unanimous or otherwise, by the Oct. 29 deadline set out in its terms of reference.
>
> Conservative members are already pressing for an extension of the deadline but Liberal members are opposed.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer again to an earlier stage of the committee's meetings, and say without equivocation that at a very early stage of those meetings there were many members who indicated that if we were faced with a deadline and there appeared to be a possibility of coming up with something, we might ask for an extension of the six weeks time limit. That was our aim throughout the hearings from the first day we sat. However, this thought was expressed by more than just Conservative members, as I said, at an early stage of our meetings.

I should like to quote one other excerpt from this article, as follows:

> According to one committee member "the Tory position hasn't changed one iota from the stand opposition leader John Diefenbaker took when he spoke on the flag question in the Commons in 1945.

I should like to know who that committee member is, because this article very definitely states "According to one committee member". I guarantee that he was not a member of our party, because our members had the sensitivity to appreciate what the words "in camera" meant. Apparently others did not so appreciate them.

The next article I wish to quote from appeared in the Peterborough *Examiner* of October 19, under the heading "Top Secret Lid Taken Off...Students get 'inside information' on Flag". I think I will read a portion of this very interesting article, as follows:

> The meetings of the Commons flag committee in Ottawa have been labelled "top secret" and the committee room is strictly "out of bounds" to outsiders.
>
> But a group of Crestwood secondary school students broke the barriers Friday and gathered an impressive array of previously hushed facts.
>
> They were the first outsiders to gain entry to the room.
>
> They learned the original backdrop of the Pearson flag may be rejected, and they saw a banner which could possibly be Canada's future flag.
>
> They were told Canada now stands where the United States stood more than 100 years ago before its civil war and that Canadians may be on the threshold of a similar conflict.
>
> The 37 students from grade 10 travelled to Ottawa with Stuart Howard, head of the history department.
>
> Their tour of the flag committee quarters was arranged by Richard Honey (M.P., Durham) and Fred Stenson (M.P., Peterborough).

I am informed that Mr. Stenson had nothing whatever to do with arranging this visit to the flag committee. The article then continues:

John Matheson (M.P., Leeds), committee member, and Prime Minister Pearson's personal adviser on the flag issue, greeted the students and spoke to them on the issue.

"There were flags everywhere in that room," said Mr. Howard.

Mr. Howard described the physical appearance of the room with flags draped all around. Then the article states:

Mr. Matheson emphasized to the students the continual reappearance of the three maple leaves on the flags being submitted by the public, and mentioned their prominence in past Canadian flags and badges.

"He seemed convinced the national flag would include the three maple leaves," said Mr. Howard, "but he was not so sure of the background.

"He also said the sea to sea motif on the Pearson banner may be seriously altered."

Mr. Howard said the M.P. questioned the importance of the sea to sea idea, saying that about 50 countries used the format and "maybe some other aspect of our history should be used."

Mr. Matheson said wavy royal blue bars at the top and bottom of the banner—an idea submitted by the group of seven painter A. Y. Jackson—is getting considerable attention.

He then pointed at a group of flags resting at one end of the room and said they were getting the most serious attention from the committee.

Resting prominently in the centre of these was a large white banner with three red leaves in the centre.

"The leaves were the same as the Pearson leaves," said Mr. Howard, "only they were more upright and closer together.

"Below that was this same flag inset on the traditional military service flag in place of the union jack."

Mr. Howard said several flags displaying the fleur-de-lis were to be seen.

Mr. Matheson told the students of a recent committee meeting when Dr. A. R. M. Lower, professor emeritus of history at Queen's University, addressed it and said Canada now stands where the United States stood just before the civil war.

I think I should point out at this stage that each witness who appeared before that committee was assured that none of the evidence given would be published but that it would remain completely private so they could be free to speak as they saw fit. This fact was impressed upon the witnesses so we could, as I am sure we did, receive from them their honest and candid opinions. This article is a good example of the information that has leaked out.

Again quoting from this article, and this is Mr. Matheson speaking:

"He said the flag is symbolic of the tensions in certain parts of Canada between the races," Mr. Howard said, "and in his opinion there could be civil war here unless the differences are settled."

Mr. Speaker, what kind of scare statements are those being made by a member of parliament, and a member of this committee, to students of this country, particularly when one remembers that the meetings of the committee were held in camera?

I should now like to quote from an article which appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* on October 20, under the heading "A. Y. Jackson's Flag Favoured". This article is written by Ken Kelly of the Canadian Press and states in part:

Famed artist A. Y. Jackson's flag design is reliably reported to be the choice of a majority of members of the Commons flag committee.

Informants say the committee probably will split 9-5 to recommend to the Commons that the 82 year old Canadian painter's maple leaf flag design become Canada's flag and that the Canadian red ensign be used to mark Canada's commonwealth connection.

Reliable sources say the Jackson design has the support of Liberal, New Democratic, Social Credit and Creditist M.P.'s so far.

The five Progressive Conservatives still haven't committed themselves and one source says they aren't expected to back the majority choice. Conservative committee members, many of whose colleagues in the Commons favour the Canadian red ensign as the Canadian flag, were reported to have proposed several designs to the committee. . . .It is anticipated that at least one effort will be made to get committee support for a request that the committee's deadline be extended.

Here again I ask, Mr. Speaker, who was this reliable source? I guarantee it was not a member of the Conservative party. I can only suggest that whoever gave this information to Mr. Kelly was certainly misleading him. Whether he was purposely misleading him or otherwise I would not know, but at any rate it is obvious that Mr. Kelly has been led down the garden path. I feel that this deliberate attempt to mislead the public must certainly have caused great discomfiture to that famed artist, Mr. A. Y. Jackson.

Then I come to October 23 and another article by Ken Kelly of the Canadian Press which appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen*. I will only read some excerpts.

Most of the Liberals on the committee are insisting on a design containing three maple leaves. They do not want the union jack in any form. The majority of the Conservatives, on the other hand, are said to be insisting that the jack be present in some form and that the maple leaf theme be confined to any number of maple leaves except three.

Here again, Mr. Speaker, I point out that somebody has talked, but certainly not a member of the Conservative party. There is another article to which I should like to refer which appeared on October 24 under the by-line of Mr. Douglas Fisher, M.P. I am going to read the following paragraph to which I should like to make particular reference:

Some suspect that the leader of the official opposition has been privy to every move of the

committee and has been piping advice through several of the Conservatives.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is completely false in every particular.

Mr. Monteith: I continue:

> This suspicion is the explanation for the retreat to the Gatineau this week end, or so the story goes.

I cannot speak too strongly about this article. First of all I should like to point out that so far as the report we are now discussing is concerned, all votes had been taken prior to the so-called retreat to the Gatineau. I cannot speak too strongly against the words of the hon. member for Port Arthur and the innuendo to be found in this paragraph. He is implying that the leader of our party was in continuous contact with and was piping instructions to the Conservative members of the committee. I can say without any qualification that no member of the committee discussed this matter at all with the Leader of the Opposition until after the votes had been taken. Never at any time until the final vote had been taken did any member do so, nor was there any effort whatsoever on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition to pipe information to the committee members. I cannot say the same for the government members.

As hon. members know, the committee report was presented to the house on October 29, the last day on which it could be presented. I come now to an article which appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* of that date, which is quite interesting. Incidentally, as you will remember, Mr. Speaker, the newspaper containing the article appeared on the streets of Ottawa some 45 minutes before the House of Commons sat. This is but another example of the Liberal party's contempt for parliament. Other speakers will no doubt refer to this article as the debate continues, but I should like to refer to one or two paragraphs of the article which was written by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman). He wrote:

> Here is the inside story which I am now free to tell provided I do not attribute votes or statements to individuals on the committee or reveal the confidential testimony of witnesses.

He denies the right of the hon. member for Leeds to reveal the testimony of witnesses, but the hon. member for Leeds did not show that integrity. I have read what he said as quoted in the Peterborough *Examiner*. There are many other excerpts well worth mentioning. I am not going to go into the article in detail at the moment, but here is another excerpt:

> In the fourth week we were beginning to know what prices would be put on concessions.

I should like to know just what is meant by that statement "what prices would be put on concessions". Here is another paragraph:

> Tension mounted as the day drew near. There was much lobbying from room to room and whispering in the corner. Frequent skirmishes broke out in committee sittings.

I do not know whether the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra was running around lobbying from room to room, although it would seem he admits he was. He says he visited other members. I accept the fact that he undoubtedly did do a lot of lobbying but certainly no lobbying was done by the Conservative members on the committee. This gives an indication of the mood and thinking of the Liberal members throughout the sittings of the committee. We recall that the newspaper appeared on the streets 45 minutes before the committee report was presented to the house, and to me this is a complete abdication of responsibility to the House of Commons.

I have only one more reference, Mr. Speaker, but I think it is worth noting. I have here the Brockville *Recorder and Times* of November 2 last which contains a quite interesting article under the headline "Tory Strategy Backfired On Flag Says Matheson". I assume that throughout the hon. member for Leeds endeavoured to give his home town paper a sort of inside story as to what went on, but I should like to quote one or two excerpts from this article to show how ridiculous and how completely wrong the hon. member for Leeds was. He makes this statement:

> It was at this point they—

Meaning the Conservative party members on the committee—

> —were given full reign to set the rules.

This is utter rot and the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) knows it. We never had any kind of control over setting the rules. I agree some of our suggestions were accepted. Some of the suggestions of other members of the committee were accepted. But when the hon. member makes a statement like—

> It was at this point they were given full reign to set the rules—

—this is simply atrocious. I quote further from the article:

> At this point, Mr. Matheson said, the Conservatives almost turned white in consternation since they had voted in violation of Mr. Diefenbaker's instructions to make sure there were no unanimous votes.

Canadian Flag

I go back to what I said earlier. Never at any time, until after the final vote had been taken, had there been any contact with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) on any matters concerning the flag committee proceedings. That is correct, and you know it.

Mr. Macaluso: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Monteith: You may get up and ask any question you like afterwards. Just sit down for the moment. Mr. Speaker, this is simply not true.

I think I should also put on the record one or two other statements made by the hon. member for Leeds in his article. There was a reference to the behaviour of the Conservative members of the committee. I presume he thought it was humour. I do not propose to quote it because I feel that does not deserve any notice whatsoever. I am sure he will understand what I am talking about. The article continues:

Mr. Matheson said he is happy with the committee's choice, although he had hoped for the three leaf design.

How ridiculous can you get. Here he is trying to indicate to his home town paper that he was standing behind his original choice, he who is presumed to have advised the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) on this three maple leaf choice. Mr. Speaker, he did not vote for it. That is obvious, but here he is trying to leave the impression in his home town that he had been standing behind his original choice. I quote further:

"It's a beautiful flag," he added, saying all the talk about it looking like the Peruvian flag was not correct.

This is in reference to the design reported by the committee on October 29. I leave it to your judgment Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not this flag looks like the Peruvian flag. I suggest that the citizenry as a whole examine it and it will be very obvious to them whether the flag chosen looks like the Peruvian flag. I simply repeat that the condition to which government members have brought this flag question is a shameful mess. To Conservative members this was an in camera committee. To at least one or more other members it was not.

I now quote from paragraph six of the committee report:

Elimination by an agreed procedure left only one design in each category. A vote for the retention of each finalist was then taken with the following results:

A—The three maple leaf design was retained by a vote of eight to six (8 to 6);

B—The single maple leaf design was retained by a vote of thirteen to one (13 to 1);

C—The design containing the union jack and/or the fleur-de-lis was rejected by a vote of nine to five (9 to 5).

I would like to inform the house that when we were defeated in our desire to retain the red ensign, something which had taken place earlier, we wanted to find out whether the government and other members of the committee were taking an uncompromising stand. We showed our desire for a compromise in a design which was produced for the committee, containing the union jack and fleur-de-lis, but we just could not get any support for any flag with the union jack on it.

Mr. Pickersgill: Or the fleur-de-lis.

Mr. Monteith: On August 24 last I spoke during the flag debate and dealt at some length with my feelings on the issue. I do not propose to go into more detail in that regard today. I also dealt at some length with the reason that I believed in a matter so personal, so close to one's heart, there should be an opportunity for every citizen to express his or her preference through means of a plebiscite. I believe the majority of Canadians wish to have this opportunity, something which has been strongly borne out by opinion polls across the country.

I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Rapp):

That the sixth report of the special committee be not now adopted but that it be referred back to the committee with instructions to strike out paragraph seven of the said report and substitute therefor the following:

"However, as the final vote of the committee did not reveal a sufficient degree of unanimity for the proposed design for a national flag for Canada, your committee therefore recommends that the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to conduct a plebiscite to be held at the next general election in order that the Canadian people may be given their rightful opportunity to declare their choice concerning a national flag".

And that the committee for such purpose be revived.

I close simply by reminding the house of the Prime Minister's rather delayed expression to the effect that on anything concerning the flag there is to be a free vote.

Mr. Macaluso: Would the hon. member permit a question now?

Mr. Monteith: I would be glad to.

Mr. Macaluso: The hon. member has stated that it was not until after the vote of October 22 that he told the Leader of the Opposition

of the committee's decision. Wasn't the committee still sitting at that time?

Mr. Monteith: I simply said that I had not had one discussion with the Leader of the Opposition concerning the flag question until after the final vote had been taken.

Mr. Macaluso: My question is, wasn't the committee still in session at that time that you advised the Leader of the Opposition of the result of the vote?

Mr. Monteith: I would reply by asking a question. Do you mean to tell me that no member of your party had any conversation with the Prime Minister during the course of the debate?

Mr. Macaluso: I see the hon. gentleman does not wish to answer because he knows the committee was still in session and that he was wrong in telling him.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Is there any objection to this amendment?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Churchill: A most unusual procedure.

Mr. McIlraith: The objection is on several grounds. The first has to do with the right to refer the report back to the committee. Such a right does not exist because the committee is a special committee, not a standing committee; it is a special committee whose final report has been made.

In support of this position I would refer Your Honour to citation 286 on page 236 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, fourth edition, where it is stated;

> A select special committee ceases to exist on the moment its final report is presented to the house. The report cannot afterwards be sent back to the committee with instructions to amend it in any particular. If further proceedings are desired it is necessary to revive the committee.

That is the first ground of objection. There is a further ground of objection which is even more fundamental, and it is this. It will be recalled that the committee was set up after several weeks of debate on this flag question and it will be noted on reading the motion to set it up that the terms of reference were very special; this is not only called a special committee but it is, in fact, special by its very nature. The reason is easily understood by anyone who bears in mind the history of the flag question in the House of Commons this session. The motion will be found in *Votes and Proceedings* No. 145 of September 10 and it reads as follows:

> That a special committee of this house, consisting of 15 members, to be designated later by the house, be appointed to consider and report upon the flag question; that the said committee be empowered to report from time to time and that its final report be submitted not later than six weeks from the date of its first sitting; and that the appointment of this committee, its power to report and the capacity of this house to act upon the report be not restricted by any motions now on the order paper.

The point I wish to make in this connection is the following one: Even if it were generally in order to refer a report back to a special committee this would not be sufficient in this particular case. The committee, in its present form, could not be revived by implication or even by a motion, as is sought to be done. What is involved here is the whole charter of the committee, its whole constitution, its whole character. This will be well understood if hon. members would bear in mind its history. It was to report back to the house within six weeks after its first meeting, and its first meeting was held some time in September—I forget the exact date. So even the implied revival of the committee is not effective. Sending back what is sought to be sent back to it for further consideration cannot be effective; it would be a mere nullity because the committee, by its own constitution, does not have the authority or the power to carry out the function which this proposal seeks to refer to it, because of the limitation of time in its constitution.

The authority for a special committee is very limited. It has only the authority given to it by the house. Perhaps I could read an excerpt from Redlich, page 196:

> It remains, finally, to explain the legal relation of a committee to the house as a whole. The main principle to be attended to is that a committee only exists, and only has power to act, so far as expressly directed by the order of the house which brings it into being. This order of reference is a firm bond, subjecting the committee to the will of the house; the reference is always treated with exactness and must be strictly interpreted. A select committee therefore always acts under a special, not a general, authority.

The point I wish to make is that there can be no authority in the committee to do what is sought by the motion for reference back. If the constitution of the committee is to be changed, that of course will require a substantive motion which must be dealt with in the ordinary way. Notice must be given and it must be treated as any substantive motion is treated.

Those are the main grounds of objection. The last, I submit, is not open to any argument at all because of the nature of the instructions the hon. member has sought to

transmit. The first hinges on the fact that the committee is a special committee only, and the cases applicable to standing committees do not apply to it.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I have only a few remarks to make relative to the points of order raised by the President of the Privy Council on behalf of the government.

The hon. gentleman said the committee must be revived. Well, the amendment itself provides for the revival of the committee, if the minister insists that this should be a condition. If he would read the amendment he would see that the house, in adopting the amendment, would revive the committee if such a course were necessary for the particular purpose of the motion. So this condition has been provided for; even the citations and the precedents relating to this direction for revival have been met.

I turn now to the other point the minister raised. He seemed to think that because the committee had presented its final report it had, ipso facto, died in the literal sense and could not therefore be revived. But I would point out that we are considering not the final report of the committee but merely the sixth report. In logic, if on the presentation of the sixth report the committee were deemed to have come to an end, how could it present its seventh report? The seventh report is a matter of record on the order paper. I would say, therefore, that in so far as consideration of the sixth report was concerned we are not dealing with the final report of the committee and, therefore, for the purpose of the discussion of the sixth report, the committee has not come to an end.

What we have before us is in essence an interim report. Therefore, the argument that having prepared its final report the committee has died does not wholly apply. Certainly the discussion of interim reports, if such reports were delayed or adjourned until the presentation of what might be a final report, could not be curtailed by using this device as a tool to prevent any discussion of any report of a special committee—not a select committee but a special committee—by merely delaying, on the initiative of the government, discussion of any interim report until what is deemed to be a final report has been presented. Nor has there ever been such a rule, because it would serve to stifle any discussion or any amendment of any report of a special committee. My third point is that any references the minister has made that have applied to select committees certainly do not apply to special committees, because there is a clearcut distinction between the two.

I would put it to the minister once again that his arguments against this amendment have been countered, first by the fact that the amendment provides for a revival of the committee for a specific purpose; second, that we are considering an interim report and not a final report; and third, that this is a special committee and not a select committee. For those reasons I put it to you, Mr. Speaker—there may be other reasons which other hon. members of the house may advance for Your Honour's consideration—that the amendment is in order for discussion at this time.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there is just one consideration which I would like to bring to your attention and one respect in which this particular special committee is different from, I believe, any other special committee that has been set up by this house. It is different, for instance, from the special customs committee of 1926. It is different in that the order setting up this committee established a particular time limit within which the committee had to work. It was a decision of this house that this special committee should do its work within six weeks, and then it finished.

If it is now considered in order to move an amendment which in its terms revives this committee, we are then reversing by an amendment an order of the house which established a committee for six weeks. We would be restoring a committee without any time limit at all; it could go on indefinitely, because there is nothing in the amendment, presumably, which would prevent that. If it can go on indefinitely, it is entirely in opposition to the original motion which said the committee must end its work in six weeks. I know that arguments can be made for and against reviving by amendment special or select committees; we could argue that matter for a long time. But I do not know of any case, because I do not believe there is any case, where a committee was set up for six weeks to do a job and then an amendment of this type was accepted; because this amendment, if carried, would restore that committee for an indefinite period of time, thereby contradicting the order of the house that it be set up for six weeks.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, you have something of a mixed bag with respect to this point of

order. I am afraid that all I am going to do is put another element into the bag for Your Honour to consider. I confess that I am concerned about the fundamental point made by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. McIlraith), now supported by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), namely that in their view there is no way at all in which this report can be referred back to the special committee.

I speak as one who would like to see this matter disposed of as quickly as possible, but it does seem to me that we have to look at the procedural points very carefully. The Prime Minister's contention that the original committee was set up with a time limit of six weeks is one that has to be considered, and it may be that any attempt on the part of the house to revive the committee should take cognizance of that time limit and amend the time limit by setting some other period of time. But it does seem to me to be not quite consistent with the authority of the house to say that, having set up a committee to do a job, we are prohibited from asking that committee to take another look at the matter which we referred to it.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. gentleman would permit a question on that particular point. Has the hon. gentleman considered the rule about reversing a decision taken in the house in the same session?

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, it is because there has been a decision in this session that the committee sit for only six weeks that I think an amendment to revive the committee is not in order unless it takes cognizance of that fact; and I suggest it would be taking cognizance of that fact if it sought to amend that time limit. The reason I have said these things is that I think whatever ruling Your Honour makes on the point of order raised by the President of the Privy Council, Your Honour should keep open the question as to whether or not some amendment to refer back might be in order. I say that because even if—and I think there is a case for it—it can be argued that there is a right to refer back, I have questions about this particular amendment. I have already alluded to one. I refer to the fact that the proposal to revive the committee, if this is going to be done, should deal with the question of its time limit. But the other point that worries me about this amendment is that it deals with the question of a plebiscite. I point out, sir, that there is already before the house a government order, No. 44(A), in connection with which there is an amendment and a subamendment dealing with the question of a plebiscite. I know that hon. members may argue that order 44(A) may never again be called; but the fact of the matter is that at the moment it is on the order paper, is therefore before the house, and it is at least theoretically possible for the present motion to be defeated and for the house to be asked to consider again the other question.

Therefore I ask Your Honour to look at that point. Since the house has already voted on an amendment in the name of the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) with respect to a plebiscite on the flag issue, and since this issue is still on the order paper, is it in order for the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith) under another guise to move what is in effect the same question, namely that of a plebiscite? I think there is some real question as to the propriety of this amendment on that ground. But having said that, I wanted to make the other remarks that I did when I first rose to my feet because if Your Honour chooses to rule this amendment out of order, I hope Your Honour will keep open the possibility of the right of the house to refer the question back to the committee, if it so wishes, for a specific period of time.

As I have said, I for one would like to see the house dispose of this question just as quickly as possible. I think the members of the committee have done a good job and we should not call them back again; but I think we should be careful about the procedural proprieties on a matter of this kind.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question? Would not the adoption of the committee's report wipe out anything else that was on the order paper in connection with this flag issue?

Mr. Knowles: It would not wipe it out, but it would supersede it, and in all probability order No. 44(A) would not then be called by the government. But the hon. member is assuming that the committee's report will be adopted. Until such time as the house has made a decision, both order 44(A) and the motion of the hon. member for Humber-St. George's (Mr. Batten) are before us.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this has been a rather unusual day. We started by asking the government, in accordance with the usual practice, whether or not the motion before the house could be held in abeyance until after questions had been asked. That request was refused by the government.

Canadian Flag

Some hon. Members: By the rules.

Mr. Diefenbaker: By the Prime Minister himself, who brushed it aside and thereby denied to parliament the right—

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have the floor now. I know that having been out west—

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A point of order is being raised.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the right hon. gentleman is entirely misrepresenting what I have said.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, no.

Mr. Pearson: I did not ask that the rules be brushed aside. I asked that the rules be observed during today, and suggested we would then go on and see what happened.

Mr. Lambert: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Prime Minister did his part to stifle questions because he was afraid of some questions which would be asked, and let that be clear. He was out west all last week when he should have been in this house.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He was out west speaking to the discoloured canines of western Canada, the unclean canines mentioned on election night. Now, having done that, an objection is immediately raised to this amendment. The government do not want anything in the nature of amendments. General objection is taken to an amendment to a motion to confirm a report given by a committee. This is another means to stifle parliament and to strangle parliament.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Hon. members may laugh. They laughed in 1956 when hon. gentlemen opposite did a similar thing and the people did not forget. They laughed when last week evidence was brought out in this house which the Prime Minister should have been here to answer. They ridiculed us. I have nothing more to say as to the consequences, but I know what they will be.

Hon. members opposite now want to prevent an amendment being moved. Let me place before you, Mr. Speaker, examples of what has happened in this connection in the past. A special committee of parliament was set up in 1926 for the purpose of looking into a certain alleged wrongdoing on the part of a minister of the crown, Hon. George Boivin, and also certain administrative officials. A motion was made to confirm the report of the special committee which was set up. This matter is referred to in the *Journals* of the House of Commons for 1926. When the matter came before the house the motion moved by Mr. Mercier (St. Henri) was that the third and final report of the special committee appointed to investigate the administration of the department of customs and excise be concurred in. Then Mr. Stevens moved an amendment to the motion in the following terms:

> That the report be not now adopted, but that it be referred back to the special committee with instructions to add thereto as sub-clauses to paragraph six:—

And so as to make the record clear I will read the amendment—

> The evidence further discloses that ministerial action has been influenced by the improper pressure of political associates and friends of the minister, or acting minister administering the department, resulting in the suspension and in some instances the abandonment of prosecutions against those charged with violation of the statutes, and in the loss of revenue to the country. Moreover successful appeals have been made to the minister and acting minister administering the department to improperly interfere with the course of justice between the conviction of the offenders and the execution of judgment thereon.

That was after conviction. There was no question of interference by ministers in 1926 or prior thereto. In those days there were only a couple of executive assistants. I think there were one or two parliamentary assistants at the time; in any event there were in 1919.

> The Prime Minister and the government had knowledge for some considerable time of the rapid degeneration of the department of customs and excise, and their failure to take prompt and effective remedial action is wholly indefensible. The conduct of the present minister of the department, the Honourable George H. Boivin, in the case of Moses Aziz is utterly unjustifiable.
>
> Your committee deplores the practice, as revealed by the evidence, of certain men influential in public life to direct appeals to the minister to relax and depart from the proper administration of his department for reasons of political expediency.

If there is any likeness between this situation and subsequent events it is merely coincidental that I am raising this particular matter.

> Your committee is of the opinion that this practice is detrimental to the best interests of the country and prejudicial to the administration of the department.

Then there is added the following paragraph, which is also included in the amendment moved today by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith):

And that the committee for such purpose be revived.

Now that amendment, Mr. Speaker, to which I have referred is to all intents and purposes the same as the one now presented and put before Your Honour.

Then Mr. Woodsworth, the leader of the labour party at that time, seconded by Mr. Heaps, moved in amendment to that amendment the following:

That all the words after the word "instructions" in the third line of the amendment be struck out and the following substituted therefor:—

"1. To add to clause 4 the following: Since the enquiry indicates that the smuggling evils are so extensive and their ramifications so far reaching that only a portion of the illegal practices have been brought to light, your committee recommends the appointment of a judicial commission with full powers to continue and complete investigating the administration of the department of customs and excise and to prosecute all offenders.

2. That the following be added to clause 6: Your committee deplores the common practice as revealed by the evidence, of members of parliament and others of appealing to the minister to relax the regulations of the department for personal advantage or political expediency.

Then there were added two further paragraphs in the subamendment, and then again the words:

And that the committee for such purposes be revived.

The *Journals*, at page 465, continues:

Mr. Meighen—

—who was then leader of the opposition—

—raised the point that the amendment to the amendment was out of order on the ground that it was foreign to the subject matter of the main amendment.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as appears at page 468, the Speaker ruled on the matter. I do not want to read it all but one has to read a portion of it because many of the matters raised could almost be contemporaneous in some respects. The Speaker said:

On Mr. Mercier's motion for concurrence in the final report of the special committee appointed to investigate the customs and excise department, Mr. Stevens moved that said report be referred back—

And so on.

To this amendment a subamendment is moved proposing—

And again I will not reread it.

A point of order was raised by the Right Honourable Mr. Meighen on the ground that an amendment to an amendment must deal with nothing but the subject matter of the amendment. It was also argued that the adoption of the subamendment would prevent the house from pronouncing on the proposal contained in the amendment.

And finally the Speaker decided:

As long as Mr. Stevens has asserted his right to express his views by making his amendment he suffers no prejudice, if Mr. Woodsworth using the same right submits a subamendment asking the house to accept an alternative proposition.

Then again, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to refer to the matters raised at pages 472 and 473, the votes on which are to be found at pages 475 and 476. Then there was an appeal from the Speaker's ruling as reported at page 477, continuing through to page 481.

Sir, I now address myself to the argument advanced by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), or at least his reference to this subject, arising out of something which was said before I came into the house by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. McIlraith), if I understood him correctly, to the effect that because item No. 44(A) is still on the order paper an opportunity may yet be available to Her Majesty's loyal opposition to deal with the question of a plebiscite. I should like to read that particular motion, which is as follows:

That the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to establish officially as the flag of Canada a flag embodying the emblem proclaimed by His Majesty King George V on November 21, 1921—three maple leaves conjoined on one stem—in the colours red and white then designated for Canada, the red leaves occupying a field of white between vertical sections of blue on the edges of the flag; and on the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker, and on the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Churchill.

The suggestion is made that this will stay on the order paper and we may come back to it, but let me make this very clear. During our meetings of the leaders of the parties I asked the Prime Minister whether or not this particular motion would be gone ahead with, and I said that we were prepared without discussion at all to have a vote on this subamendment which set out in detail the nature of the formula for a plebiscite, and on my amendment which simply asked for the plebiscite. I said if the Prime Minister would agree to that we would be prepared to let him withdraw items Nos. 44(A) and 44(B).

We believed that the people had a right to a determination, through the operation of parliament, as to the trust to be placed in those gentlemen on the opposite side in this connection. The Prime Minister's answer was that he would not agree to the proposal unless we were willing to consent to a limitation on the time of debate.

That being so I simply ask this question, Mr. Speaker, that you consider the fact that this motion No. 44(A) will not be brought back in view of the fact the Prime Minister made it very clear that he was not agreeable to our suggestion.

I could immediately see the difficulty that the government was in, having stood for the three maple leaves through thick and thin and finally backing out, because we would not have the opportunity of letting the Canadian people know how parliament would vote on a plebiscite. I may say that according to a major poll taken in this country, 60 per cent of the people in Canada are in favour of that procedure. Are we to be denied the right to move an amendment asking for a plebiscite because the government refuses to go ahead with the motion they originally moved? Surely this house is not going to be throttled in that way.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: They may laugh over there, but they are denying us the right to give the Canadian people an opportunity of knowing how they would vote on the question of a plebiscite. They interrupt, they scoff and they ridicule parliament; but you, sir, are the protector of the rights of parliament.

An hon. Member: You never gave us the chance to make any decision.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Who is that that speaketh without knowledge?

Mr. Speaker, you are the protector of the rights of parliament and I ask you to recognize that fact and not deny the opposition the right to move an amendment because there is on the order paper a motion that will never be touched upon by the government. The government would deprive parliament of the right to speak and the right of those who do not agree with the majority to have their cases decided in parliament by a vote of parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to read and consider carefully what happened in 1926 in the month of June as recorded in *Hansard*. If you do I have no doubt as to the decision you will make. In other words, I ask you to decide that the amendment is in order, and suggest that to decide otherwise would be placing handcuffs on the members of parliament, preventing them from carrying out their responsibilities. This would also place muzzles on members of parliament.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Those on the other side would like to see that done.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Byrne: Order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, just look at the hon. member for West Kootenay; he has brains to burn, yet he is the one who is laughing over there.

An hon. Member: East Kootenay.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am sorry, I meant the hon. member for Kootenay East.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I wish the Leader of the Opposition would not confuse me with the hon. member for Kootenay East.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. gentleman, for whom I have tremendous respect, that there is no possibility of anyone coming to the conclusion that he and the other member would ever have similar views on anything dependant upon common sense.

I am asking you, sir, on the basis of the record of 1926, and the similarity is very apparent, to maintain the right of the opposition to move this amendment. Otherwise motions Nos. 44 (A) and 44 (B) on the order paper being long since both deceased, we should be deprived of our rights, because the government chose to swallow itself and change its viewpoint after having introduced those two resolutions.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in view of the ground covered by the right hon. gentleman in respect of this request for a procedural ruling, I feel I should say a few words.

What we have done is ask you whether the amendment moved to this matter is or is not in order. I suggest it is important that we have a ruling on this matter because it is an important procedural matter, and I believe unprecendented. Having taken that stand we will cheerfully abide by your ruling, whatever it may be.

We have heard during the last 20 or 25 minutes the right hon. gentleman suggest that we are handcuffing the house and muzzling hon. members by not allowing the house to vote on an amendment dealing with a plebiscite. He has suggested that we are throttling the house. We had a resolution before the house, to which an amendment was moved dealing with a plebiscite, and about which we had 165 speeches made, most of them by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side. We are now asked to consider that these are the same people who are throttled and muzzled. Those speeches were made by members on the opposite side to prevent a vote. We witnessed

23 days of talking about the plebiscite, yet in respect of that procedure advanced by the government—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why didn't you go ahead with the resolution?

Mr. Pearson: —and after 23 days the right hon. gentleman insisted, and I do not quarrel with his insistence, that the matter go to a committee for six weeks. This was a six weeks committee, Mr. Speaker. The six weeks are over and the committee has reported. We ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether or not an amendment sending this matter back to this six weeks committee is in order. That is the question, Mr. Speaker, and we would be very grateful to have your ruling on it. If your ruling is in favour of the amendment, then we will go on with the debate on the committee report and perhaps my right hon. friend will at last feel unmuzzled.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I find it very interesting that the Prime Minister did not take any stand on behalf of the rights of parliament in his intervention just now.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, the question before you is whether or not the amendment is in order.

An hon. Member: The same old bunch.

Mr. Churchill: I think it has already been clearly established that it is in order, that a special committee may be revived, as the amendment suggests in the closing words, and that to that special committee as to any other committee of the house instructions may be given letting the committee know what the house wishes. It is a long established practice.

The Leader of the Opposition has cited to you, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most famous case in Canadian history involving the report of a special committee which was debated in the house and to which an amendment was moved for reference back to that committee. I do not see how anyone can go beyond that case in any decision whether or not, first, a special committee may be revived and, second, whether or not instructions may be given to that committee to do something other than it has done.

As you are well aware, sir, there are appropriate references in the books of rules, Beauchesne, Bourinot and May, and if you wish me to do so I can give you the necessary page references. The three books I have mentioned all deal with the case of a special committee, or a select committee as it is called in England, and the power of the House of Commons to refer committee reports back to committees with instructions to sit again, and reach some other conclusion, either to add to their report or to strike out something from their report and substitute something else. That is what we are suggesting in the amendment now before you.

The problem raised by the government side with regard to the committee being limited as to its time of consideration does not seem to me to be relevant at all under the circumstances. The house as a whole overrides the work of any committee, and what the house has the opportunity of determining according to our amendment is whether the committee might not take other action than the action it has recommended. So it seems to me that the period of sitting of the committee is absolutely irrelevant to the question under consideration.

The other points raised have already been dealt with. The government house leader raised a point about the final report of the committee but it has been indicated already that we are now dealing with the sixth report and not the final report. Finally, I do not see how we can go beyond the decision reached in 1926 in one of the most famous cases in our history dealing with a special committee and instructions given by the house to that committee to take other action.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, there is one point that I believe has not been mentioned which might be mentioned very briefly and which differentiates this situation from what happened in 1926. As Your Honour knows and as was mentioned by the chairman of the committee, I believe, when he moved concurrence in the report, the first vote taken by the committee was on the question of a national plebiscite. The committee has discussed the matter of a national plebiscite and has decided it by voting it down nine to five. This amendment now seeks to have this six weeks committee revived to reconsider the matter of a national plebiscite on which the committee has already taken a decision and voted it down.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Three or four members from the official opposition have spoken and I think it is my duty now to call upon the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Marcoux (Quebec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I am not an expert in parliamentary procedure, but it seems to me that after using all the means at its disposal

by the rules, the official opposition is now trying to use one that is forbidden.

When there is talk of reviving a committee to send back a report to it, that is insinuating that the committee still exists and that it can be asked to resume its work. The special flag committee, however, even when it was set up, was meant to disappear six weeks later, so that even parliament is powerless to bring it back to life.

Of course, if the committee report is adopted and then a motion setting up a new flag committee is also adopted, that could be done, but it is impossible to ask that committee to reconsider its report because it has ceased to exist. At the end of the session, every special or standing committee of the house immediately ceases to exist. Furthermore, even at the following session, parliament cannot revive them. The only possible way to extend the existence of a committee would be to make a motion, before it ceases its activities, asking for its continuation but not for its revival after it has ceased to exist.

In my opinion, the house cannot now revive that committee. After the report has been considered and voted upon, I think the house could then, if it so desired, make a motion to set up another committee, for it can do anything it wishes. But the very motion setting up this committee provides for a definite period. Therefore, the matter cannot be reconsidered.

[*Text*]

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, may I refer to one point raised by the Prime Minister. He said that the committee had dealt with the question of a plebiscite but I should like to refer to Bourinot, fourth edition, page 479, where there is the following:

> A report may be referred back to a committee for further consideration, or with instructions giving them power to amend the same in any respect. In this way a committee may regularly reconsider and even reverse a decision it has previously arrived at.

Mr. Terry Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I was about to make the same point just made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. However, I think I should point out to the Prime Minister, who in his last intervention apparently thought he had a telling argument, that if he had looked at the report of the committee he would have found that at one point the committee decided unanimously there should only be one flag and then later returned to the matter, opened it up again and reversed that decision. Therefore it is certainly obvious that the committee is not going to be embarrassed at all by having something referred back by the house. I suggest that the house has the right to refer something back to the committee to be reopened while the committee itself does not have that same right.

I did want to mention the time limit. The remarks of the Prime Minister would seem to indicate that a committee of the house was established to sit for a six weeks period. I thought that the committee had been set up to consider the flag resolutions and to bring in a recommendation to the house and that the question of time was incidental, although there was supposed to be some urgency. I think the main point perhaps was to satisfy the Prime Minister's vanity by having a flag before Christmas. But certainly the question as to time limit was regulatory only, and not of the essence. I think the Prime Minister would want to correct the impression he gave the house just now that in setting up the committee its main function was to sit for six weeks.

With reference to the point raised by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) about reversing a decision of the house already made, when we talk about the time limit I suggest that that time limit served its purpose, that the committee obeyed the time limit set out originally and that, as the President of the Privy Council (Mr. McIlraith) says, the committee is subject to the will of the house. So it is open to the house to give the committee additional instructions and the question of additional time must be inherent in them.

This is not a case of reversing a time limit already given. That time limit has already had its effect and therefore I suggest that the amendment is in order.

Mr. Speaker: I am very appreciative of the information and procedural advice given this afternoon. Obviously the question is a very difficult one to decide, and obviously I need time to consider very carefully all the arguments advanced and to refresh my mind vis-à-vis them and other precedents which have not been cited this afternoon. Needless to say, I have been doing a little homework on the point, but I would request hon. members to let me consider very carefully the arguments presented this afternoon. I suggest that in the meantime the debate could be carried on without prejudice to the rights of hon. members. I shall do my very best to come to a carefully considered and, I hope,

proper decision in as short a time as possible, —I would hope by eight o'clock, if that is humanly possible.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would it not be better to have over night on this? Your Honour may have done a great deal of work on the subject but I do not think anyone would be harmed if you waited until tomorrow.

Mr. Pearson: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, all hon. members will hope you take all the time you need. If you feel you are in a position to make a decision at eight o'clock, perhaps that would be a good time to do it; but if you need more time I do not think any purpose would be lost because in one sentence the report does mention a plebiscite, and the debate can take place irrespective of your particular decision on this matter.

Mr. Speaker: I wish to thank hon. members and assure them I will take as much time as is necessary to arrive at a proper decision.

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to second the recommendation of the committee and the motion for concurrence in the committee's report. In his opening remarks the chairman of the committee mentioned that throughout its proceedings he had tried to preserve the impartiality he has exhibited in the house. I know I can speak for all members of the committee when I say that he preserved this tradition of impartiality from the beginning to the end, and all of us were most impressed with the way he conducted the proceedings in the committee.

I would like to say just one word about the suggestion of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith). I came to know the hon. member very well during the course of our hearings, and I cannot say how disappointed I am in the tenor of his remarks. All of us on the committee held very strong views, and I thought that at the end of our deliberations we had agreed to disagree, if this had to be the case, but that in so doing we would not impute any sinister motives to any other member of the committee. I felt that in his remarks he was imputing motives, and I felt very sad to hear the tenor of the speech which he gave us this afternoon.

After the long and detailed debate that took place previously there really is not too much new that can be said in connection with the flag question, but I think there are one or two points which ought to be made on behalf of the committee's report.

First of all I think the design itself is one which conforms in every way to the proper traditions of heraldry and flag making. Red and white are the national colours of Canada. Many of us felt that the blue being mixed into the previous designs, or into some of them, was improper; but in this case—

Mr. Churchill: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Scott: Yes.

Mr. Churchill: What is your authority for saying red and white are the national colours for Canada?

Mr. Scott: My authority is the evidence given to the committee by various expert witnesses who testified and informed us that the national colours of Canada are red and white and were assigned to us in 1921.

Mr. Churchill: Can you give me the exact words in the proclamation of 1921 that declare red and white to be the national colours? I suggest you cannot.

Mr. Scott: I am sorry I do not have the actual information here but all of us on the committee did follow the evidence of our expert witnesses most carefully and, subject to being corrected, I at least am satisfied, and I think so are most of the members, that these are the national colours of our country and as such they, and they alone, ought to appear on our national flag.

I really did not feel the inclusion of the maple leaf design was very difficult to arrive at, and in this connection I point out the committee had before it literally thousands of designs from Canadians from coast to coast. I believe I can safely say that a ratio of five to one contained the maple leaf and that, therefore, in the minds of a good many Canadians there is absolutely no question of what constitutes the symbol of Canada, that the symbol is the maple leaf, and as such it is included in the recommended design.

I am aware that some members of the committee felt very strongly that a flag ought to contain the union jack and the fleur-de-lis. That is a view we listened to with the greatest of respect and we explored every possible argument pro and con. I respect that view, but in the end most of us came to the conclusion that by putting emblems such as that on our national flag we would be merely giving ourselves a perpetual reminder of the things that divide us, and that it would be preferable to have a distinctive flag that says just one

thing, Canada—not French Canada, not English Canada, not ethnic Canada, but Canada.

As I have said, I respect the views of those others; I only regret that I do not share them.

The main thing about the whole question is that it must be decided. Ever since the debate took place in the house I am sure many hon. members have visited their constituencies and have had an opportunity to get around to various parts of the country. Without exception I think almost everyone with whom I have spoken, no matter what their view, whether they wished the red ensign or a new flag, with unanimous voice said that they hoped at least parliament would make a decision.

The one thing which it seems to me is significant about the committee report, and which lends great weight to its recommendation, is that if anything can be said it is that this is a parliamentary flag. This is not the flag of any particular party. It is not the flag of any particular individual. It is the best consensus that we were able to get from the members of all the parties represented on the committee. I know it was not unanimous, and all of us regret that. But as I said in the beginning, we respected each other's views and we agreed that if necessary we would disagree in good faith. I think it is fair to say, however, that this design does command support among all parties in the house. I realize a good many members of the official opposition are perhaps not prepared to support it. But there is support for this design within their party, as there is in all quarters of the house. If anything, this flag is the flag chosen by the parliament of Canada and by nobody else.

I could go on at great length but I do not think it is important that I do so. Many of us feel the whole matter of the flag has detracted from this present parliament. If we had been able to spend as much time and energy discussing other matters such as automation, education and important problems of this nature, the present parliament might have been more distinguished in its accomplishments. At the same time we realize that these events are not within our control. The Prime Minister chose to have a decision reached on the subject at this time. Nobody is quarrelling with his prerogative. Many of us thought it was not an opportune time to raise this question, but at least the Prime Minister had the courage to deal with a subject which has been a most contentious one in Canada for very many years.

I conclude by repeating that this recommendation is the result of a serious study by all the members of the committee. We tried to hear and take account of the views expressed by everybody. It is unfortunate that we could not achieve unanimity but I think the design recommended is a proper one and a fair one, and I hope that in time it will win the allegiance of the Canadian people.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, in joining this debate today I wish to express my appreciation for the confidence my colleagues placed with me when they chose me to represent them on this committee.

I was all the more happy because I realized the importance of the work this committee would be called upon to perform, taking into consideration all the difficulties it would have to face.

If we recall the numerous discussions which occurred and the various opinions which were expressed during this debate which preceded the creation of that committee, we know that it was not without apprehension that the 15 members gathered to study this matter and endeavoured to reach a solution in order to present unanimously, if at all possible, a design to the house.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the committee dedicated themselves to this task for more than six weeks and some 45 meetings averaging two hours each.

For my part I think I went through a wonderful human experience, because it is certainly a great experience, a difficult but most rewarding one, for 15 men to be confined to a room, sitting in camera for such a long time to discuss but one subject.

What made for an interesting discussion was the fact that each member of the committee expressed his views in all candour. And here I should like to express my appreciation to each and every one of them for the manner in which they acted. I feel it is most unfortunate that we could not reach the complete agreement which would have resulted in a unanimous report, but I do not believe that any member acted in bad faith in not making this possible.

They all expressed their views verbally or by their vote. They were free to do so, since it was their duty, and I respect everyone's opinion.

Mr. Speaker, we are called upon today to approve a report submitted by the committee.

I should like, however, to remind the house that when this debate opened last June

the members of our party stated their position quite clearly, namely that every one of us was free to decide, according to his conscience, the position he intended to take in this connection.

Today, this report must be concurred in. I must say that this position still holds and that all our members are still free to approve or reject the committee's report.

However, may I assure the house that the committee's report will have a more than substantial support from the members of our party; I believe that the work of the committee deserves our appreciation inasmuch as the report which has been tabled is well thought out, is the result of work which, in my opinion, could not have been accomplished better.

Since the beginning of the debate today, we have heard various points of view expressed and I should like to comment on them a little.

I do not think that at this point we stand to gain anything whatsoever by referring this matter again to the committee. After six weeks of work the committee has made its decision known and I cannot imagine that by taking up the matter again it can in any way arrive at another decision.

The decision arrived at is the best we can reach under the circumstances. Personally, I cannot accept to return to this committee to reconsider something which I have already studied thoroughly and on which I have already committed myself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Text*]

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): Now, if I may, I should like to say a few words to my friends in the Conservative party. I should like, also, to make a sincere appeal to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker). Although I have been in this house for only two and a half years I can remember many occasions on which the right hon. gentleman correctly and strongly stated that, provided sufficient time is allocated for members to express their views on a subject, good democratic government must be assured by permitting the voice of the majority in the house to decide. This is my interpretation of words used by the right hon. gentleman on many occasions.

In my own opinion—and I think this is also the opinion of the majority of Canadians—this house has been afforded plenty of opportunity in the past to discuss this issue and it is time for us to decide by voting on this question. I recognize that all hon. members have the right to express their views one way or another, but I do not think Canadians will condemn them in any way if they put an end to this debate and vote according to their consciences. If members find themselves opposed to the design put forward I think it is their duty to vote against it. But I do not think they have the right to prevent the majority of the members of this house from deciding. It is time we brought this debate to an end and allowed the majority of members to declare their position on the question by their votes. The people of this country have entrusted us with responsibility and we should discharge our responsibility by voting upon this subject. If we are wrong, I am quite sure that Canadians will judge us in the next election. Those who have not expressed the wish of their constituents will be defeated and others will take their places.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time for us Canadians to adopt a distinctive flag. If you consider the international situation today, which is getting more and more troubled, it becomes increasingly necessary for Canada to fully establish its identity and to let people see clearly that it is independent from any other nation. I think that by deciding today to give ourselves a distinctive Canadian flag, which will have nothing in common with the emblems of our mother country or the other countries which dominated us in the past, we are taking a step which the whole population has long awaited.

I am sure that in a few years those who will come after us will be grateful to us for making that decision which is a very difficult one, I will admit, and which might bring criticism to several of us, but we are here to face such criticism and to assume our responsibilities.

If we are in this house it is because we have been sent here to make decisions. Today, we have the opportunity to make a decision which, above any other, is of great significance. In my opinion, this decision should be made by a vote according to our conscience so that in Canada, at the beginning of 1965, we could fly a flag which would be a Canadian flag, in short, the flag of the whole Canadian people.

There have been criticisms on the choice of the design. If someone in Canada could suggest to us a symbol more representative

of Canada than the maple leaf, I would ask him to rise and suggest it. Up to now we have been unable to find one more representative of Canada. The maple leaf is typical of Canada. Even if that maple leaf cannot be found in every little part of Canada, it must be agreed that, at the present time, this symbol is still the most popular in Canada and does not appear on the flag of any other country.

In my opinion we must all unite in a gesture of Canadian solidarity in an effort to build a strong and united country. Let us prove to all our Canadian citizens that when important matters are at stake we must set aside some particular and partisan interests for the general interest of the country. I believe that today we have the opportunity of doing so.

Finally, I ask all members of the house to set aside their petty grievances, their petty private interests in order to grant our country a truly distinctive flag. I only wish that this flag should receive the unanimous approval of the members of the house.

[*Text*]

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to take part in this debate. This is not the first time I have spoken on the matter of a Canadian flag. On May 28, 1963, I took the opportunity to speak on the Canadian flag, the red ensign. I spoke at that time with some emotion because I listed all the matters that I thought should be considered when dealing with the Canadian flag. I said the red ensign was the first free flag I had lived under, and I hoped my family would continue to enjoy living under this free flag. The second time I spoke on the question of a Canadian flag was during this debate.

Mr. Speaker, it was an honour for me to be a member of the flag committee. Reference was made to the fact that the chairman of our committee handled the committee's business very effectively, and I give him full credit for that. But at the same time I must say it was a strange committee. It was a committee in camera, but if any one of our members missed something the day before, he could read it next morning in the newspaper. I went into this committee as a red ensign man. I still respect the red ensign as a Canadian flag. However, at the same time I went into the committee with the understanding and conviction that if the committee could decide on a flag that was acceptable to all people in Canada, I was ready for a compromise. But I was not ready for a compromise between the three maple leaf flag and the one maple leaf flag; I was ready for a compromise which would incorporate the past history of Canada, as set out in the flag I now hold in my hand, incorporating the union jack and the fleur-de-lis.

When I look at the United States flag I see that it is a flag which does justice to their past history; the 13 stripes on that flag represent the 13 colonies that were instrumental in bringing about the United States. I thought a compromise flag should do justice to our past, too. What is wrong with having a flag with the union jack in it? What is wrong with having a fleur-de-lis also in that flag? Some members of the committee and others said this had no connection with France; but the fleur-de-lis is the Quebec flag.

An hon. Member: So what?

Mr. Rapp: Mr. Speaker, somebody said, "So what?" What right have we to pass up our history? Not very long ago three students from the University of Ottawa came here to discuss this matter with me; they wanted to know if I, as a member of the flag committee, could give them some information on it. When I showed them this compromise flag they said, "Why do not the people of Canada better understand what a compromise flag means?" It is exactly the same as the one maple leaf flag approved by the committee, except that it incorporates these two symbols, the union jack and the fleur-de-lis. I am sure if the people of the country were given the chance to vote on these flags by way of a plebiscite—that is, the flag approved by the committee, the red ensign and the compromise flag—we could then say proudly that the people had made their choice.

What right, Mr. Speaker, has this government to make the decision? It is not a government elected with an over-all majority. They have no mandate to bring in such legislation. This government was appointed by the governor general and that is the reason they are in power. Therefore, for that reason more than anything else I think the people of Canada should be given the right and the privilege to decide the flag issue. Only 71 or 72 per cent of the committee voted in favour of the recommended flag, about 28 per cent of the committee members opposing it. Most of them opposed it because it was not a compromise flag.

I should also like to point out that the motion for a plebiscite was voted down nine to five. The second motion, which was for the adoption of only ONE national flag, was carried 14 to 0. However, after two or three weeks of debate we discovered there was going to be a second flag. I brought this matter to the attention of the chairman of the committee and to the attention of every other member of the committee, because all of our discussions from the first day onward were based on the understanding that there would be only one national flag. Then to our surprise in the last week again the question came up: What about a second flag? As a minority group in the committee we had no choice. We abstained from voting because all during the committee proceedings we had understood we were only dealing with one national flag.

The second point I should like to raise at this time concerns some of our discussions. We had heraldry experts in attendance who gave us some very valuable information. We thought the maple leaf design was good because it had the maple leaf as our national emblem; therefore the maple leaf on a white square was adopted because it was a Canadian symbol. Since the union jack and the fleur-de-lis were not in the corner of this flag it meant they were nothing more than emblems.

After my second speech in the flag debate I received thousands of letters from my constituents—and I mean thousands—all of them asking me to support the red ensign. After the first vote was taken in the special committee and the Canadian red ensign was voted down ten to four, it was apparent to many people in Canada that there should be a compromise flag. It was also apparent that the people would be willing to accept it. Therefore, why do the people not get the chance to vote on the proposed flag by way of a plebiscite? In such event justice would be done to everybody. Instead of splitting the people and disuniting them on the flag question the correct thing to do is to hold a plebiscite and the people will be pleased to accept the result. This plebiscite could be held at the time of the next election; it does not require special action.

Again I return to the proceedings of the committee. Thousands of flags were presented for the consideration of the committee. Finally we arrived at the point where we had the original three maple leaf flag with the blue bars at the end, then the flag with a maple leaf on a white square with two red bars at the end, and then the same flag with the other two symbols to which I have referred. They were the last three flags on which the committee voted. By way of the elimination process, which I thought was a very good way, we arrived at a final design. To start with we eliminated by a show of hands various choices until there were four or five flags left in each group. One group represented flags with three maple leaves, some with blue bars and some with no bars. The second group consisted of one maple leaf designs. The third group comprised flags of compromise design. One was a red ensign with the fleur-de-lis superimposed on it. Another had a maple leaf in the centre, another had it on the side, and there was also the fleur-de-lis with the red ensign superimposed on it.

This matter, Mr. Speaker, is of great importance to the people of Canada today. We have been debating the flag issue for some time and the people want an answer. They know parliament is not able to come to a decision which would be adopted by the people of Canada, so for that reason I urge the house to give serious consideration to holding a plebiscite. Thousands of our people have fought in two wars. Many of the people who came to this country looked upon the Canadian flag as the flag under which freedom is the order of the day, under which there is no persecution and there is freedom of speech, freedom to speak one's own language, although the law decrees there are only two official languages, English and French. If you were to ask many of these people of ethnic origin what the Canadian flag means to them, they would point out that one reason so many of them came to Canada and are still coming to Canada is because the Canadian flag stands for democratic freedom. Indeed if we dispose of or do away with the Canadian flag, generations will pass before people will accept another flag as the flag of Canada. Although the committee did not come to a unanimous decision, I had the impression that the members of the committee commenced their meetings with the idea of deciding on a Canadian flag. As the days passed we in this group found ourselves isolated, not because we were the members who stood for the red ensign, but because we were the members who wanted a compromise embodying the symbols of the founding races. I still feel the committee might have decided to recommend the adoption of a compromise flag. Had we done so, I am sure we might have avoided dividing the nation, as it is now divided as the result of doing away

with the red ensign, while at the same time using some of the familiar symbols on a flag as recommended to the committee.

Mr. John R. Matheson (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, as the moment for a final decision on a national flag for Canada draws near we are sensible of the trust imposed on every member of parliament to act wisely for all Canadians alive and unborn. If ever there was a time when we should discipline our tongues and elevate ourselves to the dignity of sane and disinterested patriots, this is it. Each of us in this chamber I know loves Canada with a poignancy that is too real to express—our "quiet lakes reflecting the glory of the sky and the shadows of the upland forest; the wide firmament flooded with crimson sunset; the long haggard hills formless and low; the desolate mountains"—places like Heart's Delight, Val d'Or, Red Deer, Nakusp. What flag is worthy of such a land?

Speaking for myself I have come out of the flag committee, after its six weeks sitting with nothing but respect and, I must say, affection and regard for every other member of that committee. I stand earnestly in support of the recommendation of this committee that the national flag of Canada be a red flag of the proportions two by length and one by width, containing in its centre a white square, the width of the flag, bearing a single red maple or, in heraldic terms, described as gules on a Canadian pale argent a maple leaf of the first.

I would remind members of this house that this is the third time a flag committee has been designated in the Commons of Canada. If members care to refer to *Hansard* of June 17, 1925, page 4364, they will find that a question was raised by Mr. T. Church in which he asked Right Hon. Mackenzie King who was asking for such a Canadian flag and for such a change, and why. The prime minister reported that he had set up an advisory committee consisting of G. J. Desbarats, Esq., C.M.G., deputy minister of national defence; Thomas Mulvey, Esq., B.A., K.C., under secretary of state; A. G. Doughty, Esq., C.M.G., LL.D., dominion archivist, Commodore Walter Hose, C.B.E., A.D.C., director of the naval service; Major General H.A. Panet, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., adjutant general, and Group Captain J. S. Scott, M.C., A.F.C., A.D.C., acting director of the Royal Canadian Air Force.

It is I think to be deplored that as a result of very strong objection taken in respect of the composition of that committee, notwithstanding the fact that two of them were on the original arms committee appointed by Sir Robert Borden, it was dissolved without action taken.

You will then recall, Mr. Speaker, that on November 6, 1945, as reported in *Hansard*, the prime minister appointed a committee to consider and report upon a suitable design. So in fact when the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) on September 10, 1964 reported to the house the establishment of a special committee on the subject of a Canadian flag, this was the third time this sovereign nation had made an attempt to establish a banner denoting its sovereignty.

This is a subject not of recent date or of recent concern to Canadians, but is something that goes back a long while. I have before me an article written by John S. Ewart, K.C., in 1907 which appeared in a Canadian magazine. I should like to read two brief extracts from this article. Mr. Ewart said:

> A flag should denote correctly the sovereignty which it represents.

The second extract is:

> Canada's self-respect requires that her acknowledged right of independent self-government, her accession to national rank, and her admission to a footing of equality with the United Kingdom itself, should not only be amply recognized at imperial conferences, but should be evidenced by her flag—by the flag of the Dominion of Canada.

Weeks ago, sir, it was drawn to my attention as a result of our trip to the archives, that the "Royal Reader" of Nova Scotia, a pleasant book for junior scholars, published by the T. Eaton Company Limited of Toronto, and Winnipeg, for 11 cents, portrayed a flag flying over a maple tree with these words: "The union jack our emblem dear guards our maple tree." What we seek now is a change in emphasis. The revered old union jack remains undifferenced and unaltered and will remain as a precious kindly memory of our inheritance, while this sovereign nation now flies its own device and colours in the position of precedence and honour. In October, 1923, in Montreal, David Lloyd George spoke of Canada's contribution in the first world war in these terms: "The maple leaf was embroidered forever on the silken folds of the banner of human history." It is about time, sir, that we recognized this fact at home.

One of the books we discovered at the archives was a little book entitled "The Story of the Union Jack", written by Barlow Cumberland, and in it is "A plea for the maple leaf". Incidentally this article was written in 1897 and Mr. Cumberland stated:

Flags are signals to be used for conveying information to persons at a distance; their details should therefore, be simple in form and be displayed in simple colours.

The maple tree is found in luxuriance in every province of the dominion.

He then stated as we have already heard during our earlier flag debate, that this maple leaf was an emblem of the festival of St. Jean Baptiste, in French Canada, in 1836. He pointed out that the maple leaf was on the colours of the Royal Canadians, the 100th regiment, raised in Canada in 1865, and that it is still worn as the regimental badge of their successors, the Royal Leinster regiment. It is on the northwest medal of 1885, and on the uniform and accoutrement of the Canadian infantry and of the Northwest Mounted Police.

Mr. Cumberland also points out that it has revelled in poetry and prose; is the theme of the songs of our children, and that the stirring strains of "The Maple Leaf" form an accompaniment to our British national anthem.

Everywhere throughout the world the maple leaf has won recognition as the emblem of Canadians, and may well be displayed upon their flag. So, at any rate says Mr. Cumberland. This story was written many years before Canada achieved the dignity of arms.

The committee has recommended to parliament a flag of classic simplicity, consisting only of national colours. I must say that I agree with every word I heard the hon. member for Danforth utter in respect to the heraldic proprieties. This recommended flag consists only of Canada's national colours as provided in the proclamation to which my friend referred, of November 21, 1921. Displayed in the crest is a lion holding in its right paw a red maple leaf.

The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, during his quite scholarly address of some weeks ago referred to some of Canada's heraldic traditions and devices. Actually since 1868 the maple leaf, in one form or another, has by overwhelming consensus been accepted as emblematic of Canada. The flag colours, that is, the combination of white and red, may be found in the Fenian service ribbon, which was for the period 1866-70 which also covered the Riel rebellion, the Royal Military college flag, the Canada medal ribbon and finally in the Canadian decoration.

This flag sends one message—"Canada". It is in good heraldic taste. The committee's unanimous choice is immediately distinguishable from every other flag in the world and it is conspicuously Canadian in character. From the first day this flag flies it will be recognized I know, as being the flag of this country. It will look striking whenever occasion calls for it to be flown or draped alongside the union jack.

It might interest hon. members to know that the Royal Military college was founded in the year 1876 and since its founding the colours of the college have always been red and white as evidenced by their uniforms. This was, of course, the college of the nation. The original uniform was a red tunic, white trousers and white belt. That hat was a black shako, with white plume and red tip. The sash, which was worn in the wintertime, was red and white striped. In the late thirties, the library was destroyed by fire, but from ex-cadets we know that the R.M.C. flag of red, white and red was flown certainly in 1916 and again in 1918, and many of us on the defence committee have seen it since then. I remember studying it for some time during the past summer.

Now, sir, we find opposition to this maple leaf emblem. I refer to the Montreal *Star* of Tuesday, September 15, 1964. You will note that the committee was appointed on September 10, 1964. The heading of the article is: "Maple Leaf Out—Diefenbaker; Says Emblem Has No Place On New Flag". The article reads in part as follows:

Mr. Diefenbaker, "taken aback" by this statement—

The reference is to a statement by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson).

—took to the air waves last night to suggest that the maple leaf had no place in any Canadian flag...

"Now I have no objection to a maple leaf," Mr. Diefenbaker said. "I don't criticize it as a symbol of the country—but can you tell me any country in the world that ever put a symbol on its flag?"

I have been challenged in the house not only today but on previous occasions with regard to a change in my position. I will not deny, sir, that for quite a time I had hoped that Canada's flag would carry the royal badge of three red maple leaves on a white field. There has been a good deal of research into this matter, and it was indicated that Her Majesty, on August 15, 1962, entirely on her own initiative had caused to be created by the College of Arms a banner as Queen of Canada. This was our Queen's personal tribute to this honoured realm, her gift to Canada, the first of the nations of the commonwealth beyond the seas.

This flag when designed was sent by Sir Anthony Wagner, Garter King of Arms, to Canada for approval in 1962 and it was approved by the then prime minister himself, now Leader of the Opposition. Recently we

have had occasion to examine this banner carried by our Queen on her B.O.A.C. and Air Canada aircraft, on H.M.S. Britannia, over her several dwelling places in Charlottetown, Quebec and Ottawa, and at every saluting stand where she has presided. I believed that after the royal visit to Canada the significance of the three red leaves on white would be understood by all. Yet on Wednesday, October 28, the evening before the flag committee tabled its report, the Leader of the Opposition referred contemptuously on national television to the "troika flag" introduced in the government resolution.

I had felt, and was confirmed in this belief by some of the best heraldic authorities we were able to consult, that we should follow the example set by Her Majesty in 1962 when she created her Royal flag from the ensigns armorial. Certainly since October 8, 1957, when Hon. Ellen Fairclough issued a news release with respect to the arms of Canada, there was no questioning the fact that our colours were white and red and that our national emblem was three red maple leaves on a white field.

I would also point out to hon. members that on November 21, 1962, the government then headed by the present Leader of the Opposition caused a communication to be sent to the College of Arms through government house advising as follows:

> Needless to say the emblems of particular interest to the government of Canada are those granted in the royal proclamation of November 21, 1921, including "three maple leaves conjoined on one stem proper".

Sir, I thought they meant that. I thought the Conservative party was quite serious in believing that this was the national emblem because on the day that their government was defeated, February 5, 1963, they submitted in written form an answer to my question No. 1,449. The first part of the question was:

> Does Canada have national colours and, if so, what are these colours?

The answer was:

> Yes, white and red.

The second part of the question was:

> Does Canada have a national emblem and, if so, what is the emblem?

This was the answer:

> Yes, three maple leaves conjoined on one stem.

I thought it was fair and reasonable to suppose this was not the "Pearson pennant" or "troika pennant" but was the royal badge. I am simply putting this on the record because I do not want any vilification of this national emblem to detract in any way from the very fine work that has been done by our armed services for something like 40 years in bringing their badges and many of their devices into harmony with our ensigns armorial. But I must agree with the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott) that while we must regard a flag as being in the area of heraldry, there is a licence and a freedom to deal with such devices and generally speaking a lot more freedom than there would be in the case of a shield or crest. The flag that has been recommended to the house is a strong and very impressive flag. We have been satisfied that it will meet the heraldic requirements of the most exacting experts in the world.

I know it is regarded that those of us on the government side have changed our position in voting for this proposed flag. By what he said the Leader of the Opposition would have preferred to see us locked tightly to a particular design. Thus he would have been able to gain disagreement in the committee which might have frustrated the choosing of a national flag for decades to come. Quite frankly, sir, in spite of strong feelings on this matter we felt this was a matter of great national importance. I went to the committee with a strong personal preference, as I have said, that the device accepted by the Queen should be recognized as the official emblem of the nation, but with the resolve that my personal preference would not impede the creative work of our committee. I prayed that I might forget my own heraldic notions and views and think only of Canada and her welfare.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, reference was made before the dinner hour by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith) to certain items that appeared in the press, and I think I would be doing him a discourtesy if I did not refer to them. He mentioned the fact that a picture appeared in the publication *La Voix de l'Est*. I never saw this paper but I can assure the hon. gentleman that the picture to which he referred was taken some several days before the creation of the flag committee.

He also referred to press comment in the *Recorder and Times* but I can assure him I never made a speech on this subject. I did have private conversations with a good friend of mine who is the editor of that paper, and who questioned me with respect to the final report of the flag committee which he had read as it appeared in *Hansard*. I must confess I did not appreciate that this would be the subject of a press report. This was, of course, my indiscretion. Perhaps in my remarks I was a little undiplomatic but at least I am sure that what I did say I said honestly.

With respect to the visit of the grade ten children from the Peterborough school, it is true that at the request of certain members of the house, and I include among those the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Honey), the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Stenson), and the hon. member for Hastings-Frontenac (Mr. Webb), all of whom were present, a number of children were in our flag committee room; but this was by no means the first such visit. I think the hon. member for Perth will remember that several groups were admitted, and that they moved around and examined suggested designs shown on the walls. On that occasion I did give each of the children a copy of a rather outdated address I made in the house on June 17, 1964, which may perhaps explain some of the press comments in that regard. However, I do not think I disclosed anything which was secret in character, but if I did I pray the hon. member's forgiveness.

I assure him that to the best of my recollection I did not have any conversations with members of the press, in relation to the flag, during the period we sat as a flag committee, nor indeed with my leader, directly or indirectly. I can assure him of that fact.

The hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Rapp), whom I never had occasion to really know before sitting on the flag committee with him, and where I must confess I learned to respect and admire him very much, has referred to the fact that a new flag for Canada should contain in it the symbols of our national origins. I respect his view, just as I sincerely respect the view of anybody who would like to see the Canadian red ensign in its present form continue to fly as the flag of Canada. I am sure there is not anybody on this side of the house who does not love this old flag and feel deeply with respect to what it has meant in our past.

An hon. Member: They like it in Brockville too.

Mr. Matheson: I am sorry I was not able to hear that remark, but I shall be happy to answer questions at the conclusion of my comments. But directing myself very briefly to the matter raised by the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale I think I should read to him a letter which was drawn to my attention, a letter written to several papers in Canada by Lewis Grant McNab who served as an artillery counter-battery officer in world war I. He lives at 4250 Sherbrooke street west, apartment 18, Montreal, Quebec and under date of September 11, 1964 he wrote this letter:

> Dear Sir:
>
> On a recent trip overseas, there was an Anglican clergyman on my continental bus tour. He has a parish just outside London. It is what is known as a royal living, the property belonging to the crown. As such this reverend gentleman has enjoyed close contact with the royal family over a period of years.
>
> I was talking to him about the current flag controversy in Canada and he told me something which I thought was very interesting. He said that King George V felt very strongly that the commonwealth nations should have a flag of their own which did not embody the union jack, and that if they wished to fly the union jack, they could do so under their own flag.

I took the trouble to telephone Mr. McNab about this, and I may point out he is well known in certain military circles.

I should now like to read from a letter written to me by J. R. B. Walker, a very distinguished scholar enjoying the appointment of Lancaster and Registrar, I believe since 1953, at the College of Arms, Queen Victoria street, London E. C. 4. His letter is dated May 27, 1964, and reads:

> As the union jack symbolizes the union of England, Scotland and Ireland I would have thought it would be rather illogical to incorporate it in the heraldry of any other country; but the sovereign can do anything she pleases, and if she decided that the union jack was to be incorporated in the national symbol of any country in the commonwealth other than Great Britain, her decision would, of course, be perfectly valid.

My hon. friend from Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale, as do I, believes in this exciting development of the commonwealth, and in fairness I think he will recognize that India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Ghana, Malaya, Cyprus, Nigeria, Tanganyika, Sierra Leone, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda and Malta have all followed the guidance of the College of Arms. Very recently Rouge Dragon, Dr. Conrad Swan, who was in Canada for a few days, informed me that nearly every new nation in the commonwealth has taken instruction from the old College of Arms with respect to national flags,

and that the style and pattern of incorporating the union jack in them is no longer followed.

A friend of mine has just passed me an article which appeared in the *Daily Gleaner* of Tuesday November 17, which shows a plaque recently unveiled in Jamaica. The inscription on the plaque reads:

> On this spot was erected the flag staff from which was lowered the union jack and on which was hoisted the flag of Jamaica to mark the beginning of the independence of Jamaica at midnight 5th-6th August 1962.
>
> Here also was sworn in the first native governor general of Jamaica, Sir Clifford Campbell G.C. M.G., at 8.50 p.m. on Saturday 1st December 1962. This plaque was presented by Herbert G. Macdonald, O.B.E., J.P.

We must recognize that we are living in a new and changing commonwealth of nations, where new things are expected of us if we are to play the type of leadership role that as Canadians we are expected to play.

Certain comments were made by earlier speakers with respect to the flag of Peru and I feel these must be answered. I feel strongly about this. I referred a few moments before the six o'clock recess to the fact that the Leader of the Opposition had referred to the three leaf flag containing the royal badge as "a troika flag". On the same occasion, on television, in an interview with Mr. Geoffrey Scott over C.B.C.-T.V. on October 28, the night before our flag committee was called upon to present its report, the right hon. gentleman was asked: "Would this be acceptable to you as a national flag?" Mr. Scott was referring to the flag which is now the subject of discussion. The Leader of the Opposition replied: "Certainly we couldn't accept that type of flag". Later on in the program he added: "Not this Christmas or any other Christmas". His words were:

> All I have to say about that, aside altogether from the fact that it shows nothing of our heritage, is that it would be far from being distinctive. As a matter of fact, it would be the Peruvian flag... If we ever get that flag, we would have the Peruvians saluting it anyway.

As I say, I feel strongly about this because only a few hours before the right hon. gentleman taped that broadcast for national television I had produced to the flag committee the admiralty book Flags of All Nations, volume 1, which sets out the national flag and ensign of Peru, the merchant flag and the jack. Not one member of that committee took exception on the grounds that our recommendation was not clearly distinguishable both in its proportions and in its general appearance from the Peruvian flag. The comment made by the right hon. gentleman is therefore in my opinion, completely unfair.

This has been a difficult time for some of us on the government side. If it is felt that we have acted sometimes in a discourteous manner, believe me we have been under tension, too. I do not want the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Rapp) to feel he is the only person who has at times felt trapped. Listening to the attacks made on us with respect to what we thought was an honest effort to find a good flag, one recommended by the highest authorities, listening to it being assailed as a "Pearson pennant" and a troika, we have been disposed to shout at the Leader of the Opposition as Churchill did over the B.B.C. on one historic occasion when his foes across the channel were harassing England with bombs: "You do your worst and we will do our best."

We sought to find an acceptable flag design on the basis of the royal badge. That would not do. On the flag committee we struggled hard to find a strong and distinctive flag which represented a fresh approach. For a moment, indeed, we achieved unanimity—and then we discovered that the Leader of the Opposition was even more contemptuous and scathing than he had been before. I think it is quite impossible to please this angry man. I say to him, in the language of Tom Jones: "I am very sorry, sir, for your unhappiness. Whatever is the occasion of it?"

We have tried to do our best. The original design, I must say, meant a great deal to me. However, I can tell the house with complete conviction that I love this new design.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: You said that about the other one.

Mr. Matheson: Hon. members opposite laugh. But I am wearing the cuff links of the Royal Canadian Legion. Some members are wearing the badge in their buttonholes. I think legionnaires will be interested to compare the proposed flag with their own Royal Canadian Legion badge. It is not that the flag is derived from their badge. Actually each derives its colours and its motif from the same armorial proclamation of 1921—the proclamation referred to by the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott). No flag expert in the world can criticize this flag for design, concept or propositions. It meets all the tests for a distinguished flag. It is a flag of dignity and grace, worthy of a great sovereign nation. I believe it has a great purpose to serve in

this nation as a uniting factor, something around which we can all rally, together with that beautiful old device, the union jack, which I hope will never cease to fly in this country, not as our national flag but as a flag to be used on proper occasions for demonstrating our allegiance to Queen and commonwealth.

I believe that increasingly this country will be playing a larger role in certain international areas of responsibility. Those of us who have been active in the defence committee and who have taken part in the defence debates can, I am sure, be satisfied that the reorientation of our defence activities is in the direction of peace keeping. It has been manifest from the time of Suez to the present day that it is not helpful for us to continue flying a flag which is a colonial ensign or which appears to some to have that connotation.

In bringing my remarks to a close I should like to refer to an address delivered in England on June 2, 1941 by the grand old man we all honour today, we think of him almost as one of our own. Mr. Winston Churchill, speaking to Canada on June 2, 1941 used these words:

> I speak to you this afternoon from No. 10 Downing street, here in the capital and the governing centre of this battered but indomitable city and island. Our people have been through much in the last few months. They have learned much—and some things they will never forget. But above all they have learned their own strength... no one doubts that we can or that we shall see it through; and that when at length we march again into the light of happier and easier days, Canada will play her just part in laying the foundations of a wider and a better world.

This is not the kind of country that is only for us Scots. Of course we are happy to celebrate St. Andrew's day today, and we will never forget the rock from which we were hewn or the pit from which we were digged. This is the kind of country where a Croat like Frank Mahovlich, a Czech like Stan Mikita, a Frenchman like Jean Beliveau, an Indian like George Armstrong, a Ukranian like Terry Sawchuk or an Irishman like Don McKenney from my own riding of Leeds, or our own Red Kelly in the House of Commons all feel absolutely equal. My good friend the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) has pointed out to me that the first verse of the last chapter of the Bible contains these words:

> And he shewed me a pure river of water clear as crystal... and on either side of the river was there the tree of life... and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.

I should like to think that may refer to the maple leaf.

Mr. Herridge: Would the hon. member permit a question? What was the significance of the words he used when he said "The pit from which we were digged?"

Mr. Hellyer: He meant "dug".

Mr. Matheson: Perhaps I was somewhat confused in my scripture. It is: "The rock from which we were hewn or the pit from which we were digged."

On St. Andrew's day some of us are trembling with Scottish zeal. I see many Scots sitting in the house today with tartan ties. Pride in being Canadian does not mean we cannot continue to take pride in our racial origins, be they British, French, or otherwise.

Mr. Terry Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy tonight to follow the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson), mostly because I always feel that if you follow a strong speaker nobody will pay any attention; and certainly I believe that the best chance I may have of getting some attention from the house or indeed from the country is the fact that we have just listened to a speech which contains all the pious platitudes and all those symptoms of that lack of sincerity which have characterized the Liberal party since the question of the changing of our national flag has come into prominence.

Certainly I listened with rapt attention, as so many did, when the hon. member said, "I love this flag". It seems to me there is a line somewhere, "How constant is thy love?" Some of us heard the hon. member on another occasion and have reason to suspect that there was a first love of his when it came to the flag design, which was the three maple leaves. In fact I do not know whether he now claims that he was dishonestly given the credit or discredit for its sponsorship; but he has been blamed by most of us for being very prominent in trying to foist that design on the nation. Certainly he gave every indication that he loves that flag. It is not just those few words of his that characterize his attitude, and indeed the attitude of his colleagues on the Liberal benches, to this question of changing our national flag. In this at least he has been constant in that he is most inconstant, and so is the Liberal party.

I had hoped tonight, Mr. Speaker, to start out by expressing a little admiration at least for the many hours of hard work that the

members of the flag committee of this house have put in. Certainly I am sure that no matter how much members of this house have been maligned by the press from time to time because they fail to understand that committee work keeps people out of the chamber, or that other duties keep people out of the chamber, those of us in the house have some appreciation of the amount of effort that has been expended by this committee and how much extra work was undertaken by those members who sat morning, noon and night some days in order to carry out this task. I feel I would not be completely honest if I did not add that I think their burden was unnecessarily onerous because of the insistence on a time limit. Certainly the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), in his few remarks this afternoon on the point of order as to the amendment proposed, put everything in its proper perspective and revealed to us all exactly why the time limit was so important. I think the Prime Minister has revealed to this house and to the country that as far as he was concerned the work of that committee was little more than a sham. He had introduced this most controversial subject in the worst and most political way possible and he expected the committee would bring in something that would allow the government to get rid of its embarrassment as quickly as possible, and therefore the time element was the only point that mattered at all.

I suggest that all of us who are genuinely interested in the question of a flag, those of us who have some understanding of the number of people in this country who recognize the importance of tampering with our symbols in this political, halfhearted or lighthearted way, are bound to take cognizance of that fact. Therefore I have to say that, while I believe the members of that committee have certainly deserved the thanks of this house for the number of hours expended and the way in which they applied themselves to their task, it has been obvious from the outset and it is even most obvious today that the government of this country has done everything it can to make their work meaningless. I suggest that from the outset, from the way in which the Prime Minister set the stage, it was a little unreasonable and really we were asking a little too much to think that the members of that committee would have attacked their task in other than a lighthearted manner.

Consider for a moment how this flag debate started, with the Prime Minister proclaiming to the country loud and long and in the most partisan way that he was going to shove his design down the throat of parliament and give the people of Canada his design for a flag, in place of the red ensign which has been Canada's flag for the last 100 years. I suggest that the tremendous struggle that was necessary to get him to concede this much at least, namely that it should go to a committee, had become so partisan, so violent and stretched out so long that no member of that committee could have undertaken the task without a feeling of frustration; and if not frustration, at least considerable cynicism. I suggest that this degree of cynicism made itself evident as the work of the committee progressed and we saw leaks to the press from time to time; reporters reporting what was going on in a committee which was sitting in camera. I do not care how vehement members may get about a flag or how many may feel it could not matter less, but surely members of this house should feel that no member should sit in this house who cannot be called an honourable lady or gentleman. Certainly the word of a committee that it is in camera is a binding oath that should be as sacred to the members of that committee as any oath could be.

I suggest that only the worst possible foundation for starting a committee, the worst possible approach and the most cynical attitude toward it on the part of some members can account for the most shameful course of conduct on the part of those who wanted to enhance their own reputations by ruining their own good name. Any member of that committee who is accused of deviating in the slightest manner from his duty to keep those proceedings secret should, I think, be most indignant if he is accused unjustly, and most guilty if there is any falling away from his duty at all. I think there should be on the part of those who have been mentioned a very spirited effort in their own defence. Here I must pay special attention to the hon. member for Leeds who has just finished speaking.

I did not try to be complimentary to him when I started, and I repeat my original assertion that I have never heard anything so ridiculous in my life as his statement that he loves this flag. His whole speech as far as I am concerned consisted of platitudes, trite sayings and red herrings.

I was in this house this afternoon when the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith) listed what I thought was a most damning indictment against the hon. member for Leeds. He gave chapter and verse the statements which

that member had given to the press, and I heard hardly a word from the hon. member for Leeds in his own defence. Certainly I want to say on my own behalf as far as I am concerned my view of the meaning of an in camera meeting, and the duty it lays on each and every member of a committee which holds a meeting in camera to keep silent their proceedings, is a much higher duty than apparently the hon. member understands.

I am not going to be any more charitable to the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman). I know that members on both sides of the house—although those on the Liberal side who were disgusted by him are likely to be quiet and not say anything in this chamber—were disgusted, indeed shocked, by the performance of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra in his attempt to gain for himself all the publicity and glory he could from anything which came out of that committee meeting. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman), who is now known as "Mr. Leakman", certainly received his share of publicity, but I suggest that a member of this house who should have some regard for the duty he owes that committee and the equality that the members of the committee were supposed to share one with another, should at least have the decency to wait till the committee's report was made public to the house before making press statements.

I do not mind revealing, Mr. Speaker, that some time after this occurred I had a conversation with one member of the committee who was very incensed, not only at the fact that this had occurred, but because he felt that what had been said was so wide of the truth in so many respects that he wondered whether we had been released from our obligation to keep silent, and he wondered whether we could not get up and publicly set the record straight. I advised him that I thought that just because there might be sinners on the other side of the house was no reason to emulate them on our side. I am afraid that is a little different from the attitude taken by the Liberals, who whenever they are found at fault ask: And what did you do? This might be a good time to remind government supporters that if some of the sins they commit bear any resemblance to the sins of their previous government, the people of Canada will chastise them as they did the previous government during the last two election campaigns; and I hope hon. members opposite will be prepared to pay the price of their sins instead of sitting in this house and talking to us as though this would absolve them from guilt.

I cannot to this day understand why a time limit should have been set on the proceedings of the committee. The only conclusion I can come to—and I have given it lots of thought—is that the political gain which the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) hopes to achieve by presenting a flag to the country within the time he dictated was most important to him. Members of the house might have gained a ray of hope at the start when the Prime Minister, who had introduced the flag in a most political manner, announced there would be a free vote. We thought for a while that perhaps he was going to give us some inkling of the importance of a flag; that perhaps it was a little more important than just another political issue and a political gain of the moment. Then he explained what he meant by a free vote, and indeed we found he had become a real Liberal propagandist.

Then when the committee was appointed we thought that perhaps one thing had impressed him, and that was that we on this side were sincere in this flag debate on the question how this should be handled. We had thought that even if the government were successful in ramming down the throat of parliament a flag which most of us did not like, passing an act of parliament is not the same thing as a new flag which the people would welcome and accept, and we had thought that at last our long battle to persuade him to send the question to a committee might have left some impression on him. We hoped he would think there was much good in a committee discussing the question and that the people of Canada might have some feeling of satisfaction from the fact that this flag issue had at last been handled in a way which would satisfy the dissident groups in as much as there had been a fair hearing in an unpolitical manner and in a way which reflected the concern for Canada over this issue. As I say, Mr. Speaker, the attitude displayed by some of the members of that committee regarding their duty to be silent certainly shook the confidence of most of us in our sincerity adequately to consider the feelings of the various segments of the population and the various opinions they held.

I must say that no more concrete proof of the sincerity of the government backbenchers on that committee is necessary than that contained in the report presented to us for concurrence today. Those of us who were in the house earlier heard the Minister of Transport

(Mr. Pickersgill) ask one question of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) to this effect: How about the question of reviving an issue which has already been decided in this session?

Mr. Knowles: Reversing.

Mr. Nugent: Yes, that is it, reversing. The Minister of Transport, in his argument about the question whether the amendment was in order, said that if we were now to send it back to a committee before the house had decided there should be a time limit, we in this house would be reversing a question which had already been decided. My argument to that was that I thought the house can send back to a committee something the committee has already decided, and I said that had been established many times.

If you look at the committee report in which we are asked to concur, Mr. Speaker, you will find that the first question settled by that committee is whether there should be one flag or two. With regard to that, Mr. Speaker, you find unanimous agreement. This committee which we fought so hard to get established, and which we hoped might do so much to at least give the appearance to the people of Canada that the question was going to be handled in a responsible manner by members of parliament, who would be guided by their conscience as Canadians with a true understanding of the meaning of symbols, instead of simply acting as politicians following the party line, voted unanimously that there should be only one flag. I would have thought—I still hope there may be a chance of this—that the Minister of Transport, since he is so familiar with the rules, would side with me when I say that for the committee to bring up the same point later on which it had earlier unanimously disposed of and finished with is clearly contrary to the rules. For them later on to attempt to revive it by bringing in a partisan vote with a different decision than originally arrived at is also clearly contrary to the rules. It is not only contrary to the rules but is an affront to the integrity of the members of that committee. To suggest that all the members of that committee were free to vote independently from any political control by the Liberal party is an insult to the intelligence of hon. members. I suggest that such a thing could not have taken place, as it did, without some direction from the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I observe that I am touching upon the sensibilities of the Liberal backbenchers, and I suppose I have been a little naïve in complaining about the lack of integrity on the part of the Liberal members of this special committee on the flag. Perhaps I am being naïve in suggesting that this subject is of such importance to the people of Canada, and so sacred to all those who believe as I do in this country, that it should have been treated as something other than a political football. I am not unhappy in many ways about the amount of adverse publicity the press has given members on this side of the house because of the weeks and weeks of fighting we have done to get the flag resolution sent to a committee, but I cannot understand the political legerdemain by which the Liberals have convinced most of the people in this country that it is the Conservative members who are wasting the time of the country by debating the flag issue, when all the time these things are controlled by an absent Liberal party. I do think it is rubbing salt into a raw wound for that same Liberal party now to expect the people of this country to be gullible enough to stand for this sort of contempt of the rules of this house.

We have witnessed in this house day in and day out Liberal contempt for parliament, and this has been apparent ever since the Liberal government was elected, as evidenced by the government's refusal to answer questions, and in their attitude when they have been caught in errors. Certainly what took place last week was a striking example of this attitude. We witnessed the actions of a minister of justice who obviously did not have any idea or concept of his duties.

When the Prime Minister of this country spends his time out west, as he did last week, instead of being here to answer to parliament for the actions of this wayward ministers, surely that is a manifestation of this contemptible attitude. The Prime Minister decided to go on a campaign junket out in the west, which is an effrontery to this country. He talked about now being the time when we need unity in Canada. Surely that is too much for the long suffering people of this country to put up with. How phony can one get in talking about unity? The Prime Minister speaks about unifying the nation and starts out by introducing this flag issue in a political way, making sure that the country is divided. He has taken every step possible to make sure that whatever else happens the reputation of parliament is ruined, and then has the temerity to suggest that the criticism of this house shall be lessened.

He established a committee composed of a bunch of members who find little difficulty in acting with this obvious contempt for the rules of parliament. This is an indication to this nation that their obedience to the whim of the Liberal party is more important than their duty as members of a committee. How then can the Prime Minister have the effrontery to talk about unity in this country, in view of the manner in which he has handled this debate, which has done more to cause disunity than the actions of all people in the last quarter of a century?

I am glad to see the hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. Forgie) sitting in his place this evening. He is an old friend of mine and I say to him, as an old friend, that there is one thing I have always known about him. That is, he is a good Liberal, and a good Liberal is one who never allows logic or common sense to bother him.

Mr. Forgie: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to point out to the hon. member that he is a far better curler than he is a speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: You are not in your seat.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona has the floor.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, in the event that the hon. gentleman's remark was not picked up by *Hansard*, the hon. member said that I am a far better curler than I am a speaker. I do not want to leave the hon. member for Renfrew North alone in this category. I categorized him as a good Liberal, and most of the backbenchers over on that side are good Liberals simply because they managed to get elected. What the Prime Minister would call a good Liberal is an elected Liberal, who always says yes when there is a suggestion that he should do so, and says nothing when there is any question whatsoever about the course to follow because someone has failed to give a signal. I will never forget the situation surrounding the Great Slave lake railway, when someone on that side voted against the bill and all the rest followed suit. Shortly thereafter many Liberal backbenchers were heard to say: I did not mean to vote against that, but Chevrier got up and we had to follow. This is typical of Liberal policy.

I happen to know a few of the members on the Liberal side of this house quite well, and I am happy to say that there are some members over there for whom I have a great deal of respect. I have managed to keep that respect for some of them on most occasions, but I do think now that some of them would get up on their hind legs, accept their duties seriously and say to their leader: Give us something honest to stand for, for a change; act fairly with the House of Commons for a change; quit trying to evade questions; quit trying to be so sneaky; quit being so hypocritical, and make life a little easier for us. I sometimes wonder whether the Liberal backbenchers feel that their Prime Minister has a vendetta against them. It has been a long time since any Liberal backbencher has had self respect enough to get up and say: I am behind the government and I think it is—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have listened to the hon. member for quite a few minutes, and it seems to me that very few of his remarks during that time have related in any way to the subject now before us for consideration. They have been directed away from the resolution before the house. I would appreciate the hon. member's relating, if possible, the remarks he has made to that matter which we are supposed to be studying.

Mr. Nugent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I wandered astray, it was because I was considering the report of the committee and the fact that at least at first appearance that committee has blatantly violated the fundamental rules of this house.

I pointed out that the house could refer this subject back to the committee for reconsideration, but certainly it is obvious even to those on the Liberal back benches, who find it painful even to consider the obvious, that for a committee to make one decision and then a completely different decision in the next moment is a very shameful course of conduct, and they cannot even plead ignorance. We all realize that that is the kind of excuse they have been making for so much of the time on that side of the house. I suggest to them if they cannot understand these few remarks, they should remember, with some chagrin, the amendment to the labour code which included November 11 as a holiday, at which time the government was defeated in the committee of the whole, and then consider that all that party had to do on that occasion was bring the subject up again the next day when they had a majority and reverse the decision.

That is what the flag committee did. I suggest that the Liberal members of that committee had to report to the Prime Minister

on progress every day. All members of the committee, not just the Liberals or the Conservatives but every member of the flag committee, were unanimous that there should only be one flag. That matter was settled and disposed of, and there is only one explanation for its coming up again. The Liberal members of the committee got their orders from the Prime Minister that this would not do. Joey would have somebody's neck; and so the matter had to be opened up again. That is why the question was brought up again.

I would be happy to hear any logical explanation from any Liberal member of that committee. I must say that they were pretty prompt in speaking to the press while the committee was sitting. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra was a little too quick in getting his story before the public before the house received the report of the committee. What is stopping these hon. members now from getting up and giving us a logical explanation of why they should trample on so obvious a rule of the house?

I hope to say a few words about the design of a flag generally. I want to come back to the remarks of the hon. member for Leeds. He spent a great deal of time telling us what this flag meant in heraldry, the importance of the three maple leaves, and so on. His arguments can be disposed of very simply. As far as I and my constituents are concerned heraldry does not mean one tenth as much as pleasing design. It does not mean one hundredth as much as whether or not the flag stands for something.

The flag that has been presented by the committee, thanks to the efforts of the Prime Minister and the government and those willing co-assassins of Canadian democracy who have supported them, stands for pure political propaganda. It stands for the ability of the Liberal party to prove once again that they can sell a lie to the public faster than the public can catch up to them.

The hon. member referred to a dozen African countries. He did not mention countries like Australia and New Zealand which like Canada have a long, proud history and tradition of established democracy, countries which have a flag that means something to their people because they have a history of which they are not ashamed. I must say I cannot understand Liberal members not having the intestinal fortitude to stand up and tell the house what is meant by a compromise by the Liberal party on a flag. While most of us in the opposition felt that the red ensign was good enough we were ready to compromise. I think the general feeling on this side of the house was that we wanted a flag which would retain some symbol of our history and heritage to show that we are not ashamed of a flag that has flown over this country for 100 years and to show that Canada has 100 years of history of which we are proud.

The difficulty was that on the Liberal side compromise meant only one thing. No flag should fly over Canada which has on it any symbol denoting anything of our history and heritage. That is all. Anything else would pass. Then member after member would get up, like the hon. member for Leeds, and say, "I truly love this flag". I bet you that if it had been a plain, dirty handkerchief he would have been able to say the same thing, so long as it did not have any suggestion of anything indicating our history, our heritage and our traditions. All I can say is that the new flag brought in by the committee stands for the Liberal party.

I do not agree with the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott) when he says it is being brought in by parliament and not by any one person. That is nonsense. I think he is being very naïve when he does not concede that it is being brought in by the political power of the Liberal party exercised on the members of that committee. Oh, I admit they were given a little discretion: As long as you have a maple leaf on it, it does not matter. That is what I like, a party that really stands for something. Political opportunism is what the Liberal party stands for and that is what this flag stands for.

I hope that those on the other side who feel I am wasting my time and that the voters of the country are going to say I am wasting the time of the house, because we all know that public opinion says this matter should be wrapped up quickly, are feeling really happy and secure now. I have never seen more typical examples of leadership than those Liberals show who watch to see which way the flock is running, and then run a little faster in order to catch up. As far as I am concerned the duty of members of this house is to try to deal with the business of the house as their consciences dictate, and we can see from the erratic behaviour of those on the other side of the house that they have been trying to do this. But having no consciences they have been wandering willy-nilly wherever political opportunism leads, and I hope they are happy.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Henri Latulippe (Compton-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, the time has come to give Canada a distinctive flag, symbol of unity and pride, and I would even say of paternity and sovereignty for Canadians.

This motion concerns the adoption of a distinctive Canadian flag proclaiming the sovereignty of our country.

Canada, through its history, has experienced a constant constitutional evolution. It has now become a sovereign state within the commonwealth and the nations. A state is sovereign when it holds supreme soreveign authority at home and when it is submitted to no other country at the international level. Sovereign does not mean independent or absolute, because all nations must submit to public international law.

We can assert with pride that our country enjoys today the eight main characteristics of a sovereign state: the right to legislate, the right to give our legislation extraterritoriality, the right to diplomatic representation abroad, the right to have Canadian courts of last instance, the right to declare peace, war or neutrality, the right to amend our constitution according to our desire and our own decisions, the right to negotiate and to sign ourselves our own treaties, and finally, the recognition of our sovereignty by the other nations of the world.

Several factors and developments have made possible the achievement of such a maturity, but the most outstanding was the Statute of Westminister passed on December 11, 1931, which gave our country its sovereignty and independence within the commonwealth.

There is more than the possession of Canadian sovereignty which is talked about so much in this house, within the United Nations, within NATO and almost everywhere in the world; this real sovereignty must express itself through outward signs which proclaim our distinctive Canadian personality.

Our national impulse for a distinctive character does not in any way hurt our relations with the other members of the commonwealth, with which we are united through a common allegiance to the British crown.

That is the spirit behind a project which promotes the existence of a Canadian sovereignty which can express itself through external signs: a distinctive national flag, a distinctive national anthem and a national day celebrating Canadian sovereignty.

Therefore, the thing is to adopt a distinctive flag, one which would be characteristic of our country, both a flag and an anthem completely different from those of other countries and which would bear our colours and show our national aspirations as truly Canadian and distinctive.

We, Créditistes, had adopted a distinctive flag, we had advocated a diagonal one. We felt that because of its simplicity, it should have been accepted, but such was not the case. The members of this house decided otherwise.

We spent almost three weeks dealing with the flag and then a committee was set up which discussed the matter for six weeks. That committee has brought us its report. Now, since we did not come here merely to indulge in petty politics, but to do things, and because the time has come to give Canada a distinctive flag, we accept the report of the committee. We are pleased to approve it, because the old parties have been calling for the adoption of a flag for such a long time. In fact, they have been doing so for 25 years, but the Canadians have never had a distinctive flag. They are still waiting for it and since we are here to take a stand and act, we are ready to vote in favour of a distinctive flag which will do credit to all Canadians and the entire community.

It is not the first time that such a matter is raised in Canadian politics; in the past, some governments, some associations, certain members of parliament and a great number of Canadians have raised that important issue without avail.

When we consider the origin and background of flags, we note that the union jack has become the national emblem of Great Britain under a royal proclamation of January 1, 1801. We note that the red ensign, authorized in England by Queen Anne in 1707 and by Queen Victoria in 1864, is, under section 72 of the merchant and shipping act of 1894 the proper flag of all ships belonging to British citizens.

If Canadians are really to express their new Canadian citizenship, which they have possessed since January 1, 1947, and a really distinctive patriotism, those two flags no longer suit their legitimate aspirations.

Besides, the order in council of September 5, 1945 clearly indicates that the red ensign will be flown until parliament decides otherwise. The order in council thus recognizes a temporary situation which we must now rectify and define by a specific action, namely by finally adopting a distinctive national flag for this Canada of ours.

Since the last war, public opinion in Canada has constantly evolved in this field and has reached an unequivocal degree of maturity.

Why has the time come to make this decision? It is because our country, Canada, a sovereign state, needs external signs to demonstrate this legal and progressive sovereignty.

If our country has developed to the extent that everyone acknowledges its obvious maturity, we must show this emancipation by means of a truly national and essentially distinctive flag. The pride and the future of our country, and the acknowledgment of our final liberation are at stake.

Most Canadians in this North American country ardently wish to live, not for the mother countries of their remote ancestors, but for the land that feeds them and will feed their sons and daughters, for the land where they will draw their last breath.

Only a really distinctive Canadian national flag will strengthen convictions which presided over confederation in 1867, only a really distinctive Canadian national flag will give concrete form to our common aspirations, our parliamentary and individual liberties, our mutual understanding and our Canadian patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, if the Canadian people as a whole need such a flag, if the Canadian people as a whole insist on it with the support of the political parties, if the whole world recognizes that Canada has reached its maturity and has a distinctive personality, what are we, members of the House of Commons, waiting for to take the necessary step?

I hope this motion will be enthusiastically received and that the house will soon give it by a positive vote.

If we adopt a distinctive Canadian flag, we should also proclaim a distinctive national anthem, for we could not very well look at our distinctive Canadian flag and, at the same time, sing the national anthem of another country. Let us not make such a blunder, which would be absolutely intolerable and ridiculous.

Since a parliamentary committee selected a flag, the government should see to it that a national anthem is adopted at the same time as a national flag. The vote should be taken at the same time on the flag and on the anthem, and one should be just as national and distinctive as the other.

Both our Conservative and Liberal governments have long postponed the granting of a distinctive national flag to Canada. It is their business. We are anxious to have a distinctive national flag but we can wait. For us in Quebec, there are more urgent things to settle in our relations between the provinces and the federal government. But in all these other fields, we do not wish that cultural and intellectual matters be always settled by dint of numbers, nine against one. This is too unfair, too unequal, too despotic. We ask all nationalities making up Canada to try to understand us on a human basis, on an essential basis instead of considering us always by different standards.

We are then ripe for a truly national flag. The failures and the errors of the past are over. Let us face the future and let us consider ourselves as one people made up of human beings having the same essential needs; indeed, there are now 19,300,000 Canadian citizens and in 1967, when we celebrate the centennial of the confederation there will be 20,000,000.

These 19,300,000 human beings have rights recognized in our Canadian statutes. For instance, there is the famous Canadian Bill of Rights passed on August 10, 1960, which states that:

> The parliament of Canada, affirming that the Canadian nation is founded upon principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God, the dignity and worth of the human person and the position of the family in a society of free men and free institutions.
>
> It is hereby recognized and declared that in Canada there have existed and shall continue to exist without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion, or sex, the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely
>
> (a) the right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the person... freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and association, freedom of the press:

Mr. Speaker, that proves that we can do something which is national in scope, something which is truly Canadian, in the realm of the intellect, of the mind, of intelligence. I understand that it is harder and it takes longer to achieve unity when you have ten provinces instead of one and 28 nationalities instead of one, but why do we not follow that example in essential and humanitarian fields.

The drafting of the Canadian Bill of Rights required several weeks, several months and, indeed, several years of parliamentary work; it cost a great deal of money, of effort, of energy and of enthusiasm, but in the end every member of parliament voted for this humanitarian legislation, and the whole Canadian people rejoiced on August 10, 1960, when the bill was given royal assent.

And that was a document strictly Canadian in scope, in dimension, which contained not a single word likely to show our subservience to any other people in the whole world.

Did you give any thought to this initial action finally taken by the Canadian parliament, without feeling obliged to ask permission from any other country, without feeling obliged to repatriate or amend the constitution?

This is proof, Mr. Speaker, proof that we can do the same thing here through our own powers, in this house of representatives of the people, the whole Canadian people, all the people from one coast to the other, and from the North pole to the U.S. border.

But, once more, by a national initiative, like choosing a distinctive flag, each section must recognize the fact that while claiming rights for itself, at the same time it assumes the duty to respect those same rights towards other sections.

Do you admit that? This is what we have to consider before going any further in the life of the whole people whom we want to be Canadian, just plain Canadian and not French Canadian, English Canadian, Scottish Canadian, Irish Canadian, Italian Canadian or German Canadian, no more than American Canadian.

Just Canadian, Mr. Speaker; Canadian on Canadian soil, with a Canadian flag, that is what I am, that is what I want, that is what I hope to see in the near future, for me, my children, my friends, for you, for all of us here in this house, in this parliament, in this government, in this whole country, this Canada, this Canada of ours.

Canada's history is but beginning. The history of confederation is but 100 years old. The past is gone. The past saw joy, it saw grief, it was borne with its faults, its glories; now we see where we stand and look towards the future.

Let us cease to dwell on the differences, and learn to love one another better by looking at such things as we have in common, common essence, Canadian essence, human essence, both human and divine, the ultimate principle of our unity, of our vitality, of our universality.

Because if we are proud enough some day to fly a truly Canadian flag within the limits of our territory, let it be known that we shall also have to be proud enough to fly it throughout the whole world as a really distinctive Canadian flag.

Such a flag will date, we hope, from 1964 or 1967 but let it be, if possible, really Canadian, a true sign and symbol that will rally the minds and actions of the various nationalities making up the Canadian people on Canadian soil.

We will thus be able to sing before that Canadian flag the Canadian national anthem: "O Canada".

[*Text*]

Mr. Léo Cadieux (Terrebonne): To use an expression employed by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent), I was one of that bunch of cynical members who participated in the work of the flag committee. So were five Conservative members whom I did not know very well before we began our discussions and whom I have come to respect very much for the way in which they did their work, and also for the sincerity they showed throughout the sittings of that committee.

I wish to take this opportunity tonight to report to you, sir, that this committee was one of the best of any I have known. Every member participating in its discussions was in earnest, trying very hard and very honestly to find and reach a reasonable compromise on this difficult question of a national flag for Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I believe that at the beginning of the discussions, I was faced, like most members of this committee, with an issue that seemed terribly difficult. We had the opportunity during our meetings to listen to experts in the fields of heraldry, history, protocol, and so on, who briefed us, as fully as possible, on the purely technical aspects of this matter.

I think I should say the committee's members reached a decision through a logical process which could not lead them to any other choice than the one which they eventually reached by a majority vote.

First of all, we recognized there are traditions in Canada even if, among the public and the members of the House of Commons they appeared to be ignored. There exists a tradition in Canada, as far as our country's symbol is concerned.

Here, may I underline this—I said it often during the meetings of the committee as the hon. members who sat on that committee may recall—that when we are faced with the question of adopting a national flag, we cannot think of incorporating in such an emblem every glorious event in our history. We must reach as technical and as simple a definition as possible of what a flag should be.

Canadian Flag

A flag is a signal, a message aimed at identifying the bearer, and there is no question of recalling the historical background or trying to encumber such a flag with all kinds of signs recalling the history of the country it seeks to identify.

Such a flag must be readily identified. Consequently, it should be simple. Moreover, it should bear a familiar symbol. During these numerous meetings, several precedents in the history of Lower Canada as well as of Upper Canada were recalled indicating that, spontaneously, in both Canadas, the Canadian people when they wished to identify themselves always showed a maple leaf.

It is the reason why the first inevitable conclusion reached by the members of the committee—and I might even say by the hon. Conservative members who were on the committee—was that the emblem of Canada was the maple leaf.

Somewhat later, we tackled the problem from a rather more legal point of view, shall we say. Then, I remember, I very candidly remarked to my Tory friends that they had themselves made to the solution of this problem an exceptional contribution and that, for one, I was shocked to find that now that we must reach a decision ratifying what tradition had already decreed, they repudiated it.

As a matter of fact, a cursory look at history, as regards this question of a Canadian flag, will show, following consideration of this matter by the committee, that the army has more than 400 military badges bearing the maple leaf and that a Conservative government asked His Majesty the King, in 1921, to proclaim what was to be the emblem of Canada. At that time in the coat of arms of Canada, that emblem was selected, and it was three maple leaves on a single stem.

At first discussion arose as to the colour of those maple leaves. Then, in 1957, again under a government headed by a Conservative prime minister, the colour of those leaves was changed from green to red. And more recently, in 1962, the government under the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), once again suggested that the Queen herself incorporate in her personal flag, as the Queen of Canada, the three red maple leaves on a single stem.

Therefore, I repeat this question to my Conservative friends. Why do you disavow that important contribution you made in our efforts to choose a distinctive emblem for Canada?

[Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne).]

We therefore established in the first place that Canada's emblem should be the maple leaf. We established that because it is an emblem that Canadians chose spontaneously, as I said, and also because it is an emblem known everywhere.

I recall that during our discussions, when we heard, as we heard them so often in the house, that easy oratory recalling that Canadian soldiers had died fighting for the red ensign, we asked one of our own people who was on the battle front during the last war whether that was the actual truth. He admitted not only the fact that, in contemporary times, armies do not fly any flag in battle but also that even the officers take their badges off, so that nothing may identify the brigade or division in the line. And we also heard the testimony of a person who recently visited the cemeteries of Canadian soldiers abroad. This person told us that on every white cross which marked the tomb of a dead soldier, there was a maple leaf showing that this soldier was a Canadian.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that through logic we had arrived at the choice we are submitting tonight. The same applied as concerns the colours of the flag. Once more, we inspired ourselves from the proclamation which, in 1921, established the colours of Canada.

I know that this afternoon a member who supported this motion of the flag committee was asked what part of the proclamation stated that white and red were the Canadian colours. It is to be found not in the proclamation itself but in the interpretation of Canada's coat of arms.

That is why we asked experts in heraldry to tell us, laymen, what interpretation should be given to the coat of arms. It is also through logic that we have been able to determine the importance of this historical souvenir, the genealogy mentioned by our friends opposite. It is in the Canadian coat of arms that we have found the answer.

If you examine them closely, you will see that they include the lion of the Plantagenets, the lion of Scotland, the harp of Ireland and the fleur-de-lis of France when it was ruled by the monarchy. That is Canada's ancestry. The Canadian emblem, the three maple leaves on a single stem, hold the position of honour, under the shield. As far as the national colours are concerned, they are represented by the red and white mantle at the top of the coat of arms.

Technically we must therefore observe the implicit instructions given to Canadians by the royal College of Arms which had been asked to decide what should be our national colours, and our distinctive emblem.

Mr. Speaker, as far as compromise is concerned, the hon. members on the other side must accept the idea that the representatives of the Liberal party have compromised as much as possible. Indeed, we arrived at the flag committee with an emblem which we felt was already accepted by the population, three red maple leaves and two blue stripes. We came out of the committee with a flag bearing a single maple leaf and two red bands instead of blue. It seems to me it is difficult to ask for more from the representatives of a political party.

This afternoon, the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Rapp) asked the following question:

[*Text*]

What is wrong with the union jack and the fleur-de-lis? There is nothing wrong with the union jack and the fleur-de-lis except that neither is the Canadian flag. The union jack is a foreign flag; it is the flag of England. The fleur-de-lis represents royal France. These flags do not and cannot represent Canada. This was our argument all along, Mr. Speaker.

I hope that hon. members on the other side of the house are not going to pursue this line of trying to discredit the committee. Some of their own members were members of the committee and they were eager to succeed, as was every one of us. I hope they will not try to infer that there was as much cynicism as we are told there was, its having been said that we were a bunch of cynical members. We were no bunch of anything. We were very eager to find common ground for understanding, and I believe we found it. At one time, irrespective of anything which can be said on the other side, there was actually unanimity that there be one national flag only for Canada.

I also hope, Mr. Speaker, that all of the members of that committee who will participate in this debate will be accurate and honest. When we refer to one of the motions voted on in the committee, the motion for only one flag, we omit a very important word. We voted first for one national flag; and then we voted separately for a flag which would indicate our participation in the commonwealth. These are two different questions. We accepted the fact that the flag we were going to choose was going to be submitted as the Canadian emblem, and for that purpose only and exclusively. Therefore I think that in all these discussions we must be strictly honest, as were all the members of the committee when we were discussing this matter.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to have to differ from my friend the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith), who sat next to me during all the meetings of the committee. I found him a very nice gentleman, but I am surprised and shocked to a certain extent to hear him suggest that there were instructions to the Liberal members given by the government. I can say most emphatically that I talked not once during all those sittings with any member of the cabinet, especially with the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson): I did meet the Prime Minister many times in the elevator but I did not talk to him except to say good morning, especially in view of the situation I understood we were in. Some members in our party know that even the most innocuous question was left unanswered by members of the committee. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope—I do not want to delay the house—that this committee's recommendation will be carried and considered in the light in which it is offered. I believe the committee did its duty, and I do not think it becoming of any hon. member of this house, especially those who were not members of the committee and who therefore must not of necessity be informed about what went on, to discredit the committee and the members of it who participated so honestly. It is very unbecoming to be submitted to the kind of speech that one hon. member made tonight.

I have nothing more to add, Mr. Speaker. From the way things look I am confident that the committee's recommendation will receive from the house, if a vote is permitted as quickly as possible, an astounding majority; I venture to predict that, Mr. Speaker. If hon. members on the other side are so eager to have the question settled let the matter come to a vote. That is the easy solution. At the suggestion of hon. members opposite we consented to form a committee. This committee held extended sittings; everyone admits that. We have studied the question as objectively as possible. We could not come to complete agreement, and that is unfortunate. We tried very hard to reach full agreement; but we did present a majority report, supported by an important majority.

When hon. members talk of a plebiscite, if they do not accept a majority of ten to four what kind of majority would they ask from

a plebiscite? If hon. gentlemen opposite are not satisfied with 72 per cent, what are they going to request from a plebiscite? I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this question has been aired long enough and that we should now proceed with the practical side of the question, which is to vote on this matter.

Mr. J. A. McBain (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, I am taking this first opportunity of speaking on the flag issue, as I did not avail myself of an opportunity to do so when it was before the house earlier. There will be some who will say I have already spoken during this debate, and in one sense that is true, as on February 18 I placed a resolution on the order paper asking the government to consider immediately the introduction of legislation which would acknowledge the Canadian red ensign as Canada's distinctive national flag, as endorsed by the Canadian Legion and the I.O.D.E. I had an opportunity to debate this resolution on June 1, but of course you realize that a member is limited to 20 minutes on the debate of a private member's resolution. Therefore at this time I wish to put forward some other thoughts I have had about this subject. These are thoughts I have collected during many interviews in past weeks with my own constituents, as well as ideas resulting from correspondence I have received, not only from the people in my riding of Elgin but from all across Canada.

During two week ends I had the opportunity of being present at quite large non-political gatherings, and I was amazed by the number of individuals who voluntarily expressed their opinions to me about the flag issue. As a result of these conversations I can only come to the following conclusions. The majority of the people in my area prefer the retention of the red ensign as Canada's distinctive flag. Those individuals who feel that now is the time for a new design were not happy with the three red maple leaf design. They are still not happy with the committee's proposed flag with the one maple leaf and the red borders. The third conclusion I came to was that they were discouraged and disgusted with the present parliament, and that the government should get off its high horse and finish the legislative program now on the order paper before bringing the flag issue back into the House of Commons. I might point out that a great portion of the legislative program on the order paper has been on the order paper for several months without members of parliament having the opportunity of discussing it.

[Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne).]

The first group of individuals with whom I had the opportunity of discussing this issue was made up of 300 people representing municipal and county councils who had gathered together to pay honour to a retiring clerk-treasurer who had served in that capacity for 25 years. These people are retired or serving representatives of municipalities, and have done so faithfully for many years. On two week ends I had an opportunity of visiting different rural fairs, where one has wonderful opportunities of meeting a cross-section of the public and obtaining knowledge as to the feeling of those people about an issue such as the flag issue. I also attended a Labour day celebration last September which brought together people from all walks of life, and again I was afforded the opportunity of taking part in discussions on the flag situation.

At this stage of the debate we are supposed to be discussing an amendment to the committee report, and this ties in with the unity of Canada through a plebiscite, asking that a ballot be taken at the next general election. I hope that this ballot will be taken but that the results will not be related to any specific region. I think that is how it should be carried out, because we know, as a result of various polls that have been conducted, that certain sections of Canada are strongly in favour of the retention of the red ensign, while other areas are predominantly in favour of a new design.

There was a time when I thought the Ottawa area was predominantly in favour of the three maple leaf flag. Last summer we observed a great deal of ballyhoo about the three maple leaf pennant which was being flown on car radio aerials throughout the city. Some people are still flying these pennants from their aerials. I am pleased that the new proposal has changed that design, because I am sure we can all recall having seen some of these pennants that were flown for two or three months and remember that they turned a dirty grey, with the blue colour having faded, and with frayed edges. In fact, I saw one one morning not long ago that was so anaemic in appearance I stopped and asked myself: Is this the design if passed by parliament to which we would pledge our allegiance and the allegiance of future generations? I think we must still ask ourselves this question in relation to the new proposed design.

I recall the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge), in speaking to this house, drawing to our attention the fact that

the three maple leaf design had been devaluated in one joke shop in the city from 98 cents, which was the retail cost when it first became available, to 19 cents. I am pleased that we are not now witnessing the same type of pennant, with the single maple leaf design, being flown in the same manner, but I do wonder why the Prime Minister has not proposed that a flag with the one maple leaf design, having red bars, be flown on a mast on parliament hill so that members could view it, as he did in respect of his own design.

One morning last week I was listening to a local radio station which each morning conducts a survey about various topics. The listening audience is invited to call the radio station and discuss the topic of the day. The morning I was listening the topic was the design of the flag expected to be presented to the House of Commons on the following day. I was surprised to learn that of ten or 12 telephone calls, only one approved the suggested design.

The same individual wondered why the present leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, when he was the prime minister, did not bring in a measure to make the Canadian red ensign, with or without changes, Canada's flag by act of parliament. One could also go back in history and ask why Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, when he was prime minister, did not make the ensign official by an act of parliament, or bring forth a new design. We know that he took the initial step, by order in council, to make the ensign the official flag to be flown on all government buildings at home and abroad. We could also ask why Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent, when he was prime minister, did not make the ensign the official flag by an act of parliament, or bring forward a new design.

I believe the three prime ministers I have referred to were aware of the danger of creating more disunity across this country by presenting a flag that would not be acceptable to a large majority of Canadians.

We of the Conservative party have endeavoured to place before parliament the reasons the present design is not acceptable to a large percentage of Canadians. We will continue to place these reasons before parliament. We have offered time and time again suggestions as to how the government should proceed to regain that lost unity which is evident across Canada, and which has resulted over the flag design proposal.

I wish to give two examples, Mr. Speaker, of how the flag question has created disunity and has divided our populace into two camps. A few weeks ago I had lunch with a resident of Ottawa who related to me an incident that happened to him last summer. During the hot days of July he had left his car parked with the windows open and some person had placed on the inside of his windshield a small Canadian ensign sticker reading "This is Canada's flag, let's keep it flying". As he related the story to me, this could have been on his windshield several days before it was brought to his attention by his young son. He did not tell me whether or not he was an ensign supporter but did say as far as he was concerned the sticker was doing no harm to him or anyone else until several days later when he went to unlock his car to drive home and noticed a young man standing by the car with an object in his hand. This man swore at him and told him to remove the ensign or he would smash his windshield to pieces. Naturally his reply was, "In the first place I didn't put it there and, in the second place, if you attempt to remove it by force there will be more than a broken windshield. It will be your head."

Several months ago, after I had placed my own flag resolution on the order paper, I recall receiving a picture postcard from the city of Toronto which was unsigned, the picture being of the Prince of Wales gates at the eastern entrance to the Canadian national exhibition grounds. The picture showed some 21 red ensigns flying over the top of the entrance and through each ensign there was a big black cross. On the back of the card were the words: "You Englishmen, there will be blood spilled over your ensign if you don't get rid of it".

We saw blood spilled several weeks ago during the flag debate, and spilled right here on the green carpet of this very chamber.

An hon. Member: That was not during the flag debate.

Mr. McBain: It was during the flag debate. Fortunately it was only cow's blood and the incident was not directly connected with the flag debate.

An hon. Member: Why bring it up then?

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): He is speaking in parliament and he has a right to bring anything up.

Mr. McBain: I also wish to say—

Canadian Flag

Mr. MacInnis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just taken his seat has been interrupting from behind the curtain. It is bad enough to have interruptions by members from their seats but when they start to interrupt when standing behind the curtain I think it is time the Chair did something about it.

Mr. McBain: I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not of English ancestry but rather my grandfather on my father's side came from the highlands of northern Scotland, and on my mother's side my great grandfather was Pennsylvania Dutch of loyal united empire loyalist stock. I was very proud today when the hon. member for Queens (Mr. MacLean) directed our attention to the fact that this is St. Andrew's day.

As I say, great disunity has been created in this country since the flag debate was first introduced in the House of Commons. We have had riots in various parts of Canada. We have seen flags burned. We have had an increase in the separatist movement in the province of Quebec. We have seen our armouries raided and robbed. Yes, Mr. Speaker, murders were even committed while this was being done.

When I spoke on my own flag resolution I stated that I was expressing my own personal opinions as well as the opinions expressed in approximately 90 per cent of the letters and telegrams I had received up until that time. That was last June 1, Mr. Speaker, and previous to that date I had received nearly 150 signed letters and telegrams all asking me to support the retention of the Canadian ensign as Canada's national flag. This figure has now mounted to 611. Since June 1 I have received many letters supporting my stand on the ensign but since that date I have received only three letters supporting some other design than the ensign.

In all fairness to those who are writing me in support of the ensign and to those supporting some other design I propose to put on the record some comments from each side. Before doing so I may say that some time ago I received a clipping from the Saint John *Telegraph-Journal*, being an article written by Jean Sweet. The article is entitled "In My Opinion", and in my opinion it exemplifies the feelings, I am sure, of many millions of Canadians. I am going to quote from the article. This lady says:

> Normally, like most peaceful citizens, I'm a coward about public issues. But I think the time has come to stand up and be counted on this flag matter.
>
> Most people who ever saw a tree know that big trees rise from big firm roots. If you trim away the roots you weaken the tree. If too much root is removed you have nothing. The tree—that grew slowly over many decades—weakens, falls and decays.
>
> Loyalties grow the same way, putting down roots in friendly soil. Without loyalities, even misplaced loyalities, man is nothing but a drifting derelict.
>
> Millions of Canadians grew up as I did in the friendly soil of a Canada we learned from earliest years to respect and view with immense pride. We were taught not to brag loudly and constantly about our land, but instead to know what we had and to feel secure in its tenets.
>
> Above all our flag has symbolized this land. It has grown with us. From pre-school age we loved the simple but intricately planned design of the union jack, so carefully integrating the major elements of Great Britain. We were proud when we saw the Canadian coat of arms in the fly of the beautiful flag. We sang songs to it. It meant our land.
>
> Through school days I have no recollection of any "Quebec question". I remember Montreal as a fascinating place I longed to see where, right in our Canada, two languages were spoken and peoples from many other lands settled and lived.
>
> Above all, as a child I watched the proud Van Doos march through the streets of our town, where they trained, headed by the tall lean figure of Colonel Vanier (I didn't know his name then, not until I met him as our Governor General). From that time I "saw" those proud French speaking troops "fighting for our flag" as news of their exploits trickled home. When we sang "We'll never let the old flag fall" the Van Doos were in the picture, dying in France for that flag.
>
> Well, as far as I am concerned no one man, no one group of troublemakers, can tell me "here is your new flag". This is a matter of roots, Canadian roots. If my flag can be readily discarded, so can my country and any other belief I ever held in it. It is disturbing and makes me wonder: what next?

May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McIlraith: Tomorrow we will continue with the same business as today, and when that is finished we will call item No. 7 on today's order paper, second reading of Bill C-131, an act to amend the Merchant Seamen Compensation Act; then item No. 51 on today's order paper, second reading of Bill No. 137, an act to authorize certain capital expenditures of the C.N.R.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask when Bill No. C-126 will be brought forward again?

Mr. McIlraith: I just announced the business for tomorrow. I do not know when we will be ready to take Bill No. C-126.

At ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, December 1, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. DIEFENBAKER—REMARK IN DEBATE BY MEMBER FOR LEEDS

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker—

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the house I would like to make a very short statement on the possible order of our proceedings.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I rose on a question of privilege, which takes precedence over any statement, and I ask to be heard on a question of privilege before any statement is made. I thought the Prime Minister was rising on a question of privilege.

My point of privilege has to do with a statement made by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson). The statement is to be found at page 10702 of yesterday's *Hansard*, where the hon. member for Leeds refers to a television interview with Mr. Geoffrey Scott on October 28. Then he says:

> Later on in the program he added: "Not this Christmas or any other Christmas".

That is in quotation marks. I do not object to a person being the chief propagandist of new models and designs for a flag, but that statement was never made by me at any time, under any circumstances.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUGGESTED CHANGE IN PROCEEDINGS DURING FLAG DEBATE

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately we were not able yesterday to dispose of the flag committee report, and under our rules, of course, a motion for adoption of a committee report has precedence over other business. I was going to suggest that perhaps we could get unanimous consent of the house to alter our rules to the extent that, if we are not able to deal with this report today, beginning tomorrow we should set aside half an hour each day for questions, notwithstanding the rules; but in order that the discussion on the flag committee report be given all the time to which under the rules it is entitled, I suggest that we alter our hours of sitting so that the half hour would begin at two o'clock, or on Friday at 10.30. Therefore we could spend each day from 2 to 2.30, or on Friday from 10.30 to 11 on questions, and then proceed with the business as laid down by the rules until this committee report is dealt with.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I have heard the words of the Prime Minister, but I think there are large gaps in what has been proposed. For instance, this proposition does not deal with statements made on motions by ministers. It does not mention other matters. For example, it does not deal with written or oral questions, on Mondays and Wednesdays, together with notices of motions for production of papers. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the whole of our routine business prior to the calling of orders of the day has to be considered.

This question was raised yesterday as a matter of interest to all hon. members of the house, because it is not only the members on this side of the house who are interested in these proceedings but also hon. members on the other side of the house. For instance, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) obviously would have some questions to ask at this time, as would the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan); and there are also other points.

I suggest to the Prime Minister that he reconsider his position and make a definitive statement, after negotiation dealing with routine proceedings. The urgent business of the house as detailed by the Prime Minister a month ago has been dealt with, with the exception of the present matter and another matter under the Minister of Labour, which it has been the government's choice to defer. I suggest that the advancing of the hours of sitting is quite extraneous to our routine procedure. What is the pressure? I see a shrug of the shoulders and a snicker on the part of the Prime Minister, but what is the pressure in the government's eyes on the basis of the government's announced business?

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister reconsider his position and that he deal with motions; that he deal with notices of motions for the production of papers; that

he deal with other routine matters. The government may wish to bring forward some bills; I am sure some of the Prime Minister's colleagues have some interesting matters to disclose to the house. There are a number of matters. I may point out to him that we have only to go back to the earlier editions of Bourinot to discover that on motions the only matters which could be discussed were motions dealing with the business of the house, certainly not motions in the nature of substantive motions such as we are now discussing.

Therefore I suggest that for the period of this debate, and for the period of our consideration of the seventh report of the committee should it be advanced by the government, this item of motions be considered as the first item of government business.

This is a government proposal which has arisen out of a direction of this house which was consequent upon a resolution of the government appointing a committee. We are not dealing with house business in the normal course on motions, and for that reason I suggest to the Prime Minister that he reassess the position and, as suggested yesterday, the government house leader consult with the other party leaders. I think some reasonable accord could be reached in that way, rather than having these proposals laid before the house at this time.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, in regard to the suggestion by the Prime Minister that we meet half an hour earlier to facilitate the question period, I should like to state that I believe we can reach the normal question period, deal with the questions hon. members wish to ask, and reach the point of allowing ministers to make statements on motions, as well as deal with all the other regular business before this house by simply allowing the motion now before us to come to a vote.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Olson: If there had not been ample opportunity to discuss the whole matter of a flag for Canada I could envisage that there might be some reason for carrying on that debate at this time. We have already spent 22 days on this motion, which was moved by the government and which is embodied in order 44 (A). The matter was referred to a committee which has come back with a report, and as far as we are concerned we do not accept the contention that a 10 to 4 vote is not a sufficient majority on which to bring this matter again before the house. We believe there has already been far more debate on this subject than necessary. We believe the people of Canada are fed up with this debate, and we think there is a very simple way of allowing the majority of this house to express its opinion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that he confine his remarks to the suggestion presented to this house this afternoon by the right hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, speaking strictly to the suggestion which has been made, we think there is a far more effective way of proceeding in an orderly fashion in this house, and that is by allowing members of this house to vote on the motion before us, following which all the other things will fall into place.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, the suggestion made by the right hon. Prime Minister is very generous, because it will allow us, if we so desire, to ask questions of ministers from 2 p.m. until 2.30 p.m. Monday through Thursday, and from 10.30 a.m. until 11 a.m. on Friday.

When the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) tells us that we should follow the orders of the day and then revert to the debate on the flag, this is another way the Conservatives are using—and note what I am saying—to delay the business of the house and endeavour to delay as much as possible the adoption of a distinctive national flag.

The Conservatives will carry this stigma before the eyes of the Canadian people, of that I am sure.

Mr. Lambert: This should not bother you; you are not here.

Mr. Caouette: When I hear the hon. member for Edmonton West side with his group, naturally, and suggest that orders of the day be called, after which we could resume the debate on the distinctive flag at leisure, I wonder if that was not settled in caucus, at that little meeting they held this morning.

If this house is not unanimous, I would suggest to the Prime Minister that we stick to the standing orders. The Conservatives can always ask their questions once we have adopted a distinctive national flag.

Mr. Lambert: Why should this bother you, when you are not here?

[*Text*]

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, since there does not

seem to be unanimous consent may I repeat the suggestion I made yesterday, namely that the President of the Privy Council in his capacity as house leader might call a meeting of the various house leaders to see if we can find any resolution of this problem.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, on the last suggestion perhaps I might be permitted to say that I made what I thought was a helpful suggestion, that we extend our hours of sitting so we would have half an hour each day for questions during the period when the rules do not provide for questions because we are discussing a committee report. That suggestion, Mr. Speaker, has not met with unanimous consent; therefore, of course, the house leaders of the various parties could get together to see if they can work out any other arrangement.

CANADIAN FLAG

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SIXTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Monday, November 30, consideration of the motion of Mr. Batten that the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, be now concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Monteith.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps this decision will have a slight dampening effect on some of the high spirits which marked the start of our sitting this afternoon.

The house will recall that yesterday the hon. member for Humber-St. George's, in his capacity as chairman of the special committee on the flag question, moved concurrence in the sixth report of that committee. The hon. member for Perth, who was also a member of the committee, proposed an amendment to the motion for concurrence that seeks to refer the report back to the committee with instructions to strike out paragraph 7 and substitute something else in its place. On the proposed amendment a point of order was raised by the President of the Privy Council.

It is for the Chair to determine whether the point of order raised by the government house leader is well taken or whether the amendment of the hon. member for Perth should be admitted for debate and decision.

I have had the advantage of hearing the views of several hon. members, which have been most helpful to me in reaching a decision. In addition to the house leader I have heard arguments by the two senior officers of the house themselves, the right hon. Prime Minister and the right hon. Leader of the Opposition. I have also had the benefit of the views expressed by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, who is the house leader of the official opposition and who seconded the motion setting up the flag committee. It has been helpful as well to have had expressions of opinion from the former Speaker, the hon. member for Edmonton West, and from the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre who is an acknowledged authority on the rules. There were also brief but valuable contributions to the discussion by the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency and the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

I have considered the point of order with care in an effort to reach a decision that takes account of the various arguments that have been advanced, and a decision that is in accordance with the practice and precedents in this country and in the British house whose practice, under our standing order No. 1, must be followed in cases not provided for in our own rules. In reaching my decision I have tried to take into account a number of factors which I will enumerate as briefly as possible.

1. We are here dealing with an unusual matter, namely the establishment of a national flag.

2. It is a matter with a very considerable emotional impact for every one of us.

3. The motion to commit the flag question to the special committee was moved by a member of the government, seconded by the house leader of the official opposition and passed unanimously.

4. As the Prime Minister has said, there has already been a very extended debate on the flag question in the house itself, with 165 speeches over a 23 day period.

5. In that debate the Chair has shown considerable leniency and has not enforced the rules of relevancy and repetition with rigidity.

6. The committee has also considered the question fully and has held no less than 45 meetings.

7. It is the duty of the Chair to see that the rights of members on all sides are fully protected so there will be freedom of discussion and the right of expression will not in any way, be stifled. Parliament is not a court but a forum.

8. The right of freedom of expression, however, should not imperil the right of decision.

Canadian Flag

I have also tried to take account of some of the unusual features of this particular committee, as follows:

1. It was a special committee.

2. It was charged with the task of considering a specific but most encompassing question.

3. It was asked to make a final report.

4. It was given a particular time limit in which to complete its work.

5. Its appointment, its power to report and the capacity of the house to act on the report are not restricted by any motion on the order paper on September 10, 1964.

I have also been conscious of certain factors relating to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Perth which I shall enumerate:

1. It relates to the question of a national plebiscite.

2. The question of a national plebiscite has already been discussed and voted on in the committee; in fact the first vote taken in the committee was on the question of a national plebiscite, and it was rejected 9 to 5.

3. As the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre has pointed out, however, Bourinot's fourth edition, at page 479, makes it clear that a committee may reconsider and even reverse a previous decision.

4. A vote was taken in the house itself on the question of a plebiscite on the 1st September 1964, as recorded on page 660 of *Votes and Proceedings* for that date.

5. That vote, however, was on a subamendment which dealt with details as to what questions should be included in a plebiscite but not with the basic question of whether or not a plebiscite should be held.

6. The basic question of whether or not a national plebiscite should be held, which is the subject of the amendment of the hon. member for Perth, has not as yet been decided by the house.

It will be apparent to all that these various factors which I have just listed, some of which are in direct contradiction with others, make the matter a difficult one for the Chair. We have heard it suggested that the flag committee no longer exists because it was a special committee set up for a fixed period of six weeks and a final report has been made. We have also heard that the matter before the house, however, does not relate to the final report of that committee but to its sixth report. We have been reminded, as well, that committees receive their authority from the house itself and that the authority of the house overrides that of any committee.

[Mr. Speaker.]

In order to reach some kind of reasoned judgment I have looked at all the factors in the situation. First let us look at our general practice with regard to the recommittal of a report.

1. In General, Recommittal of a Report

It seems that it has been our constant practice that when the motion to concur is proposed, the report of a select committee may be referred back to the committee for further consideration or with instructions to amend it in any respect.

(a) Bourinot's fourth edition, at page 479, states in part as follows:

> A report may be referred back to a committee for further consideration, or with instructions giving them power to amend the same in any respect. In this way a committee may regularly reconsider and even reverse a decision it has previously arrived at.

(b) Citation 322 of Beauchesne's fourth edition reads in part as follows:

> When the motion to concur is proposed the report may be referred back to the committee for further consideration or with instruction to amend it in any respect.

(c) Paragraph (4) of citation 325 of the same edition of Beauchesne states:

> When a motion is made for concurrence in a select committee report, it is competent for the house to adopt it, reject it, refer it back to the committee or decide that consideration of the report will take place "this day six months".

(d) Moreover, the precedents recorded in our *Journals* establish that when it is intended to refer back the report to a select committee on the motion for concurrence, the procedure has been to do so by amendment to such motion, and therefore without notice. With the time at my disposal I have failed to find during the last 45 years any instance in contradiction of that contention.

Now let us consider the recommittal of the final report of a special committee.

2. Recommittal of the Final Report of a Special Committee

It has been suggested that a special committee ceases to exist when its final report is presented to the house and that such a report cannot be referred back to the committee unless the committee is revived.

(a) In support of that view, citation 286 of Beauchesne's fourth edition states as follows:

> It is important that the motion for the appointment of the committee should state whether the committee shall report from time to time, for if it should report once without having been given such power, it will be defunct but may be revived. Special authorization should also be given to sending for persons, papers and records.

A select special committee ceases to exist on the moment its final report is presented to the house. The report cannot afterwards be sent back to the committee with instruction to amend it in any particular. If further proceedings are desired it is necessary to revive the committee.

(b) W. F. Dawson, in his book "Procedure in the Canadian House of Commons", expresses a view similar to that set forth in the second paragraph of citation 286, when he states at page 206:

It is possible for the house, on the rare occasions when it does debate a committee report, to move to accept it, reject it, hoist it, or refer it back to the committee with the power to amend, except of course in the case of special committees, which have to be reconstituted by the house before their reports can be referred back.

Mr. Dawson refers to no authority to substantiate his statement. It is likely that since he was the assistant chief of our English Journals branch from 1955 to 1958, and published his book in 1962, he made such a statement having in mind citation 286 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, which also appears verbatim in citation 555 of the third edition by the said author.

(c) In support of paragraph (2) of citation 286 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, the author gives as his authority May's thirteenth edition, page 486, and he refers to a procedure in the British house that is indicated as 105 C.J. 201.

Upon examination, the supporting references invoked by Beauchesne to substantiate the second paragraph of citation 286 are not very convincing and do not seem to corroborate the broad statement made by the author. The pertinent reference at page 486 of May's thirteenth edition is as follows:

If a committee, at the conclusion of their inquiry, make a final report to the house, the sittings of the committee are assumed to have been closed; and if further proceedings were desired it would be necessary to revive the committee.

However, in reading the footnotes below this statement, which are purported to be the supporting authority therefor, it would appear that these references are not related to the question of referring back a report but deal rather with cases where it was intended to commit a new matter to select committees which had concluded their work.

One of these footnotes also makes mention of a ruling of the Speaker in the British house in 1893 to the effect that a motion to commit a bill to a select committee on another bill was out of order as the committee, having reported the bill committed to it, had ceased to exist.

The other footnote on page 486 of May's thirteenth edition is the very same reference as the one given as additional supporting authority in citation 286 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, and deals with a procedure in the British house in 1850 which seems on all fours with that of 1893 referred to earlier.

There can be no quarrel with citation 286 in this regard and, in similar circumstances, those precedents probably would be valid in our house. However, other circumstances now prevail.

3. Our Practice

If citation 286 is to be interpreted as meaning that, with the presentation of its final report, a special committee ceases to exist to the extent that it has to be reconstituted, or that it has to be revived by a special motion before that report can be referred back to it, with instructions to amend, it is my view that such interpretation does not seem consistent with our practice.

A review of the comparatively few precedents which we have in this regard would indicate that in no case was a special procedure involved which would provide for the revival of the committee when referring a report back for consideration or with instructions.

What are the precedents?

(a) On April 14, 1919 (cf. *Journals*, p. 171) a special committee concerning the abolition of titles was appointed without any mention that the committee would report from time to time, and that committee was not so empowered at a later date. On the motion for concurrence in the committee's report, as will be seen at pages 293-4 of the *Journals* for May 22, 1919, an amendment was moved purporting to amend the report itself. Mr. Speaker Rhodes then stated in part:

When a motion is made for the adoption of the report of a committee, it is competent for the house to adopt it, to reject it, or to refer it back to the committee with or without instructions. Or, a motion may be made for the six months' hoist. I do not think it competent to move to amend the report of a committee.

The amendment was thereupon withdrawn and another amendment was moved to the effect of referring back the report to the committee with instructions to amend it in certain particulars.

(b) In 1926, when an amendment was proposed to the motion to concur in the final report of a special committee on the administration of the department of customs and excise, a sentence to the following effect was

appended to the amendment, and to the sub-amendment, namely:

"and that the committee for such purpose be revived".

I would direct attention to the *Journals* for June 22 and 23, 1926, at pages 461-2 and 464-5.

Since this is the only occasion on which such a phrase was employed, and as the authority for its use is itself in question, it is suggested that the omission of that or a similar phrase would provide meagre ground for ruling a proposed amendment out of order. In any case, the amendment of the hon. member for Perth does contain the phrase "and that the committee for such purpose be revived".

(c) On May 30, 1928, as recorded at page 476 of the *Journals*, a motion was made to refer back the third and final report of the standing committee on industrial and international relations with instructions to amend it in certain particulars. A point of order was then raised to the effect that the committee, having made its final report, had ceased to exist so far as the reference was concerned, and therefore no other reference with respect to the subject matter first referred could be made.

Although in this instance the house was dealing with the report of a standing and not a special committee, it is relevant to mention here the following statement which is part of the ruling made by Mr. Speaker Lemieux at that time, as recorded at page 3563 of *Hansard* for May 30, 1928:

So that the practice in the Canadian parliament does not prevent a report, even if it is a final report, of either a special or, better still, a standing committee, being referred back to be amended.

(d) There are other instances to be found in our records to the effect that although the word "final" did not appear in a special committee report, we may assume that it was the final report, and where amendments to refer the report back to the committee with instructions were moved on the motion for concurrence. In that regard I refer to pages 754-5 of the *Journals* for June 26, 1948, where two amendments were proposed to motions to concur in a report of the special committee on prices. While both these amendments were ruled out of order for various reasons, no question was raised with respect to the validity of referring the said report back to the committee.

[Mr. Speaker.]

4. Conflict between Citation 286 and the Formula in Beauchesne's 4th Edition

Much has been said about Beauchesne's citation 286, which states in effect that a special committee ceases to exist once its final report has been presented to the house. However, there is a fundamental contradiction between the terms of this citation and formula No. 95, which is to be found at page 397 of Beauchesne's fourth edition. That formula reads as follows:

The question being proposed "That the final report of the select standing (or special) committee on ..... be now concurred in,"

Mr. .....moves in amendment thereto, seconded by Mr. ..... "That the said report be not now concurred in but that it be recommitted to the select standing (or special) committee on..... with instruction that they have power to amend the same so as to recommend that .....".

It will be seen that in this formula provision is made for recommitting a final report of a special committee with instructions by way of an amendment, and no reference is made to the revival of the committee.

5. Unprovided Cases

Let us now consider unprovided cases. It must be borne in mind that if the procedure now under review is at all to be considered as an unprovided case, under the terms of our standing order 1 recourse must be made to May's sixteenth edition wherein it is stated at page 642 that when a report is recommitted the select committee with all its powers is thereby revived.

6. The Present Instance

What of the present instance? It has been suggested that the case of the special committee on the flag question is different from others, more particularly in that:

1. The resolution appointing such committee has fixed a limitation on the life of the committee in establishing that its final report was to be submitted to the house not later than six weeks from the date of its first sitting and that the referral back of either the sixth or the seventh report to such committee, after the time limitation provided in the resolution for its existence, goes beyond the decision taken by the house. It may also be said that the committee should again be empowered or reconstituted by a substantive motion after notice. Obviously at this stage of the session, when members' notices of motions have disappeared from the order paper, private members would be precluded from moving such a motion.

2. On the other hand, argument was made that what was before the house was not a final report of the flag committee but only an interim or sixth report.

It is my view that if paragraph 2 of Beauchesne's citation 286 were to be interpreted as meaning that with the presentation of its final report a special committee ceases to exist to the extent that it has to be reconstituted, or that it has to be revived by a special motion after notice before that report can be referred back to it, with instructions to amend, it is reasonable to say that the committee having ceased to exist on the presentation of the seventh and final report, which was tabled at the same time as the sixth, paragraph 2 of the citation should apply to the sixth report as well. But as I have already indicated this is not, in my view, a valid interpretation of the citation.

I am also of the opinion that the resolution appointing the committee should be considered in the light of the surrounding circumstances at the time it was adopted. If we do so, we see that at that time there was before the house the motion appearing under government orders, No. 44(A), an amendment moved thereto and a subamendment. There was also government order No. 44(B). Both these were suspended by agreement. It has been argued that it is unlikely that these two orders will again come before the house. In that case it would be reasonable to assume that the practical effect of refusing amendments to refer back either of these reports to the committee, with or without instructions, would be tantamount to preventing any decision of the house on the particulars mentioned in such amendments or on any other particulars connected with the subject matter of the question. In other words, to all intents and purposes it would have the effect of limiting the house to accepting or refusing the decision of the committee, and nothing more.

I have examined *Hansard* and have been unable to come to the conclusion—unless a very narrow interpretation, which would seem to me arbitrary, is given to what was said in the house with regard to this committee—that there was any intention unanimously expressed or any final agreement that the normal procedure should not be followed when the house would be acting upon the reports of the committee.

7. Conclusion

In conclusion I may say that if we look at all the special circumstances surrounding the complex and what seems to be unique problem confronting us, I think, rightly or wrongly, that to a great extent the problem goes beyond the mere strict and rigid technical and procedural sphere and that, for a large part, the answer is to be found in asking ourselves what is fair and equitable, having regard among other things to the surrounding circumstances, the commitments or agreements made, and also having regard to the desirability of not depriving members of certain basic rights through technicalities, real, doubtful or fictitious.

After careful consideration of all the factors involved I can come to no other conclusion but that in the present circumstances the point of order cannot be entertained. It is my intention to put the amendment before the house.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we on this side accept without question your ruling and learned decision. The amendment presumably is in order, and if it were carried the committee would be revived, presumably without any time limit at all. However, the amendment deals with a plebiscite. The right hon. Leader of the Opposition has more than once, and as recently as yesterday, declared his desire to have the question of a plebiscite dealt with at once without further debate. I propose therefore, Mr. Speaker, that we take the vote on the amendment at once.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: I am going to put the amendment. It has been moved by Mr. Monteith, seconded by Mr. Rapp:

> That the sixth report of the special committee be not now adopted but that it be referred back to the committee with instructions to strike out paragraph seven of the said report and substitute therefor the following:
> "However, as the final vote of the committee did not reveal a sufficient degree of unanimity for the proposed design for a national flag for Canada, your committee therefore recommends that the government be authorized"—

Some hon. Members: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Shall I dispense?

Some hon. Members: Dispense.

Mr. Pearson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I ask, for guidance, whether Your Honour proposes to limit the debate on this amendment to the question of a plebiscite?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: I implied that in my statement, in saying that during the previous days on which this question had been discussed the Chair had been extremely lenient in order

to give ample opportunity to any hon. member who wanted to say anything on the flag question, but that in future I thought that the rules of relevancy should be strictly applied.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I take it that you are not making a blanket ruling in advance, but that as arguments are put forward the determination will then be made by Your Honour.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Is the house ready for the question.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Elgin.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, may I raise a point of order as to whether the speakers yesterday spoke on the main motion or on the amendment.

Mr. J. A. McBain (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, I can probably answer the point raised by the Prime Minister. I mentioned at the outset of my remarks last evening that I was speaking on the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Perth, and that I propose to endeavour to do in concluding my remarks today. When speaking on this amendment last evening I also mentioned that in all fairness to those people who had been in contact—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. McBain: I was saying, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Elgin.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Give them some more peanuts down there.

Mr. McBain: As I was saying, last evening I mentioned that I wished to put forward for consideration some passages from correspondence I have received from those who support the new design and those who favour the retention of the red ensign. I was just reaching those comments last night when we arrived at the hour of ten o'clock. As I made that reference, Mr. Speaker, I hope you will allow me to refer to some of the correspondence I have received on this matter. The first letter from which I wish to quote today was received from the chairman of the flag committee of the Royal Canadian Legion. This letter is under date June 10, and he says:

> Many, many thanks for your kind letter of June 5 with which you enclosed copy of *Hansard* for June 1 which I eagerly perused. I am sure I speak for all members of the Royal Canadian Legion and other loyal Canadians when I say our most grateful and sincere thanks to you and your fellow members of the House of Commons for the tremendous effort you are making in an effort to keep our flag —the Canadian red ensign—flying. I assure you we will do our bit. We had a wonderful convention and I feel sure millions of Canadians now realize that we do have a truly distinctive Canadian flag and whoever heard of the red ensign causing disunity? I was on T.V. C.B.C. and this was one of the points I stressed.

I should like to put on record some feelings of another of my correspondents, who says:

> Regarding the flag issue, my husband and I hold this opinion.
>
> A spokesman for the French Canadians who are a minority group, says that any flag incorporating the union jack is totally unacceptable to them. What about the majority group of Canadians in every other province who would consider any flag not incorporating the union jack entirely unacceptable to them? Must we accept a minority rule?

Again I wish to quote from other correspondence.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): On a point of order, I should like to know how relevant these letters are to the amendment put forward.

Mr. McBain: I believe the amendment refers to a plebiscite, and I am endeavouring to present this correspondence to show why the people desire a plebiscite. I will not read all this correspondence, but another letter I have received says this:

> We have been and are permitted to fly in this fair country at the present time a flag known far and wide as the red ensign. It contains the union jack, which is truly a known and honoured emblem all over the world. Also on the same flag is the Canadian coat of arms, which is truly Canadian, and while the union jack makes the flag part of the British commonwealth of nations, the Canadian coat of arms identifies this as a Canadian flag.
>
> The right and justice this flag symbolizes has been fought for by men of our country. This flag was here before a lot of people who are now citizens came here or were born here. If they do not like it they are free to go somewhere else, where there is one they do like. So let's keep what we have, while we have something to be proud of, instead of a few dried up maple leaves, or something else to satisfy Quebec and a few others.

An hon. Member: What has that to do with the plebiscite?

Mr. McBain: I am endeavouring to point out that the flag question is creating disunity. It is pitting one part of Canada against another part. I am showing the feelings of the people in other parts of the country who live outside the province of Quebec. This correspondent continues:

> When the time comes to vote on this flag issue how many members will be coerced into voting for a new flag fearing that if this issue is defeated the Pearson government will call an election. I hope that you will use your vote and influence to retain our present flag, the red ensign.

Then I received a photograph from Winnipeg showing the citizenship court in session in that city. It depicts a swearing in ceremony for new Canadians which was held on March 4, 1964. In the background on the wall are two red ensigns in the form of a V. At the top of the V is the Canadian coat of arms. Below that picture is Her Majesty the Queen. This is a matter which is again creating disunity in Canada.

Mr. Caron: Why do you not speak on the amendment?

Mr. MacEwan: Go to Hull.

Mr. Mandziuk: Stand up when you want to speak.

Mr. McBain: Now I should like to refer to a telegram which has been drawn to the attention of the Prime Minister. This telegram was sent by the Canadian brotherhood of railway, transport and general workers, and is embodied in a letter which reads:

Dear Sir:

I am respectfully drawing to your attention the following resolution:

Whereas local 97, Canadian brotherhood of railway, transport and general workers, St. Thomas, Ontario, do hereby support with strong intent the Canadian red ensign as the national flag of the Dominion of Canada and that no other design or proposed design will be acceptable as a national flag by this local.

This resolution was passed unanimously at a meeting of this local this 13th day of May, 1964.

This letter was signed by the president and secretary.

A few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, when the representatives of the commonwealth countries were meeting in the west block, we had an opportunity to view the flags of each one of those nations. I viewed them on many occasions and was quite interested to note, as I am sure other hon. members of the House of Commons noted, that six of the commonwealth countries have incorporated in their flag the union jack. I refer to the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Northern Rhodesia and Southern Rhodesia. One day when I was standing outside the west block a tourist came along, and I asked this party to pick out the flag he liked best. I do not know where he came from and I did not ask him. I do not know whether he was from the United States or Canada, but he picked out our present ensign.

Having put forward these views, to satisfy my hon. friends across the other side I will quote from a few letters written by some who desire a flag other than the red ensign. I am sure members will not call me to order when I mention these letters. Here is one which says, in part:

Our country is today facing trying times due to fanatic separatists in Quebec who are the first to benefit by the stubborn insistence of these England-lovers to keep the union jack on our flag. A truly Canadian emblem such as the maple leaf should be the only emblem on our banner and should create greater unity throughout Canada and would serve to abolish the hyphenated Canadianism we now have. We should all be proud to consider ourselves as Canadians first and if we must still fly the union jack we could do so as a commonwealth banner. I cannot understand how anyone who claims to be a Canadian could be satisfied with anything less than a truly distinctive Canadian flag without any foreign symbol whether it be British or French or that of any other country. ...

We have a wonderful country here so let us all unite behind a symbol of which we can all be proud and love no matter what our racial origin was. Let us all be Canadians first and put Canada ahead of Britain, France, or any other country in the world.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The amendment before the house is to refer the report back to the committee for the discussion of a very definite question, the holding of a plebiscite.

The hon. member who has the floor at present is discussing just about anything except the amendment. In view of the very wise remarks you made a moment ago to point out that the debate is restricted to the amendment, I suggest that the hon. member should come back to the amendment or, still better, since the amendment was moved by his own party, that we should take the vote immediately.

At any rate, I feel that the hon. member's remarks are not relevant to the matter under consideration, since he is now reading letters he received. We all got letters about the flag but if we all started reading them, there would be no end to this discussion.

Consequently, I would ask you to call the hon. member to order so that the debate may be concluded as soon as possible.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, it seems rather strange that the hon. member for Lapointe should claim that the remarks of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. McBain) are not relevant, while almost everytime he speaks during a discussion, the hon. member for Lapointe is the first to make statements which are out of order as regards the rule of relevancy.

There seems to be a rule for the hon. member and another rule for the rest of the house. This is not the first time that he rises on a point of order; whether it comes from the

opposition side or from the government benches, if something does not please him the hon. member always takes exception, but when he is called to order, he claims that he is being throttled. Let him bridle his tongue instead of rising on points of order.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think I need any more instruction on this point, but I should like to refer hon. members to Beauchesne's fourth edition, citation 119 (3), which reads as follows:

> Relevancy is not easy to define. A wrong comprehension of it may have a serious effect on the freedom of speech. Members are often deprived of their right to speak on the pretext that their remarks are irrelevant when as a matter of fact they refer to matters perhaps remote but yet related, even indirectly, to the question under debate. In borderline cases the member should be given the benefit of the doubt. A great deal of latitude must be allowed in the House of Commons which is a forum where every phase of public affairs can be discussed and every member has the right to be heard, even if in doing so he sometimes disregards the rigidity of procedure.

I hope the hon. member for Elgin, having heard the discussion, will do his best to speak to the amendment.

Mr. McBain: Mr. Speaker, in pointing out the attitudes taken in correspondence I have received I was endeavouring to put before this house the divergence of public opinion, in a fair manner to each side of the question about the flag and a plebiscite. I read some comments from correspondence from individuals who prefer retention of the red ensign, and some from correspondence from individuals who prefer the other design.

Mr. Grégoire: Oh, oh.

Mr. McBain: If the hon. member for Lapointe does not wish to hear these expressions of opinion it must be because they irritate him. I suggest that otherwise he would not rise on points of order.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to be fair to both expressions of opinion in the correspondence I have received. I do not want to draw attention to one other telegram I have received in favour of the retention of the red ensign, but I should like to draw attention to a telegram I received which endorses a new flag. This telegram is from the international association of machinists, local 1975, St. Thomas, Ontario, which reads:

> Members of international association of machinists local 1975 St. Thomas Ontario endorse the idea of a new distinctive flag for Canada.

Yesterday we were informed by the chairman and other members of the flag committee about the diligence of hon. members in attending committee meetings, which sometimes occurred as often as three times in one day. It is gratifying to know that this committee on most occasions had 100 per cent attendance. I might say that I wish other committees of this house had as good attendance at their meetings and did not have to wait for such long periods of time before getting a quorum. I will not refer to the specific committee, as I think hon. members know which one it is. I do wish to congratulate the flag committee for its long hours of devoted work in an endeavour to bring back a report which would be acceptable to parliament.

The flag question has been before parliament for many months, probably for so many that at this time I should review the whole situation so hon. members will appreciate how it developed.

The first indication we had of the new flag was on May 14, when the Prime Minister invited reporters to his home—I assume that was at 24 Sussex street—and informed them that the government intended to proceed with new flag legislation. On that occasion he displayed several designs that were being considered, and mentioned that the government would stand or fall on the issue.

Three days later the Prime Minister went to Winnipeg to address the Royal Canadian Legion, dominion command, at which time he said he believed most seriously at this time that we should have a distinctive Canadian flag incorporating the maple leaf design. The next day he showed a few designs to a press conference. The next day, on May 19, it was reported that the government was considering designs, and on May 21 that the government had reached a decision, but that decision was not revealed. On May 27 the design with the three red maple leaves on a white background with blue bars at each end was made public.

I wonder why the Prime Minister brought in that type of design; because on looking through the parliamentary guide I noticed the Prime Minister was born on April 23, which is St. George's day. I would have expected the Prime Minister, in recognition of his birthday, to suggest a design that at least had some religious crosses on it.

It is the opinion of the majority of the general public on the question of the flag that it has been badly mismanaged by the Prime Minister and the government from the start. First we were asked to accept one design

or there would be a general election. The Prime Minister had his sights set on the unfurling of a flag of this design by July 1 of this year. When that situation did not materialize his sights were set on a second goal, which was to have Her Majesty unfurl the flag while visiting Canada, and I expect she would have unfurled it while in Quebec city. The second goal being unattainable, the Prime Minister has moved on to his third goal, which is to have a flag by Christmas.

I say this whole situation has been badly mismanaged, because parliament was asked to make a decision on only one design, a design personally selected by the Prime Minister. At least three designs should have been submitted to parliament for a decision by parliament. Parliament was asked to make a hurried decision, not as to the choice of a design, but to accept one which was the personal choice of one man.

We hope that on July 1, 1967, Canada will celebrate its 100th anniversary as a united nation. Would it not be fitting and proper to have as one of our major centennial objectives a flag design accepted by parliament or by the majority of Canadians, through a plebiscite later approved by parliament, to be unfurled on July 1, 1967?

Again I must commend the committee for their long hours of objective work carried out in their effort to honestly narrow the field of designs from thousands down to two or three. That committee has reported, but we are still faced with the dilemma of accepting or rejecting one design and one design only. The committee's report would be more acceptable to me if it had given parliament the opportunity through a free and unbiased vote to choose between the one maple leaf design, or a design with the union jack in the upper left hand corner and a fleur-de-lis in the right hand corner of equal proportions. If parliament is not to be given the opportunity of deciding between those two designs there is no other alternative but to let the people of Canada decide between these designs through a plebiscite.

Mr. Rock: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Speaker: You may with his permission.

Mr. McBain: Go ahead.

Mr. Rock: Thank you. Would the hon. member tell me whether the Canadian Legion at their convention in Winnipeg unfurled or displayed the red ensign for the first time, and whether previous to that time the Legion at all their conventions flew or displayed only the union jack?

Mr. Smallwood: You are nuts.

Mr. Winkler: That is wrong.

Mr. McBain: Mr. Speaker, I am unable to answer that question because I have not attended their conventions.

Mr. Winkler: That shows where the Grits stand so far as the Legion in concerned.

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, by Your Honour's ruling it may be that this question will be referred back to the committee, possibly on the ground, sir, that the people of Canada have a firmer grasp of reality than the members of this house, which may be so and may not; but it did seem to me that some comments on the questions of reality and symbols might perhaps be in order this afternoon.

When I was a very small boy, Mr. Speaker, if you can cast your mind back to that very remote period of history, someone put in my hands a little book of tales of an instructive, elevating and edifying nature. I presume the idea was to improve my moral character. There may be some question whether or not the effort was successful, but I will not press that point. However, some of what I read has remained with me.

There is one particular story which has remained in my mind and even to this day I can see the illustration that accompanied the story. It was a story which illustrated the stupidity of a dog. The dog was depicted as standing on a low footbridge over a stream. It had just dropped a bone from its jaws in an ill advised attempt to snatch at the more enticing looking bone which was reflected in the water below. Of course the idea of this cautionary tale was to impress on the infant mind the folly of throwing away the substance for the shadow. I would not go so far as to say that the effect of this cautionary tale was very great on my subsequent behaviour; nevertheless this story has come back into my mind as I have listened to the flag debate in the house.

I have noted that we have here the question of symbols and reality. Symbols, of course, are very important to us. We could not live without them. We could not live without the symbols we see on every printed page. We could not live without the symbols we make in sounds with our mouths. But because symbols are so important to us there is a very

common human tendency to confuse the symbol with the reality. In fact I think one could go further and say that periodically this tendency to confuse symbol with reality has created many, if not most, of the woes that mankind has brought on itself.

We have only to recall the quite violent and bloody schismatic troubles that arose in the early Christian church over the question of whether the divine blessing should be invoked by the priest raising in benediction two fingers or three fingers. In this case, of course, symbol had not only been mistaken for reality but actually had replaced reality in the minds of those pious people, and with great piety and vigour they proceeded to express their own choice among symbols, leaving reality to fend for itself.

This would lead me to suppose, Mr. Speaker, that as a general rule those with the slenderest grasp on reality are those who are most likely to be concerned with symbols. I have had this confirmed by the correspondence I have had on the flag. I have noted that my correspondents can roughly be divided into two categories, those who take a fervid and emotional approach and those who take a cool and objective approach, and I hasten to add that representatives of each variety can be found supporting each contention on the two sides of this quarrel.

But this leads me to suggest that here we are confusing symbol with reality in a very dangerous way. In my correspondence the cool and objective ones appear to take the position that the symbol itself is of no consequence. They are much more concerned with the reality that lies behind it, and they have become quite impatient with their representatives because they are so concerned with the symbol that they have had no time to get to work building the reality.

There is, of course, one all-important fact about symbols, and this is what concerns those who take the cool and objective approach; namely, that the symbol should be accepted by everyone to represent the same thing. We have achieved that in our language. We do not quite agree over the shape of the letters that are printed on paper, but we have all agreed that these letters, whether we like the shape of them or not, whether we think they are aesthetic or not, represent particular sounds and that a combination of those letters represents a more complicated sound which in turn represents an idea.

I am coming to the conclusion that the Prime Minister may have fallen into this pit of confusion and may have imagined that by creating a symbol he would thereby create reality, seeking, I assume, the very worthy reality of national unity. It would appear to me that the Prime Minister has deluded himself into thinking that if he creates a symbol which he will label national unity he will have thereby created national unity.

On the other hand the Leader of the Opposition seems to labour under the delusion that a symbol can destroy reality. Neither of these right hon. gentlemen seems to be seized of the all important fact that first of all there has to be a reality which can be represented by the symbol; that if there were in Canada a reality which could be known as national unity no symbol could destroy it, no symbol could disturb it. But we should bear in mind that no symbol can of itself create reality. Symbols have no intrinsic value of themselves. They have value only as representing something that is of value.

It may be that there has been a poll which suggests that 60 per cent of the Canadian people wish to have a plebiscite on this issue. I must confess I would have some sympathy for them, because I presume this is an expression of their feeling that they have a better grasp of reality than we have here. But I would also suggest that this is a very unsatisfactory way of reaching these conclusions. I would go further, Mr. Speaker, and warn those who are so fervid and so emotional over something that has of itself no intrinsic value whatsoever that they are risking the reputation of the most important democratic institution in our country.

I have observed on several recent trips to the western part of Canada a singular lack of interest in symbols, a complete lack of interest in the particular design upon which this parliament may finally decide, and a growing impatience with this concentration on symbols to the exclusion of concentration on reality. We were not sent here to play with symbols. We were sent here to create some realities, and I suggest that the Canadian people are seeking from this parliament the creation of the reality of a united, prosperous Canada with a national purpose and a national identity, and we are not going to achieve that by any short-cut of producing a symbol.

I suggest to both the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition that they should bear this in mind; that we should leave symbols for the communication of ideas, where they are important and necessary; that the Prime Minister should not delude himself into

thinking he is taking any step toward reality by the creation of a symbol and, equally, the Leader of the Opposition should not delude himself into thinking that because the Prime Minister seeks to substitute one symbol for another this will have the slightest effect on reality.

Furthermore, and I shall turn in a moment to this point, sir, the important point is that it should be accepted by everyone as representing something. I will suggest to you that whatever flag we choose, it will represent reality. It is up to us, as members of parliament, to make sure what the nature of that reality is going to be. It will represent equally well a disunited Canada falling to pieces; it will also represent equally well a united, prosperous Canada with a national purpose.

This flag, whatever it is, will be accepted by the bulk of the Canadian people in a remarkably short space of time as representing Canada. I think it is the duty of members of parliament, it is the duty of the government, to make sure that this symbol, which of itself is not of the slightest importance, has something worthwhile to represent. Let us get on with this and stop making ourselves the laughingstock of the country and the laughingstock in those parts of the world that pay any attention to Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Girouard (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, if I take the floor today it is for the very good reason that I promised my constituents to express, in due course, their point of view on this famous issue of the flag.

Now that there is hope that this matter will soon be settled I wish to make a few remarks.

Were it only a matter of stating my attitude and that of my constituents, my speech would be rather brief. I would only have to say that it is my duty, as member for Labelle, to vote for the distinctive flag chosen by the committee, and against the union jack as a second flag suggested by the government.

I am very much afraid, however, that it is not that easy; moreover I would not be satisfied if I did not take this opportunity to explain the reasons for my choice.

It seems to me that the flag debate will have been a test for confederation. We will have seen and heard people express freely their ideas, their feelings, their love and sometimes their hate toward the proposed symbols and the ideas which those symbols represent. We will have feared, for a while, that this ideological conflict would deteriorate into a racial or cultural one. But since any test is a source of reward, we will have also seen that, through the worse sentimental crises, it is possible to live side by side in Canada and that, all things being considered, the fathers of confederation were wiser than we thought.

For the first time in this house, the French element has seen the English element get panicky, haggle and recriminate; please note, Mr. Speaker, that I believe my colleagues had not only the right but the duty to act as they did. I know that they will now be in a better position to understand why we, from Quebec, are clinging to certain rights which we believe to be fundamental rights and which we want to uphold at all cost.

I have no doubt the house will also have realized that when I spoke of people expressing themselves freely I had in mind the members of the opposition parties and not the government members, for in the Liberal party there is unanimity. Indeed, the Liberal party has always been a party enjoying unanimity; for better or for worse, Liberals vote as one man. And why blame them if it agrees with them?

Even at the time of conscription, when the province of Quebec strongly opposed such a measure, Quebec Liberals all voted solidly; they were returned. Quebec, like the Prime Minister, was opposed to the acquisition of nuclear weapons, and Quebec Liberals voted solidly for nuclear weapons. Quebec was against the interference of the federal government in the field of education, but the Liberals voted solidly for loans to students. Quebec was against the interference of the federal government in the provincial and municipal fields, but the Liberals gave a solid vote for assistance to municipalities.

Mr. Prud'homme: And where does the referendum fit into all this?

Mr. Girouard: That will come.

Quebec strongly opposes the union jack as second flag for Canada, but the Liberals voted for such a recommendation in the flag committee, and I am sure they will vote solidly for the union jack when that proposal comes before the house.

Therefore, to grasp what occurred concerning the flag I must note the behaviour of free members, that is the members of the various opposition parties.

It is astonishing to see how public men, with the same degree of sincerity, can take such different stands on fundamental issues. Such attitudes cannot be explained otherwise than through a study of the Anglo-Saxon and Latin-French temperaments, which are altogether different.

This brief sociological study will not settle anything, I am sure, but if I could convince the house and the Canadian people that the phenomena which are taking place at the confederation level are not monstrosities, but normal reactions for the two racial groups which founded this country, I would have made quite a step toward the dialogue.

The Latin temperament that French Canada inherited is not a conservative one, in the psychological sense of the word. One has but to study the history of France to find how different it is, say, from that of Britain. Latins have violent, if not revolutionary, reactions. In France, an emperor dethroned a king, a king dethroned an emperor, a revolution dethroned a king, republican regimes came and fell one after another. France today has achieved a certain stability through a president who, with the sovereign consent of the French people, acts much more like a dictator.

In the United Kingdom, on the other hand, when constitutional conflicts did occur, it was always to protect the established principles and traditions—

Mr. Drouin: I am greatly interested by the wanton spirit shown by the hon. member for Labelle, but I have yet to see what his comments have to do with the amendment now before us and the referendum it proposes.

Mr. Girouard: Mr. Speaker, as soon—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I listened with interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Labelle and I have the impression that what he has said up to now is just an introduction to his subject.

Mr. Prud'homme: A lengthy introduction.

Mr. Girouard: Mr. Speaker, in this house, as soon as we try to forget politics a little to underline the reality at the bottom of the whole matter, as soon as we try to study the reactions of hon. members, in other words, as soon as we leave small politics, people claim we are wandering from the subject. I say that on a matter like the flag, if the members of the House of Commons had searched their souls before taking a stupid stand, confederation would not have been endangered.

Mr. Speaker, I shall proceed with my study. I was saying that in Great Britain, for instance, the kingdom has broken up, the empire has distintegrated, the commonwealth is in a bad way but has managed to survive; however, the monarchy still remains as a symbol of stability within order.

What I mean by all this is merely that, for the Latin people, vested interests are only worth their usefulness, whereas for Anglo-Saxons, traditions are law.

It must be admitted, in all fairness, that for my English speaking colleagues, who displayed on their ships, on their battlefields, and cherished a flag symbolizing affection for proud Albion through many centuries, it was quite disappointing to witness the removal at one sweep of any symbol on the flag they considered as their own, as their Canadian flag, which, besides, had been acknowledged as such by Mackenzie King in 1945 when he decreed—and this is the irony of fate—that the red ensign would be flown whenever it would be desirable to "erect a distinctive flag"—

Mr. Drouin: Hoist.

Mr. Girouard: Hoist. I am glad the hon. member corrected me, because it is the only sensible thing he has said about the flag.

Besides, those inclined to question the honesty of some of my colleagues need only recall the rousing plea of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr) in order to admit that, rightly or wrongly, he was then speaking from the heart.

I feel, however, that some of my colleagues have been more Roman Catholic than the Pope, more English than the British people, more crown conscious than the Queen.

They must keep in mind that the 20th century also has its rights. They must remember that conservative England has, most shockingly, just elected a socialist government, and with the kindly tolerance of Her Majesty herself.

A lot of things were said in the course of this debate and many of them were regrettable.

However, I should like to say that the flag recommended by the committee is not a Quebec flag. If my province greets it so enthusiastically, it is not because it is anti-monarchist; it is not. Nor is it because it is anti-British; it is neither anti-British nor anti-colonial. Quebec supports that flag because it is wholly Canadian.

I should like to pause here a moment to point out the paradoxical situation in which we find ourselves following this epic and emotional debate. I have just stated that French Canada is proud of having a wholly Canadian flag. That is true but I can understand why such an attitude on our part may surprise our fellow citizens.

I refer to the fact that as an ethical group we refuse to have Canada become a melting pot in the American fashion where all citi-

zens would be "Canadians". We want both nations, the French speaking and the English speaking to retain their own identity within one Canada.

We Quebeckers, refuse to surrender our rights to the French language and we struggle, in order that, in Canada, the two languages be official.

We Quebeckers, want to keep jealously our traditions and our civil law.

And yet on the flag issue when the Conservative party, from our leader down, want to give us a flag establishing exactly this ethnic, historic and cultural duality, we say: No. We want one flag for one Canada.

Just as astonishing is the reaction of our English speaking colleagues who always showed a preference for Canadian standardization and who, all of a sudden, offer us half of the flag to put the French fact on it.

Mr. Speaker, if public men have let their feelings run away with them, like children, it is no doubt because public opinion in Canada was diversified and changing, but also because once again the political situation refused to budge to make way for downright honesty—

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Girouard: While commending—

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Would the hon. member tell us whether he is supporting the amendment moved by his party?

Mr. Girouard: I quite understand why the hon. member is anxious to know my stand in that regard, but if he had the kindness, the tact or at least the politeness to wait for me to conclude my speech, I would be very happy to let him know what my stand is in this regard.

Mr. Drouin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member has used up enough time for his opening remarks, and I quite understand why it took him so long to get here for we have not seen him for several months. However, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member should abide by the decision of the Chair.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Labelle has the floor.

Mr. Girouard: Referring to the fact that the hon. member has not seen me in the house for many months, I leave the matter to the discretion of my colleagues in the house, visitors in the gallery and reporters, who know what to think in this regard. If the hon. member feels so much at ease and if he believes that I am intimidated by his insults, he is wrong, because it is more difficult to say the truth than to insult others, and if he believes that he can thus intimidate me, he is mistaken.

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Speaker, I am only asking the hon. member to abide by the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member is familiar with the standing orders of the house and especially the ruling made this afternoon by the Speaker when he invited the hon. members to abide more strictly by the standing orders which compel hon. members to stick closely to the matter under consideration, in this case an amendment to the main motion.

Mr. Girouard: I take the liberty, Mr. Speaker, to remind you most humbly that the previous speaker referred to the Bible for 15 minutes before saying a word about the referendum; yet, he had the indulgence of hon. members.

At this time I venture to point out, before saying whether or not I am in favour of a referendum, that as far as I am concerned my vote is dictated by my conscience and not by the leader of my party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while congratulating the Prime Minister for being successful in his proposal for a distinctive flag, I must blame him severely for having dragged the Canadian people into an imbroglio which has proven disastrous.

During his election campaign the Prime Minister merely said that Canada would have a distinctive flag.

For the province of Quebec there can be in the flag no sign whatsoever of links with the past. But, for the other provinces, a distinctive flag is a flag representing no other country—

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Speaker, again I rise on a point of order. You made a ruling a moment ago, but it is obvious that the hon. member for Labelle is not complying with it.

In the circumstances I ask that he be called to order without delay.

Mr. Martineau: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes (Mr. Drouin) should have the courtesy—I know that he is usually very courteous—to let the hon. member who now has the floor go on with his speech and not

tell him what arguments he should put forward.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you will be able to have him comply with the standing orders of the house.

[*Text*]

Mr. Nasserden: On a point of order. We have had these repeated interruptions by the hon. member opposite—not points of order, in fact, but simply interruptions in the course of a good speech being made in the house today. If the hon. member has anything to say, his opportunity will come and he should get up on his own two feet and say what he wants to say when his turn comes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am afraid the Chair cannot agree with the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Nasserden). The hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes (Mr. Drouin) rose on a point of order. The point was well taken and the hon. member who has the floor should limit his remarks to the subject matter before us. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Girouard) did say in explanation he was going back in history to indicate why he would vote for or against the amendment and I assume that in due course we will get the final word on the subject.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Girouard: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before finding out whether we were going to have a referendum on the distinctive flag issue I was trying to define what it is and, in my opinion, it is precisely the difficulty of arriving at such a definition that has caused so much misunderstanding and discussion in this house.

I was saying therefore that according to the Prime Minister's promise, as far as Quebec is concerned a distinctive national flag should not bear any sign of a tie with the past, while for the other provinces a distinctive flag would be one the like of which no other country would possess, and that does not exclude a modified version of the red ensign. The fact that the American flag has 50 stars does not make those of Burma, Australia, Egypt, Pakistan, Syria or Yugoslavia, which also have stars, any less distinctive.

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is obvious that the hon. member for Labelle is now provoking the Chair by not bowing to the ruling you gave a moment ago.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, on this point of order, I understand the difficulty of the hon. member to bow to your ruling, since he is reading a speech written by whom I do not know, but he is thus violating two standing orders at the same time: he is reading a speech and he does not keep to the matter under consideration. I therefore ask you to give a strict ruling. If he cannot deliver his own speech, at least let him comply with the rules in a normal way.

Mr. Girouard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on two questions of privilege. My first question of privilege is to ask you to compel the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) to withdraw his charge against me to the effect that my speech has been written by someone else. I will give afterwards the necessary explanations.

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Speaker, I find that the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Girouard) is quite bold, because he is asking the protection of the Chair to make another member withdraw his words, when his remarks are inconsistent with the matter under consideration and he flatly and systematically refuses to abide by the Chair's ruling.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I did not hear the hon. member for Lotbinière mention that the speech of the hon. member for Labelle had been written by someone else. He said: "A speech that could have been written by somebody else." I must point out to the hon. member that this problem often arises because some hon. members read their speeches, a practice to which the Chair has not objected consistently so as to make the debate easier for members of the house.

I do not believe that the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Labelle is well taken. In addition, I remind him once again that his remarks are outside the matter under consideration and that the point of order raised by the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes (Mr. Drouin) is well taken, in that the hon. member for Labelle should restrict his remarks as far as possible to the matter now before the house, that is, an amendment to the main motion.

Mr. Girouard: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Now, on my question of privilege, I would ask the hon. member who said that my speech had been prepared by someone else, to withdraw his words, and since he wishes to have some explanations, I would say to him, first of all, that I am capable of delivering a speech without reading it, and if I read

it today, it is on account of the situation. That also, I think the house—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Chair has ruled on the hon. member's question of privilege and I do not think there is any reason to continue the discussion on this point. I invite, therefore, the hon. member to co-operate with the Chair and return to his speech.

Mr. Girouard: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has left a doubt in the minds of the people of this country on what constitutes a distinctive national flag. However, the Prime Minister did not cope with this doubt, but he took pleasure in amplifying it.

First, he defies the Canadian Legion at Winnipeg and talks only about his three maple leaf flag.

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Labelle is absolutely indecent. He even begins his words in these terms: "As I said."— He is thus directly provoking the Chair, and I think you should use your authority to call him back to order.

Mr. Martineau: I believe that the hon. member will admit that the word "indecent" used with regard to another member is not good parliamentary language. I am certain that you will not allow your serenity to be provoked, and that you will apply the rules impartially as you have always done.

I feel that the remarks of the hon. member for Labelle, up to now, are strictly in order, because he explains the subject matter of the question, which is directly connected with the plebiscite question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, I ask the hon. members to allow the hon. member for Labelle to go on with his remarks at least a little longer so that the Chair may form an opinion as to whether his remarks are related to the subject now before us, and to what extent.

As for the point raised in connection with the use of the word "indecent", it seems to me that the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes did not use it in the same meaning as the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue.

Mr. Martineau: Is there another meaning?

Mr. Girouard: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Allow me to add that if some hon. members do not want to listen to me, they can always go behind the curtains, as they do when there is a vote which does not interest them.

Mr. Drouin: Is that what you did last Friday?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I would ask hon. members to let the hon. member for Labelle continue his remarks.

Mr. Girouard: Last Friday, Mr. Speaker, I was at a political meeting explaining the events which had taken place in the house during the week.

As I was saying, the Prime Minister went to Winnipeg and talked about one flag only. Later, he came to the house and talked about a second flag for Canada, namely the union jack. Then the Prime Minister came before the house saying that he would leave his members absolutely free to vote on this matter. Some time later he came back to the house and stated that his members would be bound, in view of the fact that the government would consider a defeat on the flag measure as a non-confidence vote. And later on, the Prime Minister told us that his members would be free and that he would not consider the defeat on a motion regarding the flag as a government defeat, and he kept that confusion alive until the day when he stated: We shall go on to the end.

When it was necessary to refer the flag issue to a committee although the government had already spent two months fighting for the three maple leaf flag, its own members in committee voted against it and suggested a single leaf flag.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the members for Lake St. John (Mr. Lessard) and Danforth (Mr. Scott) praise the serious, honest and non-partisan work accomplished by the members of the flag committee.

While I was listening to them I thought I was sitting in the first row at an election meeting; I entertain no doubts about the seriousness and honesty of the members of that committee, but allow me to smile at their non-partisanship in this matter.

A mere glance at the report of the committee shows that, from beginning to end, everything was but a booby trap where one political group was endeavouring to catch the other. The results are quite obvious. Fifteen men who sat for six weeks, scrutinized thousands of proposals and heard a great number of experts, simply realized that the New Democratic party was right in asking for one maple leaf instead of three and that the Prime Minister had made a brilliant discovery when he advocated the two vertical bands which symbolize both

oceans. Only, the members of the committee painted the two oceans red.

But, there again, it may be that the members of the committee did their utmost. Caught between the courage, the boldness and the stubbornness of the Leader of the Opposition and the diplomacy, the weakness, not to say the cowardice of the Prime Minister, they proposed a compromise—

Mr. Drouin: I can understand that the hon. member for Labelle wants to lend a hand to his colleagues of the Conservative party in a filibuster designed to delay as long as possible the adoption of a distinctive flag. However, I feel that it is time for you to make a ruling, Mr. Speaker, and to call the hon. member to order. He has not spoken at all on the motion before us.

The hon. member for Labelle imagines that his remarks are in order when he speaks on the proceedings of the committee or on the flag proposed by the committee. That is not the matter before us. In fact, it is an amendment to the main resolution and the hon. member should stick to the amendment itself and not refer to the main motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I would ask the hon. member for Labelle to bear in mind the suggestions repeatedly made by the Chair since the hon. member started his speech. The point of order raised by the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes was surely well taken and standing orders state that a member must confine his remarks to the matter under consideration. The hon. member for Labelle will surely admit that the Chair was most lenient in his case. I therefore suggest that for the remaining part of his remarks the hon. member should confine himself to the subject matter now before the house.

Mr. Girouard: Mr. Speaker, I now come to the referendum, but I have much displeasure to note once again that French Canadians are preventing other French Canadians from speaking when all they are asking is the respect of their colleagues; unfortunately, those who are asked to respect their colleagues have no respect for one another.

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The fact that I am a French Canadian and that the hon. member for Labelle is also a French Canadian has no bearing on the point of order I raised. I only did so because I think he should adhere to the rules of the house, and also for the sake of other hon. members sitting in this chamber. It is not as a French Canadian that I have requested the Chair to call the hon. member for Labelle to order, for I do respect the hon. member for Labelle. However, I do not believe—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The question raised by the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes and that of the hon. member for Labelle may be interesting, but I repeat that the hon. member who now has the floor seems to be straying away from the rules of the house, in that he is not confining his remarks to the matter under consideration, that is the amendment to the motion made by the hon. member for Humber-St. George's (Mr. Batten).

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. May I be permitted to call your attention and that of the house on paragraph (2) of standing order 34, which reads as follows:

> Mr. Speaker or the chairman, after having called the attention of the house, or of the committee, to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance, or repetition may direct him to discontinue his speech.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore ask you to enforce this rule and—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. This rule refers to a member who wanders away from the matter under consideration, whereas the hon. member for Labelle seems about to come to it.

Mr. Girouard: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is fortunate that the house made a wise choice when electing you to preside over our discussions, a fact which allows the members to enjoy freedom of speech, even if they sit in the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, we shall probably vote this week on the referendum issue, and in order to be agreeable to my hon. friends opposite, I may tell them that I shall vote against the holding of a referendum.

They should be happy now, and I should be able to even better explain the decision I have made, because, as I said in my opening remarks, I shall vote in favour of the single maple leaf flag.

First of all, because such is the wish of my electors, and, then, because I consider it is important for Canada to be identified as much as possible as a sovereign country.

And since I favour the maple leaf flag, I fail to see why I should support the request that this matter be dealt with through a referendum.

However, I take this opportunity to ask the government to please show some logic. Either

Canada is prepared to give expression to its independence, or it is not.

If Canada has attained that degree of maturity, well, long live the maple leaf, and let us do away with the union jack.

If, on the other hand, our nation is to retain the marks of her glorious past, let us adopt the flag put forward by the Leader of the Opposition, that is equal representation of the French and English history on the same flag.

Actually, I wonder what the government will gain by sitting on the fence.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, I know that my suggestion will not be acted upon. The great and unanimous Liberal party will do as it pleases, in the best political interest of its members.

As for my colleagues who are listening to me and who understand me, I am telling them very humbly that the time of the vote is near, because whatever the position of each one of our constituents, they are unanimous on one point, and it is that they want us to vote on this issue.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Girouard: Judging from such approval, Mr. Speaker, you can see that the member for Labelle is not out of order.

An hon. member has the responsibility to vote according to his conscience and according to the conscience of his electors. The majority must prevail. That is the basic rule of democracy. The people will have their say about this decision in the next election.

After all, Mr. Speaker, if a flag is the symbol of a nation many other conditions are required to ensure the success of a country such as ours and those qualities that no country can do without, namely, understanding and love of one's fellow men, should be and are deeply felt, I hope, by every one of us, even though I have strong doubts about this today. Those are the qualities which have up to now and will continue in the future, I hope, to promote Canadian unity.

[*Text*]

Hon. H. J. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, at this stage perhaps it might be useful to refer to the original motion before the house. I fully realize there has been a bit of dissatisfaction over some of the remarks made by the previous speaker inasmuch as it was alleged that they were slightly out of order, so I propose to confine my remarks to the amendment as closely as possible. I would suggest that the paragraph of the report having to do with the plebiscite is the one to which I would ask you to direct a good deal of your attention.

We have before us a motion presented to the house by the chairman of the flag committee, who served as chairman with great distinction, and I should like to associate myself with the remarks made in this chamber by every hon. member of the committee who has spoken so far. He conducted the affairs of the committee with great impartiality and with a great degree of fairness. He has conducted himself in his public statements since the committee reported in a manner which would lead one to the conclusion that his statements would not lend themselves to any interpretation other than as being a correct interpretation of what took place. Therefore at this stage I want to say that the chairman of the committee acquitted himself in a manner which reflected credit both on him and on the government which appointed him.

Now, since the original motion, which has now been amended by an amendment which was accepted by the Speaker this afternoon, is relatively short I should like to read it. May I say that while I do not pretend to be an expert on the rules I do claim to have a degree of common sense. In my opinion, if in the judgment of the Speaker of the house the right to refer back to the committee something which the house itself felt should be referred back were denied, then it seems to me that we are placing the committee, which is the servant of the house, in a position of superiority to the house itself. Personally I was very pleased with the decision of the Speaker from that common sense point of view.

The original motion, Mr. Speaker, is in these terms:

> That the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, be now concurred in.

I have taken the trouble to look up the meaning of the word "concur". I realize it is not a long word or a difficult word. Nevertheless the meaning of the word is of most importance to this house and the members of the house in our anxiety to arrive at a proper conclusion. I find the meaning of the word both in the Oxford dictionary and in Webster's is "to agree with". So we have a motion before us at this stage, a motion which has been amended, which moves that the report of the committee be now agreed with by this house.

I suggest that when we say that the report shall be agreed with we are also agreeing with the general proposition that everything that went on in the committee and which is embodied in the report is to be agreed with, which is a proposition I cannot accept. I was a member of the committee and I consider it a great honour to have been chosen.

In view of the fact I have said I was unable to agree with the motion, or the report of that committee, I should like to state that I take that position partly because of its decision not to hold a plebiscite. Having said that I propose to substantiate, if I am able, the reasons I took that attitude.

I should like to make two comments about the attitude taken by the members of the committee. I believe the majority of members came to the committee meetings with a desire to arrive at some decision which would be of benefit to Canada, but the majority also brought with them to the meetings of that committee certain opinions, as reflected by the committee report, that could not help but lead to the conclusion that their maximum compromise involved a substitution of a one maple leaf design for the government sponsored three maple leaf design. That was the compromise in the minds of the majority of the members of that committee. The compromise of simply switching the one maple leaf design for the three maple leaf design did not and does not satisfy me.

The most important feature about a flag is that which it stands for and symbolizes. If you discard these features, or if the country discards them, everything must be discarded and the consideration recommenced. It is my belief that this committee will be remembered much more for the things it eliminated for consideration for inclusion in the design than for the things it incorporated in the recommended design.

Mr. Speaker, before commenting in detail on the committee report I should like to examine the terms of reference. They are most important, and in view of their shortness I should like to read them. They are to be found at page 682 of *Votes and Proceedings* of September 10, 1964 and read as follows:

On motion of Mr. Favreau, seconded by Mr. Churchill, it was resolved that a special committee of this house—

Mr. Lloyd: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. May I draw your attention to page 451 of May's Parliamentary Practice, sixteenth edition, and quote to you from the first paragraph as follows:

[Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton).]

A member, while speaking to a question, may not introduce matter which is irrelevant to that question; allude to debates of the same session upon any question or bill not then under discussion—

I should like to quote now from the first paragraph under the heading "relevancy in debate", commencing about half way down, also to be found in that same edition of May's on the same page:

Debate must not stray from the question before the house to matters which have been decided during the current session—

This is the important part:

—or anticipate a matter appointed for the consideration of the house, or of which notice has been given.

I submit that what we would like to hear from those members who favour a plebiscite, and I think they should speak to that point, should be related to the question which should be asked of the public in the form of the plebiscite, and the reasons such a plebiscite is necessary. If we do not follow that course, Mr. Speaker, much of the debate now taking place will be repeated during our consideration of the main motion. There will indeed be a great deal of repetition, and it seems to me that you, sir, must take cognizance of these factors if we are going to maintain any kind of rule of relevancy in this house.

Mr. Churchill: Will the hon. member participate?

Mr. Smallwood: The people from Halifax would appreciate hearing some contribution from you on the red ensign.

Mr. Lloyd: Mr. Speaker, I am entitled to address Your Honour and that is why I spoke on this question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Halifax has risen on a point of order which is obviously well taken. The hon. member for Victoria-Carleton is aware that in the course of the debate earlier this afternoon the Chair referred hon. members to a suggestion made by Mr. Speaker today that the rule of relevancy should be respected perhaps a little more strictly than it has been previously in this debate. I would ask the hon. member to keep that in mind.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks I said I was going to build my argument on the basis of the motion and then connect it to the question of a plebiscite. I am sure you would not wish to deny me the privilege of doing so. I do not expect any consideration from the hon. member for Halifax, therefore

I am not disappointed. I should like to ask how any person could properly discuss an amendment to a motion without making some reference to the motion itself. It just seems to make ordinary common sense that one must at least make some reference to the main motion.

I had begun to read the terms of reference to the committee on the flag, and should like now to continue to do so. The terms of reference are:

> On motion of Mr. Favreau, seconded by Mr. Churchill, it was resolved, that a special committee of this house, consisting of 15 members, to be designated later by the house—

This is the point I want to bring to the attention of the house, and may I ask your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, in not looking at the clock, as the hon. member for Halifax took up ten or 15 minutes of my time with his long dissertation. I do not know who looked up the citation for him.

To continue with the terms of reference they state:

> —be appointed to consider and report upon the flag question—

I draw the attention of the members of this house to the words "the flag question", because they are found in the broad terms of reference, and were not confined to the selection of a design. The committee was asked to study and report upon the whole flag question.

I submit that the flag question is an important question to this country. I have never acknowledged its urgency by any remarks I have made in this chamber concerning it, but I have acknowledged the importance of this question. When listening to members opposite who call out "question" on every occasion when someone on this side attempts to discuss this matter concerning the report of the committee, I have the impression that they feel it is a crime for any member to discuss this matter. I cannot understand that attitude. Perhaps they do not realize or recognize those things which are important to Canada. Perhaps that is the trouble with a good many of them.

In the process of coming to the question of a plebiscite, Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that the terms of reference say that this committee is empowered to report, and that the capacity of this house is to act upon the report without restriction by any motion now on the order paper. In other words, it simply means that this takes precedence. If one were inclined to do so, I submit that he could interpret that part of the terms of reference to mean that anything covered by orders Nos. 44 (A) and 44 (B) could be discussed on this motion in connection with the committee report. Those terms of reference set out specifically that they supersede and override anything else on the order paper which has nothing to do with them.

I find no fault with the committee because the majority of its members felt it was their duty to recommend a design. I have never felt that that was a duty of the committee. I feel that the committee should have chosen to recommend to this house that a plebiscite be held, and that would be perfectly logical and the proper thing to do in keeping with those terms of reference. The whole flag question has agitated various parliaments in differing degrees, and this is what was to be considered and reported upon by the committee.

So at this moment, leading up to the matter of a plebiscite, I think it is very proper for us to examine what took place in the committee, because as I mentioned at the outset of my remarks we are being asked as a house, as 265 members, to concur in a report which was not a unanimous report.

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, it was.

Mr. Robichaud: Did you say it was not a majority report?

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): I said it was not a unanimous report. I will not quarrel with the distinguished government house leader. The point is that we asked a question about making a minority report and were told that the report had to be the report of the committee, but that when the motion for concurrence came before the house any member of the committee would be at perfect liberty to get up and express his opinions with regard to the report. That is the reason why I say it was a minority report. All you have to do is to look at the report itself. The report was carried by a vote of 10 to 4. So the house is asked at this stage to accept the opinion of 10 members designated as members of a committee on something that affects almost 20 million Canadians to a very great degree. That is what we are asked to do.

Let us examine the report. We find that in the report the names of the members of the committee are set forth, as well as the names of the members of the subcommittee on agenda and procedure. The fact that the committee held 45 sittings in camera is stated and also that the committee heard 12 witnesses in the fields of history, heraldry, pro-

tocol, art and design. The report goes on to say:

> The members of the committee express their gratitude to these witnesses for their efforts in providing detailed information and also to the nearly 2,000 Canadians who submitted flag designs and suggestions.

Then I come to paragraph 5.

An hon. Member: You have read it.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): I have not read it. Paragraph 5 is subdivided into (a), (b) and (c). Subparagraph (a) recounts that a motion was made for a national plebiscite. That is what I am talking about, a national plebiscite. That motion was defeated by a vote of 9 to 5.

An hon. Member: What about 14 to zero?

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): The way things are going this afternoon it is no wonder we get our papers a little mixed up. The motion for a national plebiscite was defeated by a vote of 9 to 5. In the course of some remarks I made in the house on August 13 last I took strong exception to a majority of the members of the house, 133 in fact, having the responsibility of approving a design for a flag which discarded our heritage of the past and substituted a new flag for Canada. I still object to it. I objected to it in the case of 133 people. But now we are asked to agree to the majority decision of 15 people, so everything I said in connection with the matter at that time is enhanced about nine times.

Let the people decide. It was appropriate then and it is appropriate now. That is what was proposed in the committee, but the motion was defeated by a vote of 9 to 5. By the motion now before us we are asked to agree with that decision and I cannot do so.

Subparagraph (b) of paragraph 5 deals with the motion for the adoption of only one national flag, which was carried by a vote of 14 to nothing. I draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that this motion received unanimous support. Yet before the committee's work was completed it was conveniently discarded and completely ignored. The explanation given is that the second flag is to symbolize our membership in the commonwealth and our allegiance to the crown. This has been unnecessary in the past. Why should it be necessary in the future? Are we to consider that the national flag recommended by the committee leads to the conclusion that we will do away with our allegiance to the crown by adopting it? If so, I submit this is another good reason for voting against the motion now before us and in favour of the amendment seeking a plebiscite.

I also have some comments relative to the vote in committee on the motion that the Canadian red ensign be the national flag of Canada. This was defeated by a vote of 10 to 4. By the motion now before the house we are asked to agree that 10 people can decide to discard the flag which has been used, respected, revered, beloved and admired by the Canadian people generally for a period of nearly 100 years. To me any government which suggests that we should approve the taking of the opinion of 10 people in a matter as important as this are themselves not deserving of public approval and should not be in office in this country.

The Prime Minister and his supporters should welcome a plebiscite as a means of solving this difficult problem. In the course of my remarks on the previous occasion I contended that there should have been a non-partisan approach to this matter, that it never should have been relegated into the area of political partisanship at any time, because it was too important. The Prime Minister may have felt impelled to bring the matter before the house, but may I point out that Mr. Mackenzie King did not do so in 1946 when there was a vote of 23 to 1 in favour of a new flag. No doubt he felt the problem was too contentious.

An hon. Member: We are in 1964 now.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): In connection with the whole question of the red ensign I ask the government and their supporters these questions. Do they completely ignore the fact that the Canadian Legion wishes to retain the Canadian red ensign as the flag of Canada? Is it a matter of complete indifference to them that the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire are on record in every part of Canada as favouring the red ensign? Is it a matter of complete indifference to them that some 200,000 people signed a petition to retain our present flag? Is it a matter of complete indifference to the government and the members of the government that they must have received thousands of communications from Canadians imploring them not to discard or destroy the flag which we have been using for nearly 100 years?

These are some of the things which we felt should be pointed out. This one was defeated. According to the report, we are asked to express our agreement just because ten people voted against four. I, for one, cannot possibly subscribe to such an idea. The way this mat-

ter has been handled is another great blunder by this government, already noted for its performance in the field of blundering. I cannot support a motion in this parliament that would discard the Canadian ensign from consideration as the national flag of Canada. Remember, the motion is to discard it from consideration as the national flag of Canada. In 1946, as I understand it, a committee reported 23 to 1 to this parliament, to a Liberal government, on a new Canadian flag. Concurrence in that report was never moved by the government of Right Hon. Mackenzie King. He would not accept the responsibility for accepting the committee report at that time. No doubt he had what seemed to him to be good reasons. Right hon. Mr. St. Laurent did not bring the matter before parliament during his term of office as prime minister.

The present Prime Minister decided to have a new flag by act of parliament, giving as his reason that he had promised it during the heat of an election campaign. I contend that is not a good enough reason. It would be much more in the national interest to disregard such a commitment, because the carrying out of a commitment of that nature is much worse than being accused of a broken promise. I declare here and now that I have not and do not prefer any design for the flag of Canada to a greater extent than I do the Canadian red ensign. However, I will say this: I do not rule out the possibility that in the interests of unity in Canada, for the encouragement of a proper attitude by all Canadians from all parts of Canada, an effort should be made to find a somewhat different design more capable of general acceptance. This is the reason I favoured in the committee a design which had incorporated in it the symbols of the founding races of this country, and incorporating also a maple leaf which might be considered as having symbolism with regard to the progress of our country during our growing up period. There it is, Mr. Speaker. There is the design for which I voted. I make no apologies for it. I think it is a very fine compromise.

Now, if it were necessary in the interest of national unity and for the good of the nation that there should be some variation in where these symbols stand, I would be the last one to stand in the way. Some people say we have grown up, and since we have grown up we should run our own show. We should be masters in our own house. I subscribe to that idea. However, it is not necessary to throw out the pictures of our father, mother, grandfather and grandmother in the process. We do not need to do that.

Now, I want to have something to say about this particular feature before dealing with its significance. However before leaving the subject of the Canadian red ensign containing the union jack, I do want to say a word with regard to British justice and its importance to all of us. Many times we hear remarks related to the Canadian Bill of Rights for which my right hon. leader was responsible. I say that the Canadian Bill of Rights was based on British justice; that was the foundation of the bill of rights. By accepting this motion before the house, and I am now speaking in favour of the amendment, we are asked to do away with every symbol indicating we have British justice in this country. This is a far cry from the type of thing to which we have listened in this house during the last couple of weeks. Many people sleep better at night because they are citizens of a country in which British justice prevails. I cannot bring myself to support a motion which discards the symbolism indicating that situation, so I shall vote for the amendment.

On Monday of this week the Prime Minister stated that the people on this side of the house had been doing their best to prevent a vote on the flag issue. I want to say to him, I want to say to any member of the government or any member of this house, that I reject and resent that assertion. I spoke twice in the previous flag debate. I spoke because I believed what I said, and because a very high percentage of the people of Canada believe as I do. It is my opinion that they still do. In spite of this, the government brings forward a motion which asks us to agree that ten people should rule out of consideration the symbol of those things to which I have just now referred.

Now we come to the report of the committee and we find that the flag designs submitted were divided into three categories. Toward the conclusion of paragraph 6 of that report we find these words:

> Elimination by an agreed procedure left only one design in each category.

I want to speak about the word "elimination" and the words "agreed procedure". The procedure was agreed, without a doubt, but the elimination took on the character of a decision based on a previous vote. As a consequence, I want to say that the elimination is something which should be stressed in this house for the benefit of hon. members who may not have given the question of elimina-

tion the consideration which it deserves. What did we vote to eliminate? We are voting to eliminate the union jack.

Mr. Grégoire: Hear, hear.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): This is fine, but I may tell hon. gentlemen that—

Mr. Bigg: You have exposed yourself.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): —it would be the things which they valued most and which are guaranteed to them under the union jack, which would be eliminated if they only knew it. I say they would eliminate the symbols of the Christian heritage of this country.

Some hon. Members: Oh, no.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): This is what is embodied in the union jack. It is the cross of St. George; it is the cross of St. Andrew; it is the cross of St. Patrick, and it goes back to the time of the crusades. This is what those in the far corner, apparently, are favourable to having removed from the national flag of Canada. We are asked to agree to that elimination. I cannot do so.

According to the report, we find that in the process of a vote being taken, the three maple leaf design was retained by a vote of 8 to 6; the single maple leaf design was retained by a vote of 13 to 1; the design containing the union jack and the fleur-de-lis was rejected by a vote of 9 to 5. Yesterday the hon. gentleman who was a member of the committee, and represents Terrebonne, said in this house that there was one time when there was complete unanimity on the design, and it was the present suggestion. Now I know, at least I feel, that he would not deliberately mislead the house.

I refer the house to this particular paragraph because this is the paragraph which applies. It reads as follows:

> A vote was then taken to determine the committee's preference between the design containing three maple leaves and the design containing one maple leaf.

All they were doing was voting as between those two designs, and it specifically says so in the report.

> The single maple leaf design was retained by a vote of 14 to 0.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Drouin: Fourteen to zero.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Now, if the hon. member can understand, I should like to suggest something to him—that seven Liberals, members of that committee, voted

against the design which had been submitted to this parliament by the Prime Minister himself. Why did they change their minds. Two or three months ago it had to be three leaves. They were married to the three leaves. But they got divorced awfully quickly; they did not stay together long.

Mr. Roxburgh: I should like to make a statement on a question of personal privilege. The hon. gentleman has just said that members on this side of the house, all of us—

An hon. Member: He said those on the committee.

Mr. Roxburgh: —were committed to the three maple leaves. I should like him to know that right from the beginning—and I made my views known within the party—I have supported the one maple leaf.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): I would accept at its full value any assertion made by the hon. member who has just spoken. If he dissociated himself from the position taken by his party I admire him for publicly saying so. I am speaking in general terms. A few months ago it had to be the three maple leaves, and it could be nothing else.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): But in the committee they changed their minds and voted for one maple leaf—voted against the design submitted by their own Prime Minister.

Mr. Choquette: A question of privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member raising a question of privilege?

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): It is a spurious question of privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sure the hon. gentleman would wish to allow the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) to state his question of privilege.

Mr. Smallwood: Sing "God Save the Queen" and sit down.

Mr. Choquette: Don't make any jokes about "God Save the Queen".

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who now has the floor has no right to say that we were determined never to consider any other design apart from the three leaf flag.

In so doing, he is not speaking the truth. The government introduced in this house a

proposal for debate and the Prime Minister always said that he was ready to consider all suggestions.

The statement made by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton is false.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It is obvious that the question of privilege of the hon. member for Lotbinière is ill founded; in fact, it is an argument and not a question of privilege.

Mr. Choquette: He tells falsehoods.

[*Text*]

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Just what I expected. Since we are on a question of privilege I hope you will pardon me, Mr. Speaker, if I explain my conception of what a question of privilege is.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. May I point out that the question of privilege has been ruled out. I might mention, too, that according to the clock the hon. gentleman's time has expired. However, there were some points raised, taking three minutes or so of the time allotted, and they will be allowed.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): I am only anxious to conclude my remarks and I thank you for your consideration, which is exactly what I expect from you.

I believe this whole matter, the committee's report and all the rest, has been mishandled; it is one more blunder in the series of blunders for which the government is famous. I make no apology for saying this. But there is no reason why even at this stage the government could not redeem itself. It could do so by having this amendment carry, by giving its members the right to have a free vote, and letting the report go back to the committee so that the people could decide. Surely this is the right way to settle the matter. It has been stated on many occasions that this is not an urgent question. It does not need to be. I am sure everyone who feels there is a degree of urgency attached to it would be satisfied if it were dealt with at the next general election in the course of a referendum held during that election. My feeling is that the government should seriously consider this course. If they do lose face to a certain extent it will not be nearly as bad as the disruption which I am convinced will follow if this matter is not handled in something like the way I suggest.

Some hon. Members: Question.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, if everybody had been unanimous that the motion should come to a vote immediately, I would have resumed my seat. But I saw another Conservative member who was getting to his feet to discuss the matter. Therefore, I should like to take the opportunity to give some of my impressions.

Today, you made a ruling on the amendment now before us. I shall not discuss that ruling, of course. I only regret one thing and it is that I did not ask for a vote on your ruling, because I think it is parliament as a whole that has authority on the management of the business of the house.

But all that is now over and we are discussing the amendment of the Conservatives which reads as follows:

> That the words "be now adopted", be struck out and replaced by the following:
>
> That it be referred back to the committee with instructions to strike out paragraph 7 of the said report and substitute therefor the following:
>
> However, as the final vote of the committee did not reveal a sufficient degree of unanimity for the proposed design of a national flag for Canada—

The quality of the French version is to be noted. I think that the Conservative party could not find one French Canadian among its members who accepted to write this amendment. That is why the French version is full of awful errors.

> —votre comité recommande alors que le gouvernement soit autorisé à prendre les mesures nécessaires afin de conduire un plébiscite...

Imagine "conduire un plébiscite" instead of an automobile.

> ...lors de la prochaine élection générale afin que le peuple canadien soit fourni l'occasion...

You may well smile, Mr. Speaker, because it is really funny to hear such jargon.

> ...qui en est son droit, de déclarer son choix pour un drapeau national.

Mr. Grégoire: That was concocted by the member for Edmonton West.

Mr. Caouette: Once more, I say that no French Canadian member of the Conservative group agreed to translate the original amendment which was drafted in English.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Lambert is not a French Canadian.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, this is the paradox with which we are faced—and it really is a paradox: That parliamentary committee was created at the special request of the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) after a meeting of the five

leaders of the political parties in the House of Commons. This parliamentary committee composed of 15 members had not been mentioned previously. But the Leader of the Opposition told us that, without the establishment of a committee which would study the question of a distinctive national flag, he would not consent to put an end to the debate on the flag issue. At that time, some 65 Conservative members had already spoken in the house.

We asked the leader of the official opposition what kind of a majority he was considering should the Prime Minister and the leader of the other parties agree to the formation of such a committee which would present a majority report. He replied: On 15, 13 to 2. That is not a large majority; it is almost total unanimity.

The leader of the official opposition knew in advance that five of his followers would be sitting on the committee. There were seven Liberals, one N.D.P., one Social Crediter and one member of the Ralliement Créditistes, for a total of 15. The Liberal who acted as chairman, the hon. member for Humber-St. George's (Mr. Batten) did not vote but the others did. After six weeks of sittings, the committee concluded its proceedings by a final vote of ten to four. In other words, one Conservative member voted in favour of the recommendation made by the committee. That was not sufficient.

Now that we have the report, we are getting into a marathon similar to the one we had during the debate on the resolution. It is a Conservative "talkathon".

Mr. Speaker, the amendment deals with the very same issue that the Leader of the Opposition raised during the discussion on the resolution. What the Conservatives want seems obvious: waste the time of the house to prevent the government from taking action and to prevent the passage of legislation. Their game is surely to throw the country into another general election which they themselves would have trouble facing, especially today—I know what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, because even if the Conservatives maintain that the province of Quebec is the only one ready to vote on this issue, I must say that I have been to western Canada to speak to English Canadians, I went to Parry Sound, in Ontario, not long ago, I am going to Toronto next Thursday, to Trinity College, at the Kiwanis club, and in the afternoon, I shall be interviewed on television. Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives can say what they like, and resort to all the tricks laid down in advance by the Leader of the Opposition—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Caouette: —English speaking Canadians have had enough of this Canadian talkfest, they are fed up with this waste of time.

An hon. member is interrupting me. Right now I am ready to talk before any association in his riding. I will prove to him that his riding is ready to adopt a flag immediately and without a plebiscite.

One hoax after another has been played on us in the last few days, just as we have been misled since last June with those words: "The public wants a plebiscite."

In 1963, the Conservative members of the province of Quebec said: "We are in favour of adopting immediately a distinctive national emblem." The Liberal members said the same thing throughout Canada and that was part of their election platform, as it was part of ours. Personally, I was elected with a 12,000-vote majority, and a distinctive national flag figured in my program. The Liberals got the greatest number of seats in Canada. The Conservatives followed suit.

The members of the New Democratic party, at election time declared themselves in favour of a distinctive Canadian flag. But this means nothing to the Leader of the Opposition who is certainly touchy, for instance, when it comes to the matter of unanimous consent with regard to a time limit for debates on an issue such as this, one which has been going on for months and months.

Mr. Speaker, we have been elected and the people who elected us trusted that we would adopt a distinctive national flag, here in the House of Commons.

Today, the Conservatives, to play petty politics, strongly call for a national plebiscite. They want to ask the people who trusted us to select the flag they wanted, to vote on this matter.

I have said, on several occasions, that the design of the flag is of little concern to me. My personal preference is clear: I prefer the flag launched across Canada by the native sons of Canada on the one hand, and by some French Canadians from the province of Quebec, namely the diagonal flag, half red and half white, with a green maple leaf.

However, I do not oppose the adoption of another design, provided it is Canadian, provided it bears a Canadian symbol.

A while ago we heard the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton say that he represents

a population which respects British justice. We have had French justice also. I am the first to recognize that we did have justice under the British empire.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us look what is happening around the world today, let us look at the countries that have always belonged to the British empire, such as Jamaica, Canada and others. Recently, when the members of the commonwealth parliamentary association met in Jamaica, a little country of about 1,800,000 inhabitants, that just won its independence two years ago, the flag flown on the occasion of that meeting was the distinctive national flag of Jamaica. There is a country that is still a member of the commonwealth but it has its own symbol.

People even went further than that. When the Conservative member attended this meeting, and I think perhaps they were two, the national anthem that was sung in Jamaica, during all their stay there, on the occasion of public demonstrations, was not even the national anthem of the British empire or the Queen. It was the national anthem of Jamaica. In fact, it was sung three times, without any attempt being made to sing or to intone the national anthem of England.

I hear those members telling us that the union jack represents British justice. Very well. However, are we not able, after 100 years, to have our own individual symbols as Canadians while continuing to be part of the British commonwealth of nations?

When I go to any social club, I do not wear my neighbour's suit but my own. Why don't we, as Canadians, have our own symbols and why don't we refrain from hanging on to something that we still respect when it is time, not to part with it, but to express our own feelings with our own symbols as a sovereign and independent nation which can take its own decisions.

We have nothing against England nor against the British empire as such. But we object to those backward persons who would like us to go back 150 or 200 years and seek to have the fleur-de-lis on a distinctive Canadian flag.

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Caouette: Do we ask that French symbols be included because we are of French descent.

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Caouette: We ask for nothing like that. We say more: if the Canadian symbol, now represented by the maple leaf on the flag proposed by the committee which considered this question, is not satisfactory, then let us remove the maple leaf and put a beaver, or a sheaf of wheat, or indeed anything else, as long as it is Canadian. But to tell us: pass a red ensign with a union jack in the upper corner and a fleur-de-lis at the bottom to remind us of our forefathers, to remind us of what happened in Canada in 1534, 1608 or 1790, etc., we are fed up with those things.

As I was saying a while ago, not only we French speaking Canadians, but also English speaking Canadians—I noticed it wherever I went—are fed up with it, and I shall prove it Thursday when I visit Toronto.

In my opinion, this amendment tends merely to make us waste our time, to carry on our debate until Christmas and after Christmas till Easter. However, I would like to say another thing to the Conservatives, who every day request a question period in order to speak on the flag. We are now discussing the flag issue—I see that the Conservative house leader is in his seat—I formally warn him that there will be no answers to questions on the order paper, that there will be no question period on orders of the day until the vote has been taken on the report of the committee on the flag. We shall comply with the rules. The unanimous consent of the house will not be granted. We want to know if Conservatives are Canadians, true Canadians, or if they just pretend to be Canadians, from whatever part of Canada they come.

I hear whispers coming from the Conservative opposition. They say that I am in collusion with the Liberals. No, I am not. Moreover, I have not been elected—

[*Text*]

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Is this man going to be allowed to refer to the opposition as a semblance of Canadians?

Mr. Kindt: I was going to raise the same point, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman who has raised this question.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the remarks of the hon. member; however, he can interpret my words any way he wants and it will not bother me in the least. If the hat fits, wear it. It is as simple as that. If it does not fit, do not wear it.

The plebiscite requested by the Conservatives is but a roundabout means to waste the time of the house. This matter was considered by the house before it was referred

to the committee. Now that the committee presented its 10 to 4 majority report to the house, this question of a plebiscite is revived.

I say a plebiscite would only delay the adoption of a flag. We are the elected representatives of the people and we should assume our responsibilities as such.

If there is a majority in the house, the Leader of the Opposition can definitely not make me believe that it does not represent the majority of the Canadian voters. That is what they would want us to believe. They say: "You want to impose closure", and the Leader of the Opposition often says this, as well as some other Conservative members. Some closure, when they have been talking as they have from the very start of the flag debate. It is a Conservative political play. If they think of winning back public favour by so doing they are mistaken, for they are tying around their own necks the rope with which they will hang themselves for sure at the next general election.

Instead of only seeking purely political advantages, let us think and act as Canadians.

I said earlier that during the last election campaign we supported the adoption of a distinctive national flag. We were elected on that plank. Now, we would be asking for a plebiscite on this question? They are not saying that the plebiscite would be held immediately, no, but at the forthcoming general election. Should the next election take place two years hence, we would be dealing with the plebiscite two years from now and then, before ordering the plebiscite, we could still discuss the flag question and, once the plebiscite was over and a government elected, from one of the political parties, there would still be members questioning and discussing the plebiscite, because some will not be satisfied.

Mr. Speaker, have you ever heard of a plebiscite being held in the countries I mentioned a moment ago, which surely belong to the British commonwealth and have won their independence, such as Jamaica, Ghana, India, etc., and England herself? Did some people ask for a plebiscite in those countries, to choose a national flag and a national anthem? Have the duly elected representatives of the people no responsibility in such matters?

Think of those smaller countries I just referred to, Jamaica, Ghana, the African countries, that have won their freedom and independence and are still members of the British commonwealth, with symbols of their own on their flags, not a union jack or a fleur-de-lis, but, for instance, a true Jamaican symbol. They did not put a banana on the distinctive national flag of Jamaica. It is only with strictly Canadian symbols such as those that we shall enjoy national unity.

Let no one try to make me believe that if I wear my neighbour's hat, I am wearing my own clothes. There is no doubt about it.

The Conservatives will keep on talking endlessly, but they will be held responsible by the Canadian voters. Let me tell you this. Those to whom I appeal in their group are those who have already taken a stand and come from other provinces than Quebec, because I have met several who admitted to me they were anxious to dispose of this matter and to take action, since their electors were after them as they are after us.

Mr. Speaker, that is the wish I make for all of us, that we act in the interests of Canada. It is true that Canada is a member of the British empire but, as Canadians, we should act in the interests of Canada by incorporating our own symbols in our flag, so that we can be identified as Canadians in every part of the world.

[*Text*]

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question? I should like to ask him whether the translation was accurate, in that I understood that member to say that he does not care what is on the flag at all, but mentioned a beaver or a sheaf of wheat as being acceptable, provided the red ensign is destroyed?

Mr. Caouette: I did not say that. I said I wanted a national distinctive flag which could have on it anything which is Canadian, whether it be a beaver, a maple leaf or anything distinctively national.

Mr. Starr: Would the hon. member permit another question, Mr. Speaker? I wish to ask him whether he would agree with the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), that this flag will not bring about the unity of Canada?

Mr. Caouette: Which flag?

Mr. Starr: I refer to this proposed flag.

Mr. Caouette: To which proposed flag do you refer? The hon. member for Lapointe has never said anything like that.

Mr. Grégoire: I never said that.

Mr. Smallwood: You sure did.

Mr. Grégoire: I never did.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. If the former minister of labour wishes to lay such accusations, he just has to submit the text.

[*Text*]

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I wish to say that the hon. member for Lapointe on a previous occasion said that a new distinctive flag for Canada would not bring about the unity of this country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I wish to point out that I have not yet said a single word about the flag, and that I have been absent for 22 days, the time taken by the Conservatives to discuss this question. And it is a good thing I was away, because that debate depressed all the other members in this house.

I wish to state once more that I have never spoken on that subject and, consequently, the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr) is mistaken.

[*Text*]

Mr. Starr: You made your speech outside the house.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, we have just witnessed an example of the reason the people of this country are completely sick and fed up with the party of which the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) is a member. We have listened to him point the finger of scorn at the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) and at the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming). Let me suggest to him that if he used those members, of which he is scornful, as examples to follow rather than Hitler, Mussolini, and people of that category, this country would be better off.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Smallwood: You would sooner follow Hitler. You said you admired him.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member has no right to lend any motive whatever, and I want to tell him that I shall certainly not follow in the footsteps of his leader, any more than I would have followed those of Hitler or Mussolini whom he just mentioned. It would be better for him if he were minding his own business instead of that of others.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, we heard the hon. member talk about a Canadian flag and suggest that we could have a beaver or a sheaf of wheat on it. Is that not exactly what Adolf Hitler said to the German people when he took their flag away and provided them with the swastika? That represents the same philosophy—destroy your history and tradition, and replace it with something new.

Mr. Caouette: Oh, oh.

Mr. Grégoire: Go back to England.

Mr. Coates: My friend, I am a Canadian.

Mr. Grégoire: I do not think you are.

Mr. Coates: I do not think I am any less a Canadian than you or any other member of this house, and I will stand on that statement.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. May I suggest to hon. members that very little will be accomplished by a shouting contest between members. I invite the hon. member for Cumberland to confine his remarks to the speech which I assume he proposed to make to this house.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member would permit a question before he proceeds with his speech? Does the hon. member for Cumberland interpret the presence of only one minister of the crown in the house as a desertion of the Prime Minister's stand on the flag?

Mr. Coates: In view of the fact the Prime Minister's members of the committee deserted his flag completely, I would not be surprised if what the hon. member has suggested is an example of the importance they place on the present flag design. If it should be suggested tomorrow that some other design would be more acceptable and receive a larger degree of support from the country, I am certain the Prime Minister would pass that word along and such a flag would be supported this week. In that event I am sure we would hear all the trained seals say "me too", as usual, and they would stamp their approval on it. At that time we would hear the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) get up and say: I really love this flag. He would say so, no matter what it looked like, provided the Prime Minister approved it.

The speech by the member for Leeds last evening in this house exemplifies the degree

of hypocrisy inherent in this whole flag question as far as the government is concerned. Never in the history of this nation have we seen a government as contemptuous of the rights of the people they allegedly represent. It is a government that has displayed on this issue deceit, defiance, delusion, demagoguery, dereliction and a despicable attempt to destroy a dignified symbol that has meant so very much to so very many Canadians of all races, colours and creeds.

What we have witnessed, Mr. Speaker, is this. On May 17 of this year the Prime Minister travelled to the Canadian Legion convention and told the people there that the government was going to have a three maple leaf flag, and that the red ensign was going to be scrapped in favour of this new design which he considered to be more representative and symbolic of this nation's history and tradition.

Mr. Grégoire: Hear, hear.

Mr. Coates: The hon. member says this is wonderful. I hope those members of the opposition will stay and listen to this debate. The Prime Minister stated "I have spoken with a select group of members from the press gallery and told them what I wanted. I told them also how I was going to get what I wanted, by making certain that the members of parliament would not be able to vote on this motion as their consciences indicated, because I was going to make this a government vote involving confidence in the government." We heard the trained seals get up one after the other and say how they supported this flag, how, like the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson), they loved it, and then on September 10 the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) finally agreed to set up a committee to determine what the flag design should be.

The committee reports, and what do we learn from the report. We learn that every Liberal member on the committee voted against the design which on May 17 and for every day thereafter until September 10 the Liberal party told the Canadian people was the flag that should be accepted by them without question. We have the committee report before us, Mr. Speaker, and we see that the committee arrived at three designs upon which it voted, the Pearson pennant, the one they now wish us to accept and the one proposed which incorporated our past history and traditions.

I want to say first of all that when the members were appointed to the committee there were those who said that the Conservative members of the committee would go in there as red ensign men and come out as red ensign men, and that it was useless to set up the committee because there would be no spirit of compromise among the Conservative members appointed to that committee. Let me say this, Mr. Speaker. I was truly amazed when I saw the flag design that had associated with it our past history and traditions because in effect it was a maple leaf flag, about which these people on the other side of the house have talked so much, with a very small emblem in each corner which associated today with the past. For anyone to say that the Conservative members appointed to that committee were not willing to compromise would be absolutely and completely ridiculous. As a matter of fact, if I had been a member of the committee I am very doubtful that I would have been willing to compromise to the degree that was indicated in the design that was accepted as the flag incorporating an association with our past. It departs a long way from the Canadian red ensign.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, as dedicated as the members of the committee were, as willing as they were to attend meetings day in and day out and work, I have no doubt, long and diligently in order to come up with a solution, I say that to my mind the flag committee failed. They failed parliament, they failed the Canadian nation. They had available to them a means of solving this problem but because, no doubt, of word passed down to the Liberal members of the committee it was impossible to produce a flag that would have received the unanimous approval of all members of the committee, and thereby have eliminated any debate in the house.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) said that if unanimous or nearly unanimous approval could be obtained for a flag design there would be no further debate on the matter. Certainly I as a strong advocate of the retention of the Canadian red ensign would not have been happy with such a flag design. Certainly those who wish to remove the union jack from the flag would not have been happy either, but the flag committee would have produced a compromise against which it would have been impossible for any member to argue. But where are we? We are back in the House of Commons because of the regimentation of the Liberal party and the willingness of the members of that party on the flag committee to put their party before the Canadian nation.

I have said on more than one occasion, Mr. Speaker, that the whole point involved in this flag debate is whether or not Canadians are

willing to allow the union jack to be removed from the flag. The hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) certainly fortified the statements I have made in the past, that they are willing to accept any flag with any kind of design, whether it be the swastika or the black hand of the Mafia or a pumpkin, as long as the union jack is removed.

What could be more ridiculous, idiotic and completely stupid than to consider removing from a flag the nation's history, its traditions and the sacrifices made by generation after generation of Canadians who helped to build this nation and bring it to the point where it is today? I say that such an attitude can only assist in destroying what we have created and that the present government, so willing to do whatever is indicated as desirable by Gallup polls, is not one that is going to strengthen trust in the minds of the people who have some consideration for those who have made a contribution to the building of this nation.

The Prime Minister has put the house in the position where it must do as he asks or he will choke it off and allow no business to be done except to deal with what is apparently his childish pet, a new Canadian flag. The Canadian people must wait for the Canada pension plan, they must wait for the labour code, they must wait for anything else that is of real value and importance to the future of the nation and the way it progresses, because the Prime Minister of the country has the childish attitude that he wants his flag and he wants it now. He is not going to allow parliament to stop him from having it, whether or not he stops the business of this nation. We cannot even ask questions about anything the government is doing now because the Prime Minister wants his flag. What a childish attitude for a man who is supposed to be as big as he is. What a stupid attitude for a man who is responsible for running the affairs of this nation. What a ridiculous attitude for a man who is concerned about unity and about the effectiveness of parliament. The Prime Minister, more than any other man, is destroying the effectiveness of this parliament with this flag issue. Nothing appears to be more important to him than getting a flag so he can say to the people of Canada, "See, I told you that you would have it by Christmas, and here it is." How childish. How ridiculous.

Mr. Byrne: Take another drink; it is a rather dry speech.

Mr. Coates: There is one thing about the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne). He does a tremendous job of interjecting but he finds it most difficult to stand on his own two feet and make a speech. This has been the case ever since I have been in the house.

Mr. Byrne: I would not want to make a terrible speech like you are making.

Mr. Coates: My friend, you could not make any kind of a speech, and you know it; that is the only good thing I can say about you. You have the common sense—

Mr. Byrne: That is a rotten speech.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Coates: I will say this: I would rather have others judge it than you. I would not really depend on your judgment.

Mr. Byrne: I cannot hear you; you are just mumbling.

Mr. MacInnis: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Reference was made by the hon. member—if I may be permitted to be so loose with the word—to the effect the hon. member was making a rotten speech.

Mr. Byrne: No question about it.

Mr. MacInnis: Is this a parliamentary phrase that is going to be permitted?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Well, the word may be a little strong, but the word "rotten" was applied to the speech. I suppose if it had been applied to an hon. member it would probably be unparliamentary. However, since the expression was applied to the speech, it is not unparliamentary, although it is a rather strong word to use. In any event, I suggest the hon. member for Cumberland be allowed to continue.

Mr. Coates: I cannot say I am really concerned about what the hon. member for Kootenay East thinks of my speech. I was referring to the fact that we are unable to secure any information from the government because of the method adopted by the Prime Minister in allowing this debate to go forward. One matter I should like to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, which is germane to this debate is a question I have on the order paper. It is question No. 1,889 and it has been there since September 9 unanswered. This is a period of three months. The question requests information related to the cost the Canadian taxpayers will have to bear if a new flag design is adopted by this house.

Now, there have been a lot of people who have said—

Mr. Byrne: How much would a plebiscite cost?

Mr. Pascoe: It would cost you your seat.

Mr. Coates: There have been a lot of people who have said they could not care less whether we have a maple leaf or the Canadian red ensign.

Mr. Byrne: It will not cost as much as P.F.A.A. under you.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Coates: The gentleman just has bad manners, Mr. Speaker, and we should excuse him. Ignorance should be excused at all times, whether it is the hon. member for Kootenay East or anyone else.

Mr. Byrne: You are so gracious; I accept.

Mr. Coates: As I say, there are statements to the effect that people care little about what the flag might be. There are some, but I do not agree that there are a lot. There are certainly some people in this nation who have no great concern about whether or not we have a flag. They might care, sir, if they were to realize that this action by this government in producing a new flag is going to cost the Canadian taxpayers a good many millions of dollars, to say nothing of individuals who have a flag now and might desire to have one that does represent this nation.

Here this question lies, unanswered, on the order paper. It will not be answered because of the gag the Prime Minister has applied to this parliament until he gets his childish way and we relent and provide him with a flag.

Mr. McIlraith: I wonder if the hon. gentleman would permit a question?

Mr. Coates: Yes.

Mr. McIlraith: Does he not agree that it would be more honest to tell the truth and say it is the rules which permit questions only before routine proceedings, and that the Prime Minister did offer an opportunity to the official opposition today to have a question period, and they turned it down.

Mr. Coates: So far as I am concerned, there are no degrees of honesty. You are either honest or dishonest. If the hon. member is calling me a liar, then let him look at *Hansard* of yesterday where the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) explained to the Prime Minister what was going to happen if he did not come forward with a motion that could receive unanimous approval and thereby allow the ordinary business of this house to be conducted while this debate takes place. The Prime Minister refused. He refused him like the spoiled child he is.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Coates: The amendment now before us, Mr. Speaker, is to send the report of the flag committee back to that committee in order that its members might consider the merits of having a national plebiscite carried out to determine through the Canadian people what variety of flag design they consider to be most appropriate as a national flag.

There are many reasons why this seems to be the most logical method of determining a flag for Canada. Certainly we as members of this house have indicated beyond doubt that we are not capable of arriving at a conclusion which would be acceptable to the Canadian people at large while at the same time preventing a deterioration in national unity. Polls have been taken by numerous organizations across this nation.

Mr. Byrne: Including one in Waterloo.

Mr. Coates: The poll in Waterloo South indicated that the Liberals lost their deposit for the first time probably in the history of this nation.

Mr. Byrne: The Tories did not do too well.

Mr. Coates: They may not have done too well but they were certainly an improvement over the Liberals.

Mr. Byrne: How did they do in Cumberland?

Mr. Coates: They did very well in Cumberland.

Mr. Byrne: Westmorland.

An hon. Member: Let him make his speech.

Mr. Coates: As I was saying, polls have been taken at various times across this nation by various organizations and on each occasion the majority of those questioned indicated the belief that a plebiscite is the best answer, the best way of determining the kind of flag which would be accepted by all Canadians.

I have before me the result of one of these polls recently carried out by Telepoll, a CTV program. It was forwarded to me by the dominion president of the Canadian corps association who also urged the government to carry out a national plebiscite. The poll in question states that of the 1,134 persons polled across Canada 51.7 per cent favoured a plebiscite, 33.9 per cent wanted parliament to decide and the remainder had no opinion. In the Toronto area, of 150 persons questioned 53 per cent favoured a plebiscite. Many other polls have been taken and most of them show a higher percentage in favour of a plebiscite than the Telepoll to which I have just referred. However, that is the latest poll because it was taken on November 28, and it is an indication of the continued belief in the minds of the people that they should have an opportunity to decide what the design of our flag should be.

There are many reasons why the people should be asked to express their views with regard to a flag design, but the most compelling reason in my mind is the way in which the situation has been handled by the government to date. I refer not only to designs, though in this respect members opposite have shown a readiness to change their views from week to week as necessary, but because the government has unfairly taken so many actions which have proven to be a source of great irritation to many Canadians. I have a telegram here from a Mr. J. A. Pope of Montreal dated November 27. Mr. Pope, in his telegram, has this to say:

> The flag on the main administrative building at the Royal Military College used to be the union jack. Subsequently I believe the Canadian red ensign flew proudly over that building. Now it has been replaced by a red and blue flag which is supposed to be the college flag. Since the post offices in Canada and the R.C.M.P. fly the Canadian red ensign I am amazed that someone has authorized the removal of the last vestige of the union jack from the Royal Military College at Kingston, Ontario. As you probably know, an independent country, South Africa, incorporates the union jack in its national flag. Bud Drury must be proud of this action.

That is just one of numerous examples of this type of thing happening across this nation at government instigation or, if not at government instigation, known by the individuals who take the action that the government will applaud them for it. The example of H.M.C.S. *Yukon* flying the Pearson pennant out at sea is just as glaring an example as the one described in the telegram I have just read. The bumper stickers that were to be distributed by the sticker-licker, the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis), is another example.

An hon. Member: Where is he?

Mr. Coates: I do not know where he is these days. He is probably trying to recoup his losses from bumper stickers that reproduced the wrong flag. I guess the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) sort of pulled the rug out from under him when he instructed his Liberal—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not see that it is at all relevant to speak about other hon. members, who we must assume are doing their duty.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. member is, nor do I care; but I do know that he endeavoured to publicize in what was certainly a most unsatisfactory manner the former flag design proposed by the government. He used government offices and his position for this endeavour. I certainly see nothing wrong in talking about this as an example of the type of action that has been taken by the government to try and convince Canadians that some sort of a maple leaf flag would be more acceptable to the Canadian nation than the present Canadian red ensign, or even the flag design proposed by the committee which involved an association with our past history and tradition. I believe that all these incidents when added up indicate that this house is no longer capable of producing a flag design that is acceptable to the majority of Canadians, even though it may be acceptable to the majority of the members in this house.

Certainly if it is necessary for the official opposition to stand up for the rights of a majority of the Canadian people, then I say it is their duty to do so. There are some people who suggest that we should now desist from talking about the flag or the flag design that the Canadian people desire. They say, "Don't talk about it any more. While the majority of Canadians still desire the same flag they have had for the last 97 years, the public are getting sick of it and you are going to lose popular support if you keep talking about it and holding up the business of parliament". Mr. Speaker, the first thing the people who put forward this argument should consider is that the government decides the order of business in this house; it is not the official opposition—and if the government desires to hold up the business of the country in order to discuss the flag issue, that is up to them and they must take the responsibility for it.

Second, I consider it a matter of principle that we must insist on a flag design which has an association with our past history and heritage. If we believe in this principle, we believe in it today and we will believe in it six months from today; we do not stop believing in it because some people feel that the business of the country is being held up, especially when you know that the government determines the order of business of the house.

I consider it is as important today to insist that the flag of our nation has incorporated in it an association with the past as I did when this issue first came before the house; and I consider that we are as responsible today in insisting that the flag that is adopted by this house must recognize that association with the past as we were when we insisted upon it when the debate began. I certainly hope to see this matter debated until such time as the government is willing to remove the committee report from the business of the house, until such time as it can more constructively be considered, in the light of the more important business that is on the order paper, or until such time as they consider that it is indeed wise to consult the Canadian people and let them determine what we in this house do not seem to be able to determine.

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate you on the wise decision you made this afternoon which makes it possible to hold the door open for a compromise on this controversial subject which has been before the House of Commons and the people of Canada for such a long period of time.

Mr. Byrne: You can say that again.

Mr. Dinsdale: I think it is the desire of the house—and this has just been indicated by the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne)—that we should as quickly as possible settle in one manner or another this subject of a distinctive national flag. Not only is there a desire in this house for the debate to be completed as early as possible so that we might get on with the more important economic measures that are necessary to deal with the problems that face Canada at this time, but there is also the widespread feeling across this nation. Your wise decision has made it possible for the house to avoid the mistake that was made when this matter was last before us, namely in refusing to resolve it in the only conceivable manner, to my

mind, in which it is possible to achieve resolution at this time; that is to say, by means of referring the matter to the people of Canada in a plebiscite.

When I first entered this debate on August 23, I believe it was, this was the viewpoint I put before the House of Commons. I did so because I was then under the impression that the government, as has been the case in so many other major items of business since it assumed office, had stumbled into this unhappy situation. Nothing that has occurred since that time has changed my viewpoint in this respect. I am still of the opinion that the government has unwittingly blundered into this position and has created the impasse that we now find facing the parliament of Canada and in the first instance, the House of Commons. I am sure that the events of last week, for example, have revealed once again that on basic matters of policy, rather than planning and organizing the business of the country in an orderly fashion the government stumbles and bumbles, to use the classic phrase the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin) loved to use when he was a member of Her Majesty's loyal opposition. It seems to me that here again is a colossal example of the lack of constructive leadership that has marked the record of the administration ever since it assumed office just over a year and a half ago. So I repeat at the outset of my remarks that I hope that we will be able to vote on this matter of a plebiscite and that hon. members will see fit to get this controversial subject out of the House of Commons and into the hands of the people where it obviously belongs.

When the subject was referred to the committee some two months ago it was hoped at that time that an all party committee would be able to come to a compromise solution which would make it possible for all parties and individuals concerned to reach unanimity. It is now obvious that the committee has not been able to achieve this greatly hoped for objective. I was not a member of the committee and therefore I was not privy to all the deliberations which took place. We have had reports from several of the committee members, which I suppose will be supplemented by the statements of other members. We have also had reported leaks in the newspapers of Canada, which unfortunately did nothing to assist the committee in its very difficult deliberations. It is unfortunate that the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson), who has played such a crucial and vital role in this question, was one of those who spoke

to the press prior to the tabling of the report which we now have placed before the house.

I am convinced, as I was convinced when I spoke on this subject before that, as many hon. members have outlined, the only possible way we are ever going to achieve a distinctive national flag acceptable to all the diverse parts and elements of Canada is in the typical spirit of Canadian compromise. Because of the circumstances which have already been referred to—the leaks which tended to introduce partisan considerations into the discussions of the committee—it is unfortunate that we have not been able to reach such a compromise.

I was interested, Mr. Speaker, in the comments of the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Rapp). Because of his own personal feelings and his own background, he was one of those who was most enthusiastically dedicated to the retention of the red ensign. It was encouraging to hear him state to the house yesterday that for the sake of national unity he and those from this party who had been associated with him on the committee had been willing to compromise and had voted for one of the three designs which were placed before the committee—the distinctive national flag with the red maple leaf plus the symbols of our basic dual ethnic origins. I think this is a major step forward because, as I have already intimated, the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale was one of those who were passionately dedicated to the red ensign.

It was also encouraging to hear my deskmate, the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming), indicate that he was willing, in the interests of resolving this subject and removing it from the House of Commons at this stage by means of deliberation within the committee, to accept the maple leaf flag which bore the symbols of our dual ethnic origins. This, Mr. Speaker, is the spirit that must be brought into the discussion by all hon. members if we are ever going to resolve this contentious issue.

Last evening I listened to the hon. member for Leeds extolling the symbolic significance of the maple leaf as a distinctive Canadian symbol which is accepted in all the parts of Canada, as well as being recognized abroad as something which is strongly reminiscent of Canada. I agree with the hon. member in that respect. I have always agreed during the course of this discussion that the maple leaf is an acceptable Canadian symbol. Veterans wear it on their badges. It appears on innumerable products made in Canada. When we flew with the air force during the war the R.A.F. roundel was modified by having the red maple leaf within the inner circle. But why is it necessary in adding the maple leaf to repudiate all the symbols of the past? That is the point I want to stress throughout my remarks. This seems to me to represent the spirit of nihilism, which is usually identified with those countries who have a revolutionary rather than an evolutionary tradition.

I am sure that all responsible Canadians would agree that the flag which is one of the three which came before the committee, and which bears the symbols of the past, is a distinctive flag acceptable in all parts of the country. Indeed, I would say it would be more distinctive than the one the committee finally presented to the house, because as has already been intimated this flag strongly resembles the flag of Peru. As a matter of fact at a distance it would be quite impossible to distinguish the Peruvian flag from the one that has been supported by the committee. I know this has been disputed by the hon. member for Leeds, but I have checked into the references in this regard and, except for the red maple leaf in the centre white patch, the recommended flag and the flag of Peru are identical. With this flag we would not be achieving the goal that the government has expressed time after time it wishes to achieve, namely the adoption of a distinctive national flag which could not be mistaken for the flag of any other country. Let us be reasonable in this approach, and let us not assume any position from which we will find it difficult to retreat.

One other matter I had hoped would be dealt with by hon. members on the committee is that we are not dealing with one flag only, but with two flags. The comments of the members of the committee which discussed this matter indicate that this situation was in their minds. Unfortunately we are dealing with a so-called distinctive flag and the union jack.

In dealing with this matter the government has never intimated distinctly what its position is in this regard, and this leaves the government open to a charge of political duplicity. We are going to have a flag which removes the traditions and symbols of our past history, while at the same time adopts another flag which reminds us of a time in our national evolution which we should have forgotten over the years.

It is a major breakthrough in this field, that organizations such as the Canadian Legion

have finally accepted the red ensign as Canada's national flag. This matter was referred to by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier-Lasalle (Mr. Rock), who drew attention to the fact that it is only within recent years that the Canadian Legion has flown any flag other than the union jack. I suggest the Canadian Legion has moved forward in its thinking and has now accepted the red ensign. The Orange lodge of Canada, one of the most vehement supporters of the union jack, now accepts the red ensign. The I.O.D.E. has moved forward in its thinking to a position of accepting the red ensign as Canada's distinctive national flag.

We have a government which professes to be moving forward in displaying symbols which represent our progress toward national sovereignty, but which offers on the one hand a national flag devoid of any traditional symbols, while on the other hand attempts to reconcile the irreconcilable, by offering the union jack as a symbol of our allegiance to the commonwealth, in spite of the fact the union jack has been superseded by the red ensign and has been accepted by most of these organizations which were enthusiastically devoted to the union jack.

This whole problem is not new to Canadian national life, and of course it is not going to be resolved in one fell swoop. Nor is this the first parliamentary committee which has presented a recommendation to this house on a Canadian flag. In 1945 a parliamentary committee made certain recommendations, and I think it took a more realistic approach to this problem than the approach taken by the latest parliamentary committee. That committee recommended a modified version of the ensign with a maple leaf on the fly. If the government of that day had had sufficient courage, and had not been so concerned with obtaining votes, this modified version would have been adopted, resolving this whole question once and for all.

One thing that has been said before is of such significance that I think it bears repeating. What is now happening under the present circumstances is that the government is catering to the extremist viewpoint, or at least attempting to do so. The government needs to be reminded that it cannot appease or cater to extremism. A responsible government must provide leadership and take a firm stand. This government has not provided this leadership or taken this firm stand, which is the main reason for our difficulties at this time.

The Winnipeg *Free Press* heaved an editorial sigh of relief when the 1945 parliamentary committee report was published, and indicated in an editorial that it felt the problem had been resolved. That editorial states that feeling in these words:

> Only two small remnants of extremism survive the earlier controversy. On the one hand, there are still some extreme "loyalists" who want the union jack alone, but to this there are overwhelming practical objections, besides the fact that citizens of the United Kingdom understandably show no enthusiasm for having their flag used by Canadians. On the other hand, there are those who want a flag that does not contain the union jack at all. The Canadian people have continually shown by their actions that the majority feels otherwise.

If I may be allowed to interpolate, this is precisely the feeling of the majority of Canadians today.

The editorial then continues:

> Hence the red ensign has been for all practical purposes our national flag since confederation. Notwithstanding the lack of formal authorization, it has ousted all competing flags. It has withstood every effort to discard it. And it surely will withstand any future effort, for this is the standard under which Canadian soldiers were proud to fight and die in both world wars. It is by consent of parliament in 1946 our national flag "until such time as action is taken by parliament for the formal adoption of a national flag." The other day it was consecrated as such on the altar of Westminster Abbey.
>
> In the result it may be said that the Canadian flag question is now settled, finally and irrevocably, except for formal recognition by parliament.
>
> Surely the time has come for this final step. Parliament at the next session should declare the red ensign to be our national emblem.

That is what was said in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of 1954, and I think it is as pertinent today as it was ten years ago. Let me repeat, the government will not resolve this matter by catering to extremists—those who want nothing but the union jack, and those who want anything else but the union jack. Those are two irreconcilable polarized positions. The government is attempting to bring these two extreme points of view together, and this cannot be done by appeasement.

The proposed flag design now before the house represents the first actual and fundamental departure from tradition that has been put forward at any time during discussions on a national flag. Unfortunately, because of party discipline and solidarity, it seems apparent that regardless of the issue the members of the Liberal party will vote in favour of any government proposal. This fact has been manifested by the actions of the Liberal party throughout the years. To quote the classic phrase, if they do not hang together on controversial issues, they will hang sepa-

rately. This attitude has been demonstrated by the members of that party on many occasions when it seemed almost impossible to believe that solidarity could be maintained.

The Prime Minister has made this issue the subject of a free vote, because the fate of the government is not at stake. I have spoken to many members about this subject, and many from the other side of the house have urged members on this side to continue the fight for a sensible and reasonable solution. I urge those members to vote according to their consciences, in favour of a referral of this matter to the people of Canada, because that is the only possible way we can extricate ourselves from the dilemma into which we have been precipitated by a government motivated by panic reactions.

An hon. Member: Oh, tut, tut.

Mr. Dinsdale: I think that is the only explanation of the present situation. Mr. Speaker, I heard someone say, "tut, tut". I repeat that I believe that is the only explanation possible, if one is to understand the precipitate action taken by the government in dealing with the great majority of controversial matters. As a result of the discussions of Canadian confederation over the past few months, the activities of the bilingual and bicultural commission, the visit of Her Majesty the Queen and the flag debate I have the feeling that today a more moderate mood is beginning to operate in Canada. As I understand the situation concerning the flag, the issue is not whether we shall have a distinctive national flag but what kind of national flag we shall have. With the voice of moderation now being heard in various parts of Canada I think it would be an excellent idea for the government to withdraw from the dilemma in which it has got itself.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Byrne: You are in the dilemma.

Mr. Dinsdale: There is cynical laughter from the other side, but the government has repeatedly withdrawn from impossible postures into which it has got itself, and I am sure that events as recent as last week are an indication of this fact. I am trying to be conciliatory in my remarks tonight. Why not use this method which has ever been the method of resolving hopeless divisions in Canada? The government could safely use it as a face saving device.

From the discussion that has gone on in the press, on television and in the house and from the letters we have received surely we now realize that forcing a flag devoid of traditional symbols through the house is as divisive in certain parts of Canada as a distinctive flag with traditional symbols is in other parts of Canada. This is the problem we face and it cannot be resolved just by cracking the whip on the government side and forcing the issue through the house. In other words, what I am trying to say is that unity will not come out of a flag. Rather the reverse is true: A flag can only come out of unity.

The government has proceeded with precipitate haste in response to the extremism of the separatist sentiment that was rampant just a few short weeks ago in this country. It said that something had to be done to heal the wounds in Canadian confederation. I say, Mr. Speaker, that now that the voice of moderation is being heard, surely the time has arrived for the government to take a reasonable viewpoint on this matter. Just to show how the voice of moderation has been heard in various parts of the country, I point out that not so long ago overtones of republicanism surrounded the flag debate. I am not going to go over old controversial issues but we do know that hon. members of this house have even gone so far as to say that in another ten years the issue facing Canada will be whether we remain as a constitutional monarchy or whether we become a republic. The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) has publicly uttered this viewpoint both in and outside of the house and it was obvious that this sentiment was present in the unhappy events which surrounded the visit of Her Majesty. That was a shocking experience for Canadians everywhere.

I feel that one of the high points of the current session was the day when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) rose in this chamber and asked all hon. members to join in an address of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. That was a unanimous expression of the opinion of the house. One of the voices that spoke at greatest length and in loudest tones that day in support was that of the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette), and I recall a distinguished member of the press gallery, Mr. Charles Lynch, indicating that this seemed to be a turning away from some of the more extreme viewpoints that had been expressed in the chamber and in other parts of Canada. The leader of the Liberal party in Quebec, a former member of this house, Hon. Jean Lesage, has also been emphasizing over and over again the

need for a spirit of compromise and reconciliation if we are going to overcome the present difficulties in Canada.

I am going to take the liberty of quoting from someone outside the house who is not necessarily well known in Canada but I think expresses a viewpoint which reflects the voice of moderation of the ordinary Canadian citizen. I refer to Mrs. Henri Vautelet, a distinguished leader of women in the province of Quebec, a past president of the Quebec federation of Liberal women and a woman with many other public services to her credit. She was speaking in Montreal in the middle of November and here is what the article says:

> A prominent French Canadian woman says violence in Quebec province is linked to a world wide pattern of violence and that French Canadians have used their emotions rather than reason in putting their complaints about confederation.
>
> Mrs. Henri Vautelet, former president of the Canadian association of consumers, said the recent outbreak of violence in Quebec was "the idiotic muddling of a lucidly defendable case".
>
> "While I cannot escape the evidence of history that today's strains and stresses on the fabric of confederation are 100 per cent English Canada's responsibility, I feel that French Canada must bear the responsibility for our stupid, sometimes ugly, and usually ineffective and mainly emotional handling of the required presentation of our case."

The article goes on to point out that she was guest lecturer at Loyola college and spoke to students in political science. The article continues:

> She said that recent violence in Quebec is a backwash from world wide violence and had little to do with Quebec's resentments.
>
> "Throughout the more civilized world a strange disease of violence, a free floating hate searching for an objective, and a deliberate abandonment to massed hysteria has struck the younger generation. Since Quebec is part of the world, I am astonished that the obvious connection between the rantings of our young separatists and this malady of the age seems to have been largely overlooked. . . .
>
> Slogans are not facts but they can be dangerous and substitute too easily, in minds aware of a grievance but a little hazy as to what it really is, for the actual reality of facts."
>
> She pointed to the "masters in our own house" slogan, used by the Quebec Liberal party during the 1962 provincial general election, as an example of an unproved assertion implying needs that no one has yet defined clearly.
>
> "For we are masters in our own house here in Quebec in all but crises of war, and we even have the power to protect our minorities in other provinces and to force a revaluation of our Canadian partnership if we used our existing weapons instead of going off half-cocked over minor and all too often unreal grievances."

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is the voice of moderation coming from a very distinguished French Canadian woman leader.

I think it indicates that there is no longer any need for panic reaction on the part of the government because we are over the crisis.

Now, I have had many letters reach me on this subject. I am not going to read them into the record, but they have repeatedly presented questions that have never been answered in this house and which I find it difficult to answer myself. Perhaps I could pinpoint the problem as my constituents see it if I put some of these questions on the record. First of all, they ask me why the Prime Minister introduced the flag during the opening ceremony of the biennial meeting of the Royal Canadian Legion at Winnipeg. Was the Prime Minister not aware that this is a memorial service dedicated to the memory of some 200,000 Canadians who have paid the supreme sacrifice in defence of freedoms motivated by the values represented in the symbols that he announced would be removed from the Canadian flag? They keep asking me this question. Why was it done in this abrupt and precipitate manner?

Another question is this one. The Prime Minister suggests he is bringing forward the flag question at this time because of an election promise. Does this imply he feels he must discharge all election promises whether they be foolish or wise? My only aside to this question is that if political parties had to discharge all the promises made during an election campaign the country would be in a very sad and unhappy state.

Another question they ask is why the Prime Minister, if he considered this such an important issue, did not introduce the flag question in the speech from the throne, which is the normal method of outlining the business of the house to be brought forward by the government in any particular session? The only answer I have been able to give in this regard is that there was a panic response to the voice of extremism, as I have pointed out in my earlier remarks.

The fourth question they ask is this: If the committee was looking for a distinctive flag which could not be mistaken for the flag of any other country, why did it choose a flag which closely resembles the flag of Peru? I cannot answer that question.

Mr. Byrne: You must have had a letter from John.

Mr. Dinsdale: Yes, I have a lot of good Johns in my constituency, a lot of good folks, who are seriously concerned about this matter.

Another question I ask is, in a country which has achieved sovereignty by the process of gradual evolution, why has the government suddenly decided to deal with the flag question by the revolutionary process of repudiating the traditional symbols of the past? If I may make an observation on that, I would say we have had several speeches indicating this was the way it was done in the newly emerging nations of Africa. Canada is not a newly emerging nation. We are a nation highly respected in the councils of the world because we have always been a people who demonstrated a spirit of tolerance, good will and mutual understanding.

Another question is, in view of the fact that the restlessness in Canada is a reflection of the fundamental economic changes taking place in Canada, particularly in the province of Quebec where the full impact of the industrial revolution is being felt, why does the government give precedence to issues which divide us rather than concentrate on the basic economic and agricultural problems in Quebec? This question comes from the farm part of my constituency which cannot understand why this issue was hammered by the government all during the month of August. The usual procedure in the house, and I have been here for 13 years, is to tackle a matter for two days and go on to another item of business. Day after day, almost in frantic panic and haste, the government hammered away at this particular issue.

Mr. Teillet: The Tories talked.

Mr. Dinsdale: Here is one that takes us out into the international field. We hear from the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Teillet), who says it was the Tories who hammered away at this. I just say the government determines the business of this house. It was their decision to set aside every other item of business, and for what reason I do not know.

Mr. Teillet: And the Tories talked.

Mr. Dinsdale: The hon. member is new to the house, and does not really understand that the opposition can only discuss what the government puts before the house. We have repeatedly asked for consideration of railway and transport matters which the minister knows, since he comes from Manitoba, are matters of great concern to that province. During a speech in Winnipeg two weeks ago the minister made a vicious attack on the Leader of the Opposition. This has been the tactic of hon. members opposite.

Canadian Flag

Mr. Teillet: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I did not deliver an attack on the Leader of the Opposition, I answered the false charges he had made the week previously.

Mr. Smallwood: You did not.

Mr. Dinsdale: I have a clipping here from the Winnipeg *Free Press* and the headline on it is, "Shrewd, dangerous, Diefenbaker still Canadian Menace,—Teillet." This is exactly what he said. Again, Mr. Speaker, these are the sort of tactics that do not enhance the reputation of public affairs when we deal with personalities rather than policies.

Before the minister interjected, I was dealing with certain questions. We live in a world which has become virtually a whisper gallery or neighbourhood, due to modern means of communication, and yet is torn apart by the poison of narrow nationalism. Under these circumstances, why is the government raising controversial, chauvinistic, nationalistic issues at this time? This is a question I cannot understand. In a day and age when we are moving towards support of NATO, NORAD and the United Nations, when we talk of the necessity of North Atlantic unity and all the rest of it, we suddenly inject the poison of narrow nationalism.

Finally, here is a question that is heard more and more—particularly since the Prime Minister was in the west last week, because he was asked about this question: Will we have a distinctive national flag for Christmas? He said yes. The flag for Christmas promised by the Prime Minister, according to the committee report, is going to be this flag devoid of our traditional symbols. If it is to be regarded as a Christmas present, why does it studiously avoid any of the symbols pertaining to the Person whose advent gave rise to the celebration of Christmas? I think there is a fundamental conflict in this regard. These symbols, as I have already noted, do not denote colonial obsequiousness, but rather they denote that we have slowly evolved out of traditional western Christian civilization. Rather than repudiating these symbols, we should hold them to us as an example of the fact that Canada is still in the vanguard of bringing the benefits of our free institutions to all the people of the world.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Forgie): I must say to the hon. member that his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. A. C. Cadieu (Meadow Lake): I am sure many of my constituents will be keenly disappointed, disgusted, even, that the subject of the flag should again be before the house at this time so close to the Christmas season. The large majority of them are very happy with our present flag, the red ensign, and many of them are more concerned about providing for their families. This year a great number of farmers are finding it extremely difficult to do so, owing to unfavourable crop conditions in many districts as a result of the drought; income is lagging far behind the need; many of them were forced to sell their livestock, their basic herds—

Mr. Byrne: With great respect I would point out that the hon. member is reading a speech which is obviously—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Forgie): This is not the first time that criticism has been levelled against an hon. member for reading his speech and I think the criticism is extraneous.

Mr. Cadieu (Meadow Lake): I wrote these words myself and I will deliver them myself. These people are very much concerned about their situation—more concerned than is the man who claimed on television the other night to be a great Canadian. I refer to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays), whom we see very rarely in this house. I am sure not many farmers in the districts which have suffered from the drought would refer to him as a great Canadian, especially those who were forced to sell their livestock at such low price levels, the lowest in many years. If the Minister of Agriculture was such a true Canadian he would be in the house today, because surely it is an important occasion when we are discussing such a question as the flag of our nation. This absentee member referred to himself as a great Canadian. I think he is well aware that no one else is willing to give him that title.

Why has the government refused to allow a plebiscite on this flag question? Why are they so afraid to have a plebiscite on the issue?

An hon. Member: Why are you afraid to have a vote?

Mr. Cadieu (Meadow Lake): Let us stop to think. Had it not been for the official opposition we would today be flying throughout this country the three maple leaf flag, or the Pearson pennant. The flag committee—

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Forgie).]

Mr. Byrne: The hon. member is not only reading his speech but there seems to be someone reading one just behind him, coming to my ear through the earphone.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Forgie): I cannot conceive of that being a fact.

Mr. Cadieu (Meadow Lake): I can tell the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne) that I do not intend to read my speech and I am not listening to anyone behind me. If the hon. member would contain himself he will, I am sure, have an opportunity of making his own speech. But for the official opposition that flag would, by now, be the flag of Canada.

I say it was unnecessary to bring this question before the House of Commons, when there is so much other work which could and should be done. It makes one wonder why the government should be so afraid of letting the people have a say in choosing the flag which is to fly over this great country.

All those who have been following this affair know that the committee was destroyed before it was even set up. Everyone realizes this. In the speech from the throne there was no mention of a new flag design and many members on the other side told me that no proposal for one had been raised in their caucus before the question was introduced in the house. If it was considered so important to change the flag, the intention to do so could very easily have been announced in the speech from the throne. A committee representative of all parties could have been set up to deal with the matter before controversy arose in the House of Commons itself.

I would remind hon. members that when it was introduced in this chamber the Prime Minister stated there would be a free vote. As reported on page 3164 of *Hansard* of May 12 the right hon. gentleman said:

> When the time comes to submit the decision of the government in this matter to the House of Commons I would hope every member of the house would vote as his conscience dictates and that there will be no question of confidence or non-confidence in a party sense.

A few days later the picture changed. The right hon. gentleman was not as strongly supported within his own party on the new proposed flag design as he had thought he was. And a few days later, on May 19, as reported on page 3337, when he was asked by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam

(Mr. Douglas) to say how the matter stood, he replied:

> The government must stand or fall on the result of the decision of the house. But we have gone out of our way, and I have gone out of my way personally, to let the members of this party know that in a question so personal, so close to their conscience, so deep in their emotions, as a flag, a member of the Liberal party in voting against the design submitted by the government would not be read out of the party for so doing.

So the picture changed. I heard members from every party except one say, in casual talk, that they were strongly in favour of the red ensign but would agree to some modification. Why did the picture change so completely when the Prime Minister said this decision would be taken as a vote of confidence? All the members on the other side, except one or two, ran for cover. What happened to the members of the splinter parties? Why were they so afraid that they covered up and got behind the government? Mr. Speaker, I could read what some members on the other side of the house have said in this regard. The hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Leboe) is reported as having said, "The people of Canada have never asked for, nor have the people said they want, a flag other than the red ensign". Why should people allow themselves to be scared into accepting a new flag design overnight? Many people have said to me when I have been back home occasionally, "Have you fellows got nothing else to do? What is wrong with the flag we have?" Many people of ethnic groups from all over Europe live in my constituency. They are proud of the flag that we have. In spite of this, I have not heard anyone, when speaking in favour of the red ensign—not even in our party—who was not perfectly willing to accept some modification in the design; but it has been felt that the heritage of our two founding races should be incorporated in the design of a Canadian flag. I believe this was very unselfish on their part.

No one can say that members of parliament have not the right to heed the hundreds of thousands of letters received from many organizations and Canadians. These letters certainly warrant recognition and attention. There have been thousands of postcards and letters received saying, in effect, with regard to the red ensign, "Keep the old flag flying". Thousands of such letters have been received by members of the house, and surely they have warranted recognition on our part. Many organizations have written to members of parliament. Many of us have received requests very recently from such organizations as the Canadian Legion, the I.O.D.E. and others, which we must recognize. One cannot ignore this vast majority of people who hold something dear to their hearts. If one stops to think, one realizes that had it not been for the official opposition in this House of Commons the Pearson pennant would be flying today. I ask the house, what does it look like when compared with our glorious red ensign?

Now another design has been proposed, and in all fairness to the committee I wonder just what happened during its meetings. I have every respect for the maple leaf, but what would this proposed flag look like when the white background became a little dirty? What would it look like flying outside the House of Commons, compared to the wonderful colours in the flag we are flying here today? I wonder what happened to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson), who was a member of the committee. How did he vote when the three maple leaf design was considered? This is the man who has taken so much credit for bringing forward flag designs; the man who went to Winnipeg with the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) to try to ram down the throat of the Canadian Legion their choice of a flag, whether the Legion liked it or not. Where was the hon. gentleman who introduced this design, who thought he was an expert on designs and should introduce a flag design and nobody else should have anything to say about it, not even the members of his own party, when the vote was taken in committee?

We know that the committee did a wonderful job and put in a great deal of hard work and many, many hours. But as I pointed out, their efforts were defeated before the committee was even set up. Why should we be faced with this issue in the Christmas month? Some people blame the opposition. How can you blame the opposition in this connection? Consider the error we would have fallen into today if it had not been for the official opposition. Consider what would have been flying over this House of Commons. Can you blame the official opposition because the government has seen fit to bring forward this issue again, when so much legislation is pending? I think the government and their supporters had better take another look at some of the fumbling and bungling with regard to the way in which the business of this house has been conducted. I think it is high time people did not have to tolerate such a ridiculous government. People ask what is going on in this session of parliament. One has only to consider the length of time this house has been in ses-

sion and the many things that could have been done and which the government should have done, rather than bringing forward a maple leaf flag. Instead of putting a red maple leaf on this design, they should have put a red herring on it.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Cadieu (Meadow Lake): I think of all summer when we were debating the flag issue, when they were saying we were the ones holding up parliament; in fact, Mr. Speaker, they did not have the legislation ready.

Mr. Nasserden: The house leader smiles in acknowledgement.

Mr. Cadieu (Meadow Lake): When I travel through my vast constituency I meet many Indians and Metis. These people are not worrying about the flag we have at the present time, any more than they worried about their treaty rights agreed upon and signed under the union jack and their great mother, Queen Victoria. These people are not worried about the red ensign; but some of them are worried about what they are going to eat.

An hon. Member: Will a plebiscite help them?

Mr. Cadieu (Meadow Lake): Many of these people are concerned about what they are going to eat; but they have adopted the red ensign and are proud of it. However, they are wondering about some of the promises of this government. What happened to the Indian claims commission, for example—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Cadieu (Meadow Lake): —that was shoved down to the bottom of the list?

Mr. Winkler: A very good question.

Mr. Cadieu (Meadow Lake): That is what these people are worried about.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Forgie): Order. This is extraneous to the subject the house is discussing at the moment.

Mr. Cadieu (Meadow Lake): These people are not worried about a plebiscite; they would be very happy to have a plebiscite on the flag. I think what I have been saying pertains to the question of a plebiscite. However, Mr. Speaker, there are other matters that these people are worried about today more than they are concerned with our debating the flag, which they are proud and happy to live under. I attended an Indian conference and saw how proud and loyal these people are in regard to the red ensign. They are not concerned about a different flag; they are satisfied with the one they have today. But they are concerned about what they are going to eat this winter. They are concerned about the problems this government promised to do something about. Why should the government be scared of a plebiscite being held?

I heard one member last night challenge us to put this question to a vote. I challenge him to put the question to a plebiscite. I challenge him and the government to go to the people, to call an election, on this issue. Let's have an election on this issue, if they think it is so important and they are afraid of a plebiscite. This is a serious matter. Why are the government fumbling and bungling along? If they are so determined that they are right, let's have an election.

I know it is said we must not fight an election on this issue because the unity of the country will be destroyed. This government has already destroyed the unity of this country, which is at its lowest ebb ever. It is true we do not want an election fought on the flag issue, but if that is the only way the government sees it, let us go to the country. We are not afraid to go to the country on this issue. We know where we stand and we know where the people stand.

Mr. Byrne: The hon. member is reading his speech again.

Mr. Winkler: That is better than you. You do not even make a speech. You speak from your seat.

Mr. Cadieu (Meadow Lake): I know a lot of people across Canada will be pleased to read that tomorrow. I say to the government: Go to the country on this issue if you want. We are ready to go. As I pointed out, we are in the Christmas month, a time when we should be winding up the work of the house so that we can get back home to our families and our constituencies. But we find ourselves with a government trying to force something down the throats of the people of Canada in order to attain their own ends.

Mr. W. H. A. Thomas (Middlesex West): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to put my thoughts on record in connection with this flag issue. We are now, after a great many perambulations and circumlocutions, considering an amendment to the report of the flag committee. May I begin by expressing my own personal appreciation of the manner in which the flag committee carried out its duties. I refer not only to the representatives from our own party who were on the committee, but from conversations I

have had with various members of the committee I am convinced that a conscientious job of seeking to choose a compromise design satisfactory to the people of Canada was done. The committee succeeded in part and in part only, but they are still entitled to our thanks for the work they did.

The report which was brought in by the chairman was a masterful report. He reported fully, and I am sure that all hon. members of the house had a reasonably full understanding, when the chairman had presented his report, of what went on in the committee. His report was fairly given and I am sure much appreciated.

The amendment to this report advocates the use of a plebiscite in choosing a design for a new Canadian flag. I believe in the principle of a plebiscite and was not converted to this view only recently after the report was brought in. I want to refer to a question I asked on February 24 of this year. As reported at page 136 of *Hansard,* a time when hon. members will admit we had reached not very far into the 10,000 or so pages of *Hansard* we have created so far this session, I asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) the following question on the orders of the day:

> In view of the government's undertaking to provide the people of Canada with a distinctive national flag, has consideration been given or will consideration be given to allowing the people to make their own choice through a plebiscite or referendum from among several of the most popular designs, including the red ensign?

I had, Mr. Speaker, given some thought to the question of choosing a flag for Canada, and the question I asked was not an idle one. It was not a question intended to embarrass the government. It was an honest question asked for two purposes: first of all, to obtain information as to the attitude of the government to the possibility of holding a plebiscite; and second, to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that others were thinking along these lines. Indeed, I was not the first hon. member in the house to mention it this session; it was mentioned by others even earlier in this session. The Prime Minister answered as follows:

> All I can say at the moment, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the procedure which should be followed in this matter is that parliament certainly should be put in a position to decide for or against a particular flag. As to whether it would be desirable to have a popular referendum on this matter so that the people could choose from among a number of designs, I would like to give that matter very careful consideration before agreeing to it.

So that my belief that a plebiscite would be a good and satisfactory means for choosing the design for our national flag is not new.

In his speech this evening the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Coates) gave the house the results of some public opinion polls which were held in various parts of Canada and which indicate that a great many people across the country, at least in some parts of the country, are seriously considering the possibility of a plebiscite as a means of choosing a satisfactory flag design.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what does the Conservative party stand for in regard to this issue? I cannot speak for the Conservative party but I can speak for myself. I realize I am not the only one in the Conservative party who feels the way I do; there are many others. I also know that some of my colleagues do not agree with me, and for various reasons. And I do not insist that they should. Our party is democratic and the members of our party, ever since my association with it and since I was elected to this house, have been free to express their own opinions in their own way on every occasion. No pressure has been brought to bear on them at any time by our leader or by members of the government. Our members have been free to go their own way and there has been no unpleasantness and no pressure brought to bear. That statement I can make honestly, and it is true despite suggestions to the contrary which have appeared from time to time in the press.

In the first place I think the purpose of every member of the Conservative party is to promote and maintain national unity. We believe the best way to retain and promote national unity is to devise some means of choosing a flag, as a result of which there would be no losers and no winners.

If hon. members opposite support the government in its method of choosing a flag, a great many people in Canada will have bitter feelings toward a great many other people in Canada, and that is a most unfortunate situation. If we chose a flag through imposition a great many people will feel bitterly disappointed.

I should like to know why the government is in such a hurry to adopt this flag. If the government had argued early this summer that there was some urgency about choosing a flag, that argument might have been understood; but such an argument carries no weight at this time, and a course followed along that line of thinking, with such persistence, will

do nothing but create friction and develop a great deal of bitterness between the two founding races of this country.

Since early this summer the flag question has become the centre of activity in this House of Commons, and all the government legislation has been built around it. I do not suggest the government euchred us out of an Easter recess, but we certainly did not have an Easter holiday. We did not have a summer vacation, and I am not sure we are going to have a Christmas break, as things appear at this time. The government can be assured, however, that neither bribe in the way of holidays, nor pressures in the way of threats of an election, will prevent me from using every rule in the rule book to see that we devise a method of choosing a flag which will generate the least possible bitterness in this country, but which will maintain the greatest possible national unity.

I suggest there should be no reason for bitterness between our French speaking and English speaking colleagues in this country. However if we persist in imposing a flag on the people of Canada, I see no opportunity of avoiding a great deal of bitterness. I think we can avoid this bitterness by adopting the suggestion that a plebiscite be held, during the next election in order to save expenses. If we co-operate in this way I am sure we can choose a distinctive national Canadian flag of which all Canadians, French and English speaking, can be proud, while avoiding a a great deal of bitterness. We must avoid rushing into a decision. We must avoid these continual pressures, and we must avoid threats of an election. Let us discontinue the practice of tying our legislative program to the flag issue. The members of this house have been under constant pressure since this matter was first introduced during this session. I am sure the members of the house as well as the people of this country are sick and tired of the whole show.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Thomas: The fact that we have been under pressure and are sick and tired of the whole situation is not something which will prevent me from continuing to discuss this matter, with the hope that a proper and satisfactory solution to the benefit of the people of Canada can be found.

Again, speaking for myself, I suggest that a ballot be prepared for submission to the electors at the next general election containing several suitable compromise designs. In view of all the argument and discussion that has taken place in this house and across the country about the red ensign and the three maple leaf design, neither of those should appear on that ballot. The presently proposed one maple leaf design might be considered as a suitable compromise for inclusion on such a ballot, because it is the design recommended by the flag committee.

In this regard, three proposed flag designs have been distributed in this house within the last 24 hours. They might be designs suitable for such a ballot. Other designs have been of interest to some of our French speaking colleagues in this party, and I am sure those designs are possibilities for submission to the people on a ballot. I think five or six designs in colour and in miniature should be placed on a convenient-sized ballot so as to allow the people of Canada to express their preference. They could do so by marking the figure 1 beside their first choice, figure 2 beside their second choice, figure 3 beside their third choice and so on. I think the results of such a plebiscite should be calculated on the single transferable voting system. That is, all votes cast for the last choice design could be allotted to the remainder. All the votes cast for the second last design should be allotted then to the remainder, and so on until one design had a clear majority support. That is not a new system of voting, but one that has been used in the province of Alberta for many years in single member constituencies. I think that system has also been used in other provinces. That system, used to calculate the results of a plebiscite as has been suggested, would be a foolproof method. No matter which design illustrated on a ballot—provided they were all reasonably compromise design—was chosen by the majority of the people voting, no one would lose and all French and English speaking citizens could be justly proud of it. This would eliminate or reduce to a minimum all bitterness and controversy. I am glad to associate myself with any other members of the house who are prepared to keep this discussion going, in the hope that reason may prevail, that the government in its wisdom may find it possible to follow some line of approach in choosing a national flag which will be less dangerous to national unity than the method of imposing a flag by a vote in this house.

There have been charges of obstruction levelled against our party and I should like to deal with those charges.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Thomas: Not too fast, my friends, not too fast. There have been charges of obstruction and a great deal of criticism, but did you ever stop to think what would have happened if there had been no extended discussion of the flag issue in the house? Have you ever stopped to think what we would have had? We would have had a flag imposed on the people of Canada which even the party that endorsed it would not support in the final analysis. The three maple leaf design was endorsed by the government, but later when they had had a chance to look around and after they had listened to a great many speeches—174 Conservative speeches, was it —on the subject, they decided it was possible to devise and choose a more suitable design, and that is what was done by the committee. So the fact is that the continued discussion did serve a purpose.

The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Roxburgh) rose in his place this afternoon and said he never did like the three maple leaf design. He made no such statement during the extended discussion of that design. But when the opportunity came to choose a more satisfactory design he was very glad that it was found possible to do so and that a more satisfactory design was recommended by the committee. I say it is just possible that if members of the Conservative party keep on talking for a while we will be able to devise some other design which will bring to government members as well as to all other members of the house, and to all the people of Canada, as much more pleasure as the single maple leaf did as compared with the three maple leaf design. It will possibly be a further improvement over the present proposed design. This is possible.

Why do members criticize us so severely for keeping the discussion alive and continuing to thresh over and reconsider the idea? Much progress has been made. I submit to all members of the house that in this flag issue we are playing for keeps, or we should be playing for keeps. We should not approach the matter lightly. What would have happened if through action of the house we had imposed the three maple leaf design on the country? The country would have had a flag which a great many people did not like and which a great many members of the house did not like. When the sponsors of that flag were faced with a better choice, not one of them stayed with it.

There is no reason at all to suppose that this question is closed. If members of the house will put their minds to it we can just as easily produce a still more satisfactory design. What is the hurry? Why not take our time? After the house has done all it can to provide suitable designs on which the people can vote, why not let the people themselves choose their flag from among the several designs recommended by a committee of the house?

In our amendment we are asking that the flag problem be referred back to the committee. So far as I am concerned I would not say "the" committee but rather "a" committee, because what can we expect if we refer back to the same committee a matter which they in their wisdom have already considered? There were only 15 members of the house on that committee. Why not submit the problem to 15 other members of the house? Set up a new committee with different members on it and let them have a go at the matter. It is very unlikely that they will come up with exactly the same solution as the former committee. I think that would be most wise and that would be my idea of how we should go about this matter. Appoint 15 other members to a committee and let them have a try at choosing a design. If we keep on we will end up with a number of very suitable designs which can be placed on a ballot.

Again I repeat, what is the hurry? If there was hurry last spring then I know of no hurry now. I know that the government of the country promised to bring in a distinctive flag within two years, but surely they have tried. Surely they have made an honest effort to carry out that promise to the electors. If they have not succeeded, at least they have tried and they are entitled to the credit for trying. But there is no hurry now. I can see no need for hurry. So let us take our time and do this thing right. Let us use methods of choosing a design for a new national flag which will tend to prevent friction among the different sections of the country.

I stated that I intended to deal with the topic of obstruction and filibuster. Beauchesne, fourth edition, citation 119, contains this statement in paragraph 2 of that citation:

> In parliament every corner of the country is represented and no rule should silence elected representatives when they think they have a message to deliver. Freedom of speech is a sacred principle and if there is a place where it should be fully respected that place is the parliament of the nation, and it is the Speaker's responsibility to see that this principle is not infringed upon.

In paragraph 1 of citation 119 we find this opinion:

> Delays, multiplicity of amendments and even obstruction must not always be regarded as illegitimate political weapons.

I am going to repeat that.

> Delays, multiplicity of amendments and even obstruction must not always be regarded as illegitimate political weapons.

In paragraph 2 of citation 119, we find these words:

> The mere object of shortening sessions may lead to an undue curtailment of the freedom of speech. The duties of a representative of parliament are too important to be performed in a hurry.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I wonder if the hon. member, while he is looking at Beauchesne, would refer also to citation 149, paragraph (i), which states that a member must not—

> —use his right of speech for the purpose of obstructing business of the house.

Mr. Thomas: I have much ground to cover yet, Mr. Speaker, so if our friend does not mind I am going to plow ahead. He will be at liberty to take 40 minutes in due course and make his contribution to the problem of choosing a national flag in some way which will not tend to arouse friction between the various sections of this country.

Mr. Winkler: He can be the spokesman from British Columbia. Nobody else will speak.

Mr. Thomas: I am speaking in support of a plebiscite, and bringing forth reasons why a plebiscite is desirable on this matter. These references in Beauchesne indicate the rights of minorities in the House of Commons to challenge the government's right to proceed when in conflict with public interest. There is provision in the rules, however, for the government to override the demands for change of policy by a minority. This is the closure rule. If the government are sure enough of their position, they can invoke closure and answer to the people for their actions. No government can, therefore, successfully contend that they have been prevented from carrying out their responsibilities through the act of a minority opposition.

If the government are unwise in their method of producing a national flag, let them take the steps to start the action suggested. I would say that any charge by the government now or in the future, that a minority are preventing them from carrying out their responsibilities, is completely unfounded. The government are responsible for submitting business to this house, and if the opposition believe that the government are making a mistake it is their job to use every advantage in the rules, every provision in the rules which is available to them, to prevent the government from making a mistake or taking an unwise action. Surely, hon. members on the government side cannot criticize members sitting on this side of the house for doing the job the people sent them here to do.

Now, in dealing with the flag issue, may I repeat that this is playing for keeps. We do not look forward to having a flag issue or a flag controversy with every change of government. What a situation that would be in this country. This is something which is done once in a generation, once in a lifetime—my colleague says, once in a hundred years. We should not have any talk about changing it again. We are playing for keeps. Why hurry? Why not let us take sufficient time to do the job properly? If the government persists in their present method, then I submit they are planting in Canada the seeds of bitterness for several generations to come. This flag issue is of the utmost importance to our national unity. I believe that the problem should not be approached in haste. No amount of effort no amount of time, and no amount of expense should be permitted to stand in the way of choosing a national flag which is capable of enhancing the national unity of our country.

This afternoon one of the speakers from the southeast corner of the house, I believe it was the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) said that he was elected, and his colleague were elected, on this flag issue. Well, perhaps they were, Mr. Speaker. I do not know what the election issues were in Villeneuve. I was not anywhere near there. I was in western Ontario, in Middlesex West, with one or two exceptions. This is where my campaign speeches were made. I do not remember making any extravagant promises. My main promise was that I had done my best to carry out my duties and I promised if re-elected I would continue to do just that, to do my very best in carrying out my duties as a member. I was re-elected; but to the best of my knowledge there was no mention made of a new Canadian flag in that area.

It is true the Conservative party, in their national conference, had passed a resolution in favour of a national flag, but that was not an issue in our election. May I call it ten o'clock?

At ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, December 2, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. SCOTT—DECISION ON COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE OF CONVICTED MURDERER

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I want to rise on a point of privilege. One Georges Marcotte is at present under sentence of death and is destined to die tomorrow night for the crime of murder. We have been trying all day to obtain from the Minister of Justice an announcement of the decision the cabinet has made as to whether the sentence is to be commuted to life emprisonment. The Minister of Justice has declined to make such announcement until such decision has been taken. If the decision is delayed any longer, Mr. Speaker, it will make it virtually impossible for those members of the house who are interested in the case to take any action they might deem appropriate in the light of the decision which the cabinet may have taken. I want to raise as a point of privilege that the failure of the minister to make this decision known to us is an infringement upon our rights as members, and is in effect preventing us from taking the action which we might deem necessary.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair has to decide whether there is or is not a question of privilege involved here. I have listened to a statement but I have not seen any supporting evidence outside of the mere statement that the minister has not informed the hon. member or some other hon. members about this matter. I do not see any question of privilege in that. The minister is simply carrying out his duty, as far as I know.

Mr. Scott: Mr. Speaker, no longer than three minutes ago I spoke to the minister on the floor of this chamber, asking him to make an announcement about this decision, and he again declined to make this decision known to me.

CANADIAN FLAG

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SIXTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Tuesday, December 1, consideration of the motion of Mr. Batten that the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, be now concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Monteith.

Mr. W. H. A. Thomas (Middlesex West): Mr. Speaker, when the house rose last evening I was attempting to show cause for submitting the flag issue to the people of Canada in the form of a plebiscite, so that the people across this country can choose the design for a new flag.

By way of a short résumé of one or two of the points I covered I should like to state that I, as well as other members in this party and I believe in common with all hon. members in this house, stand for national unity. It is the purpose of parliament to maintain national unity, and we in this party have been searching for ways and means of promoting that unity and avoiding in every possible way discord among our people. If the government follows its present proposal to impose a flag on the Canadian people through a vote in this chamber, there will be discord. The whole issue becomes a party matter. I am sure the party to which I belong as well as other members of the house will agree that if we can devise some means of choosing a flag which will avoid discord and disunity in our nation we should do so.

The Conservative party has moved an amendment to the motion for concurrence in the report of the special committee to the effect that this matter be referred back to the committee with instructions to consider arrangements for submitting this question to the people through a plebiscite. Speaking for myself in this regard rather than for the party—and I should be glad to associate myself with any member of this house who feels the same way—we should continue this discussion with the hope that some better means will be found for deciding upon a flag for the Canadian people than through a government proposal to impose a flag by action of this house.

To show that there is not unanimity in the country, I have permission from my colleague the hon. member for Elgin to place on the record of the house a telegram which he received this morning from radio station CHLO in St. Thomas, Ontario. I may say that

this radio station also covers the Middlesex West area. It reads as follows:

Jim McBain, M.P.
House of Commons, Ottawa, Ont.
Jim: Monday and Tuesday, Doug Hinz conducted a straw vote on "High Gear"—

"High Gear" is the name of the program he conducts in the morning hours.

—re the single maple leaf flag design. For your information, Monday's program showed 80 per cent of listeners against it. Tuesday's program 83 per cent against it. Program attracts listeners from 6.30 to 9.15 a.m. Regards.

Barry Kentner CHLO Radio.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the amendment moved by representatives of the Progressive Conservative party. However, I must explain that I am giving expression to my personal opinion on this occasion and to what I am very certain is the opinion of the majority of the constituents I have the honour to represent. I must again emphasize that in matters of conscience members of our party are free to express their personal opinions with respect to any issue that comes before the house, and like the members of other parties in the house we are not all of one opinion on this question.

Personally I favour the red ensign as a flag that represents the realities of history which, if we go into our history, we find were given voice in Anglo-Saxon assemblies, in the terms of Magna Carta, in the struggle for freedom during the reigns of Edward III, the Tudors, the Stuarts and James II, in the glorious revolution of 1688, in the reform acts of 1832, in the representation acts passed from 1867 up to 1948, in the mother of parliaments in Great Britain that provides for a government and an opposition, which protects the rights of the minority to free expression and which we are very glad to see has found its counterpart in the parliament of Canada.

However, Mr. Speaker, regardless of my personal opinion and even of some of the very strongly voiced opinions of some of my constituents, we are anxious to adopt a flag that will be acceptable to the great majority of all Canadians. We enter this debate in a spirit of compromise to that end. I spoke of this question on June 30 last, Mr. Speaker, and expressed my criticism of the way the Prime Minister had handled this question. I was particularly critical of his bringing this flag issue before the remembrance service of the Royal Canadian Legion convention held at Winnipeg earlier this year, and of other speeches he made on this issue. For that reason I urged support for a national flag that provides for the continuity of our history, with the inclusion of the union jack and all it stands for throughout the whole of our history, as well as the inclusion of the fleur-de-lis which stood for so much in the struggle for freedom in France in the days of long ago.

As I said before, we enter this debate in a spirit of compromise with a view to developing finally a national flag that will bring complete unity to the Canadian people. Referring to my own constituency, Mr. Speaker, I must say I have had the wholehearted support of all the Legion branches in my riding, the I.O.D.E. organization throughout the riding, the Orange lodge and a good number of other organizations, including the women's institutes which have expressed their views very strongly with regard to this question. In addition to that, sir, I have had somewhat over 2,000 of my constituents who have informed me in writing of their views with regard to a national flag for Canada, a flag that will contain symbols of our struggle for freedom, for parliamentary institutions in Great Britain, in France and in Canada.

I hear the hon. member for Leeds asking me to name those constituents. I am sorry, I did not hear correctly, Mr. Speaker; it was somebody else over there. Naturally, I could not do that, because I believe that everyone who wishes to speak in this debate should have that opportunity, and then we should vote on the issue.

Before proceeding further I should like to pay tribute to the chairman of the flag committee and the members of that committee. While there have been some criticisms of leaks from that committee I must say that in my opinion they laboured long and laboured in silence. I think there was less in total leakage from the flag committee than from any other committee with which I have had anything to do in this house over a period of 19 years. I think it is only fair to say that.

Unfortunately, from my point of view and the point of view of the majority of my constituents, and I am sure the majority of the Canadian people, the committee did not produce a flag which will be satisfactory. I must say that I am not enamoured with this flag. I do not like this design. I should like a maple leaf with other emblems on the flag as suggested by a speaker from the Progres-

sive Conservative party, which would then include symbols of the founding races of this country and the other groups that have helped to build up this great nation of ours. That is the reason I am supporting the amendment at this time.

There has been a very strong demand for a plebiscite. I have heard pleas for a plebiscite made by the Royal Canadian Legion, the Canadian Corps Association and other veterans groups. In this connection I would like to place on record in part what they have said in this respect. On November 11 the Canadian Legion presented its views to the cabinet with respect to veterans legislation and other matters, and included a copy of the resolution which it adopted at its convention in Winnipeg earlier this year. That resolution reads as follows:

> Be it resolved that the delegates to this, the 20th biennial convention of the Royal Canadian Legion assembled at Winnipeg 17th-22nd May, 1964, reiterate the stand taken by the delegates of our 18th and 19th biennial conventions that we urge the government of Canada to, by act of parliament, adopt the Canadian red ensign as the national flag of Canada.

I also have here a very interesting letter from Mr. Heesaker, dominion president of the Canadian Corps Association, which contains the following passage:

> Therefore, the Canadian Corps Association, dominion command, again emphatically requests the Prime Minister of Canada, and parliament as a whole, to place this subject before the people, at the next regularly scheduled general election. Let the voters of Canada finalize this matter.

I have received correspondence in similar vein from other veterans organizations, and from reading the papers I understand public opinion polls have been conducted on this issue. I am informed that some 60 per cent of the persons questioned in these polls have asked to have a plebiscite at the next general election in order that they may choose the flag they wish.

We have had nearly 100 years of self government under the British North America Act. So far as I know we are the first country to bring a measure before parliament to change its national flag after nearly 100 years of history. Though that was done by newer members of the commonwealth which obtained their independence in recent years, we are the first country which, having had that long experience of parliamentary government, has brought such a measure before parliament.

I urge members of the government to give consideration to the fact that the veterans of this country have spoken clearly and with one voice on this issue. I am talking about the organized veterans of the country.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Herridge: Other responsible organizations across Canada have also urged the necessity for a plebiscite, and I ask members of the government to give consideration to their representations.

I am quite sure that the symbols we have at present, the symbols in our red ensign, the symbol of the fleur-de-lis, are very dear to many people because they represent such a great sweep of our histories.

I support the amendment to refer the matter back to the committee so the committee may bring in a report containing two, three or four designs which could be submitted to the Canadian people in a plebiscite at the next federal election. I am confident that if this were done—and it could be done at little extra expense added to the cost of the election—whatever decision was reached would be accepted as a majority decision of the Canadian people made with conviction and in good faith.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in concluding my somewhat brief remarks I urge that when every member has had an opportunity to express his views with respect to this amendment and his views on the remaining portion of the flag debate, we should then return to the realities of present circumstances and deal with legislation that awaits our attention.

An hon. Member: They don't have it ready.

Mr. Otto: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. gentleman would permit a question.

Mr. Herridge: Willingly.

Mr. Otto: I ask the hon. gentleman to believe that I raise this question for our edification. He mentioned that the fleur-de-lis was at one time or another a symbol of freedom. I think we all recall the tricolour and even the cross of Lorraine, but I wonder whether the hon. gentleman could remind us of the time in history when the fleur-de-lis was a symbol or emblem of freedom.

Mr. Herridge: I willingly do that, Mr. Speaker. I consulted my good friends the Créditistes as to the history of the fleur-de-lis in the development of French democracy.

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, of all the many words that have been said on this flag issue and of all the many speeches that have been

made, the words Your Honour used, although you are not supposed to make speeches, impressed me more than all the others I have heard. I refer to a few remarks Your Honour made in this house on September 2 last. I believe Your Honour was dealing with a point of order on a subamendment, and you quoted from Beauchesne's fourth edition, citation 119(3). I read it in part:

A great deal of latitude must be allowed in the House of Commons which is a forum where every phase of public affairs can be discussed and every member has the right to be heard—

Sometimes we doubt that.

—even if in doing so he sometimes disregards the rigidity of procedure.

Then you went on to say, Mr. Speaker; and these are the words I refer to in your very short speech:

Basing myself on this principle, and in view of the highly charged emotional context of the issue, it seemed to the Chair that members should be dealt with in a most reasonable fashion.

I would say that if in your wisdom, Mr. Speaker, you could have in some way impressed upon the Prime Minister of this country those two points, this flag debate would have been finished weeks ago.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McIntosh: Hon. members on the other side laugh, but let me just repeat what you said, Mr. Speaker:

Basing myself on this principle, and in view of the highly charged emotional context—

I think we would all agree with that. And the flag issue is not the basic issue; the basic issue with which we are dealing, although we may be speaking about a flag, is the unity of this country; and that is very basic.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McIntosh: As Your Honour has said, this issue should be dealt with in a reasonable fashion. I contend that this is all the opposition has been trying to do ever since we began this debate. We have asked the Prime Minister to treat it in a reasonable fashion. In fact I am one of those who contend that it is not our place to decide on this flag issue; it is an emotional issue that should be decided by the people. It has nothing to do with the social welfare of the people or the economics of the country. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that if you in your position could even now impress these two points upon the Prime Minister I am sure this debate would be finished today.

Some hon. Members: Yes?

Mr. McIntosh: Some hon. members say "Yes?" The reason we are dealing with this issue now is that it was an election promise. Coming from the west, I wonder about some of the other promises made by hon. members opposite. There are not very many Liberal members in the chamber. One promise that was made in the west that is perhaps more important to the west than the promise of a flag was the $2 a bushel for wheat. When is that promise going to be kept?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McIntosh: In fact some of the western members mentioned a figure of $3 a bushel. What has been done about that election promise? I just wish to say a few words on this matter, Mr. Speaker. Instead of the price going up, it has been going down. I refer to the price of Durum wheat mentioned in this house the other day.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. McIntosh: This is in order. I am talking about the promises the government made. They have said the flag was an election promise, and that is the reason the Prime Minister introduced this issue into the house. We contend there is more important business for the House of Commons to deal with than the flag issue.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McIntosh: We ask ourselves, why was this issue raised in the first place? Why was it raised at the time it was? Why was it not mentioned in the throne speech, if it was so important? We can give hon. members opposite the answers to these questions. They may have different answers, but we know why this issue was introduced. It was because legislation was not ready.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McIntosh: They laugh, Mr. Speaker. Do they want me to point out those pieces of legislation that had to be withdrawn after being introduced into the house? There were two or three such cases, and it is not necessary for me to give the details. I have said before that there is other and more important legislation to be dealt with. Some of this is legislation that could be dealt with in a very short space of time. In our opinion the flag question cannot be dealt with in a very short space of time; as Mr. Speaker has said, it should be dealt with in a reasonable manner. I repeat that all we are asking

is that it be dealt with in a reasonable manner.

Members of the New Democratic party are very anxious that the bill dealing with the labour code be brought before parliament. We are also anxious that this be done.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

In my opinion, you should call to order the member who is speaking at this moment and ask him to keep to the subject under discussion. Furthermore, I would ask you to render your decision immediately, as you did yesterday, and suggest to the hon. member that he confine his remarks to the subject under discussion.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: It might be helpful at this time to indicate to the house the understanding of the Chair. The discussion should relate to the amendment. If we assume that a member is going to speak for 40 minutes, I do not see any particular harm in speaking generally for five minutes, but the other 35 minutes should relate to the amendment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Winkler: What about the farmers in Quebec? Why don't you make a speech about that situation? Come on; stand up.

An hon. Member: He is not allowed to speak over there.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out once again that your remarks impressed me for this reason. We are speaking on the amendment and raising the question that this whole matter should go to the people in the form of a plebiscite. Because Your Honour made those remarks, to my mind what I have been saying is directly related to the issue before us; in fact, it is the strongest argument that I have.

This is the reason it should be decided by way of a plebiscite. I refer to the two points that Your Honour raised. I do not understand why backbenchers opposite should say it is not relevant. We just wish to deal with legislation that should be dealt with at the present time, and this question has been raised time and again. This is another reason this matter should be decided by a plebiscite, namely that there is important legislation with which we should deal. I refer to the rail line abandonment legislation, for example. That is another matter that is very important to us in the west. Perhaps it is not so important to the people in the east; it appears to me that to some of them the question of a flag is more important. As far as I am concerned, this is a strong reason for this question being decided by a plebiscite.

My second reason for suggesting that the question should be decided by a plebiscite I take from the remarks of the seconder of the motion, the hon. member for Danforth. I refer to just one paragraph of his speech for the moment, in which he said:

> I am aware that some members of the committee felt very strongly that a flag ought to contain—

I would point out that he was speaking for the committee:

> —the union jack and the fleur-de-lis. That is a view we listened to with the greatest of respect and we explored every possible argument pro and con. I respect that view, but in the end—

I emphasize this last part; the hon. member refers to those in the committee.

> —most of us came to the conclusion that by putting emblems such as that on our national flag we would be merely giving ourselves a perpetual reminder of the things that divide us—

Well, Mr. Speaker, whoever heard of the coat of arms of our country being something which would divide us? I submit that this conclusion which was arrived at by the committee is based on a false or erroneous premise. Certainly the union jack will not divide us. I ask the members of this House of Commons, what will the maple leaf do to us? It has already created another faction which did not exist before.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. McIntosh: To some people—perhaps not to those who are anxious to get this through and are calling "carried"—a national flag represents the deepest emotions of the heart. It means heroism, self-sacrifice, courage and love. I do not think there is anything there which would divide us regardless of which province we come from. I suggest that this is another reason why this issue should go back to the committee and to the people by way of a plebiscite.

Further on in the hon. member's speech he said:

> The one thing which it seems to me is significant about the committee report, and which lends great weight to its recommendation, is that if anything can be said it is that this is a parliamentary flag. This is not the flag of any particular party. It is not the flag of any particular individual.

I think had I been helping the hon. member with his speech I would have said "Nor

is it the flag of any particular country". It does not, as the hon. member tried to point out, signify unity. Unity is not something which can be legislated, as we all know, any more than a flag can be created by an act of parliament. A flag is merely a bit of coloured cloth until people take it to their hearts, and that cannot be ordered by decree. This flag to many of us is still just a piece of coloured cloth which may come to mean something to us if it is the selection of the people of Canada as a whole.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the report of the committee is not realistic. It means nothing. In my opinion the flag they have recommended is a nebulous design because it means nothing. The hon. member for Leeds a day or two ago said that the maple leaf represented Canada, and he referred to some publication he had obtained from the parliamentary library. That publication stated that this flag represents all Canada. However, the hon. member neglected to say that the writer of that book died roughly 100 years ago. It did represent all Canada at that time, but not today. When that book was written Canada stopped at the great lakes. Since that time a much larger and greater country has developed, and certainly the maple leaf is not seen west of the great lakes. Therefore in my opinion it does not represent Canada. I would say that each group in Canada should have some representation on the flag to which their hearts are attached.

The hon. member for Kootenay West, who spoke a few moments ago, told us what the union jack meant to him. I have heard members from Quebec say what the fleur-de-lis means to them. I hope I respect that meaning, and in return I would ask those members from Quebec to respect the fact that the union jack means something to me.

I should like to refer to a speech made in this house some time ago by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, who is a returned soldier. He was speaking on what the flag meant to him and referred to the days of liberation after both world war I and world war II; I believe he served in both. The hon. member said the red ensign began to mean something to him when it was waved not by people of Canada but by people liberated by Canadians from oppression and tyranny. As the hon. member said, he realized at that time that the red ensign also meant something to him. I was born an Anglo-Saxon and I served a number of years in the army. Because of those two facts I like the red ensign, and as I say the union jack means something to me.

At this time I think I should put on record what the red ensign means to our veterans organizations, and I should like to read a letter put out by the president of the Canadians corps. I think this letter was sent to every member of parliament. It is dated November 27, which actually was about three days before this amendment was moved. It is addressed to all members of the House of Commons and reads as follows.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. May I refer to Sir T. Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, sixteenth edition, page 470, which reads:

> Although it is the duty of the Speaker to interfere in the first instance for the preservation of order, when, in his judgment, the occasion demands his interference, it is also the right of any member who conceives that a breach of order has been committed, if the Speaker refrains from interfering (either because he does not consider it necessary to do so, or because he does not perceive that a breach of order has been committed) to rise in his place, interrupting any member who may be speaking, and direct the attention of the Chair to the matter, provided he does so the moment the alleged breach of order occurs.

May I also refer to page 451 with respect to the subject of relevancy of debate. It says:

> Debate must not stray from the question before the house—or anticipate a matter appointed for the consideration of the house.

We have numerous illustrations of this principle being followed, and I would ask the Chair to direct that what we are concerned with here is the question of a plebiscite and nothing else.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps I should attempt to answer the point of order. It is all very well to cite principles, if hon. members are able to find citations, but those principles have to be enforced. If I may refer the hon. member to standing orders, standing order 34 (2) says:

> Mr. Speaker or the chairman, after having called the attention of the house, or of the committee, to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance, or repetition, may direct him to discontinue his speech, and if then the member still continues to speak, Mr. Speaker shall name him, or, if in committee, the chairman shall report him to the house.

In this type of debate, dealing with this type of subject, it seems to me the Chair should at least be given wide discretion, and to follow subsection (2) of standing order 34 is just not called for at this time. I am watching and listening very carefully to the remarks of the hon. member, and I would ask hon. members to trust my judgment to

interfere if and when in my humble opinion it is necessary to do so. Up to the moment, although the hon. member has been speaking quite generally, he is working toward a conclusion and to that extent should be given the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, if I could make your job any easier for you perhaps it would help if I read the last paragraph of this letter, which is rather unusual. It says this:

> The Canadian Corps Association, dominion command at this time reiterates that no change in Canada's present national flag should be made unless the government is so instructed by the citizens of Canada by means of a plebiscite vote held in conjunction with Canada's next general election.

Everything I am saying is related to the amendment now before the house. I also remind the hon. member for Leeds that this is the first time I have spoken on this issue either inside or outside the house. I could become irrelevant by repeating something he has said in regard to this issue, but I would be off the subject so I will refrain from doing so.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to read what the Canadian corps has to say about what they wish the Prime Minister would do, and I suggest it is exactly the same as we would like the Prime Minister to do. They say:

> The right hon. Prime Minister Pearson and some of his associates have, during the past few days, called for British fair play and justice.
>
> The Prime Minister has, therefore, substantiated the veterans of Canada's demand that our present government must not eliminate from Canada, the flag of justice and freedom, the Canadian red ensign.
>
> The Canadian Corps Association, dominion command sincerely hopes that with the latest events in parliament, that the members of the House of Commons will take a closer look at these disclosures and then decide whether to be stampeded by irresponsible people whose only aim is to remove from Canada all the things that we, as Canadians, have been proud of for years.

Perhaps I should say that I read the last paragraph first. At this time on behalf of the Canadian Legion particularly, and veterans generally, I should like to place on record what General Charles Foulkes, former chairman of the chiefs of staff had to say about a cartoon which was detrimental to veterans, as reported in an article in the Toronto *Telegram* of May 6. The article is headed "Ridicule—how quickly we forget". I believe that statement to be true, and perhaps it is our fault here that we forget so easily. The general had this to say:

> A recent cartoon in the Ottawa *Citizen* depicted two apparently inebriated legionnaires expressing disapproval of the Prime Minister's proposal for a new Canadian flag. While I have no inclination to get into the controversial flag issue, I must take issue with the cartoonist and the Ottawa *Citizen* for publishing this most insulting cartoon, which attempts to associate the views of the veterans of two wars to those of two inebriates.
>
> Perhaps some of the legionnaires do imbibe a bit too much in their haunts in the various Legion halls, but we should remember that these were the same individuals whom we exhorted to come forward and fight in the mud of France and Flanders. I suspect that many of those who are now poking fun at these old veterans were not too conspicuous in the actual fighting of the last war.

I believe that is true, because of an investigation which was carried out to find out who was responsible for putting this cartoon in the *Ottawa Citizen*. The general continued as follows:

> I rarely speak out on such occasions but to allow such an impression to get abroad that the views of the Canadian veterans can be assumed by such a cartoon is just too much for some of us to take. The newspaper concerned may have forgotten that the men they are lampooning are the same men who withstood the savage attacks at Vimy and Cambria and the Somme. Those of us who saw the fighting in Sicily, Normandy, and Germany are indeed very sympathetic towards the heroes of France and Flanders and take serious umbrage to those like this cartoonist who make fun of the old veteran who still likes his pint of beer, but in his day offered his life in order that we can now enjoy the freedom of the press.
>
> To have affection and pride for a flag and symbol which was once the flag of battle seems to be misunderstood by some, perhaps it is because they never had or wanted to see that emblem in the heat of battle. Be that as it may it hardly behooves any of us who fought under that flag to make jest or fun at his expense. How do we know what he may have suffered or sacrificed while serving under this emblem?
>
> How soon we forget! How easy it is to take a crack at the burned out veteran and his pint of beer and his affection for the flag he fought for. But it was his sacrifice and that of thousands who never came back, that make this free discussion of a Canadian flag possible.
>
> Do what you like about the flag, but don't dare lampoon those who fought to make this free decision possible.

I agree with the general. As a result of the heated argument that has taken place on this issue, and in an attempt to find some solution to our problem, I have read the speeches of many members of this house to ascertain whether I could find some common ground, or a common denominator. I should like to refer to *Hansard* of November 30, which was last Monday, and particularly to the remarks of the hon. member for Danforth, who had this to say:

> —it would be preferable to have a distinctive flag that says just one thing, Canada—not French Canada, not English Canada, not ethnic Canada, but Canada.

Canadian Flag

I should now like to turn to another statement by the same member, as recorded in the same volume of *Hansard.*

Mr. Marcoux: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am finding it difficult to pick out anything that is relevant to the amendment now before us in the speech being made by the hon. member. His remarks seem to be relevant to the main motion but without relation to the amendment. Perhaps I should refer again to that citation from Bourinot. The hon. member seems to be anticipating a matter appointed for the consideration of the house which is not the subject matter of the amendment.

According to citation 119 (3) of Beauchesne's fourth edition, relevancy is not easy to define. However, in view of the number of speeches we have had for so many days, and in view of the decision taken by Your Honour yesterday on the matter of relevancy, I think the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek is out of order and should be called to order.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak on the same point of order. I am not surprised that the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency has attempted to prevent my colleague from speaking, because he is one of those who, in a speech some time ago, recommended that closure be applied.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The difficulty of the Chair in attempting to maintain relevancy and avoid repetition is self evident. I do not wish to be involved in one procedural argument after another. Hon. members must discipline themselves to a certain extent.

Perhaps I can help hon. members in this way. It seems to me that the amendment now before us for consideration deals with the holding of a plebiscite. The house has already reached a decision on the subamendment having to do with the four questions that were suggested should be asked through a plebiscite. We do not have to deal with that matter again. The opinion in that regard can be found at pages 6912 to 6920 of *Hansard* of Monday, August 17.

We are now dealing with the flag question in relation to a plebiscite, and it seems to me the questions to be asked are, should we have a plebiscite or should we not have a plebiscite? What are the reasons for holding a plebiscite? That is the question before the house at the present time, and I am sure hon. members will do their best to help the Chair by trying to be relevant and trying to avoid repetition.

[Mr. McIntosh.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcoux: Mr. Speaker, may I remind you that the amendment is even more specific than the question of whether a referendum should be held or not. The subject of the amendment is to refer the report back to the committee with instructions to change a paragraph and replace it by another. The matter of a plebiscite is relevant but it is not the main point of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith).

I must point out to the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot that I am not stopping anyone from speaking, but I ask the speakers to restrict themselves to the matter under consideration. I said earlier that I was in favour of closure, and I still am.

[*Text*]

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to establish the reasons why we should hold the plebiscite and I prefaced my remarks by saying that my main reason stemmed from two statements you yourself made in the house. I will repeat them again for the benefit of the hon. member, who I understand believes in closure. The Speaker said that this issue has a highly charged emotional content and should be dealt with in a reasonable fashion. That is all I am asking the House of Commons to do, to deal with this issue in a reasonable fashion, to deal with the people of Canada in a reasonable fashion.

I also said that to my mind, and you may not agree with me, the flag issue is not the basic issue, and I will have something to say about the province from which the hon. member comes in a few moments. I went on to show the reason why I think there is a mutual channel which we can all follow, if we will, in that time and time again the speeches by members on both sides of the house have expressed the desire that we want to be Canadian. I should like to repeat a few remarks that were made by the hon. member for Compton-Frontenac (Mr. Latulippe). As found on page 10711 of *Hansard* of November 30 he said:

> Do you admit that? This is what we have to consider before going any further in the life of the whole people whom we want to be Canadian, just plain Canadian and not French Canadian, English Canadian, Scottish-Canadian, Irish Canadian, Italian Canadian or German Canadian, no more than American Canadian.

In other words, apparently all of us are of the view that we want to be Canadian and, if so, maybe we are going at this problem the wrong end first. We all say we want to

be Canadian regardless of what country we came from or where our ancestors came from, and we have one thing in common. Can we work from there? Maybe a plebiscite will help us to do so.

For the benefit of some of the Quebec members who may not have travelled extensively in western Canada I am going to read a portion of a letter I have received from a constituent which may startle them. I think we in the House of Commons must face facts if we are going to settle our problems. This constituent's letter reads in part as follows:

> This also raises the Quebec question. Surely it is time someone said "enough". The militant group which is supposedly reflecting public opinion in Quebec are like a labour union and every concession is a confession of weakness. They do not set a limit to their aims. All they want is more. Surely there must be enough intestinal fortitude on the part of someone who will say "no, this is it". Surely it is time for Canadians—

Here he repeats something that we all have in common.

> —not English Canadians, French Canadians, Scottish Canadians, Russian Canadians, etc., to forget all their previous ancestries and be one thing only and that is Canadian.
>
> You as a member of parliament have a voice in the affairs of Canada and surely there are enough good Canadians of all political and racial backgrounds and creeds in the house who will be prepared to stand up and speak for Canada. If you do not and it is not done soon there will be no Canada as such in our lifetime. This small militant minority cannot be allowed to destroy our heritage for their own peculiar and selfish ends. I can assure you that they are being sponsored from without.

I say again that the flag issue is not the basic issue. The basic issue, and the reason we should have a plebiscite, is to preserve what unity we have in Canada, not to divide us more but to try to bring us together. To me it is apparent that our primary need for unity in Canada today is between the people of the province of Quebec and the people of the other nine provinces. The question that has been asked many times, to which we from the west have not received an answer, is, what does Quebec want?

An hon. Member: Quebec.

Mr. McIntosh: If we do have a plebiscite we may possibly find out during the course of the plebiscite or during the course of our discussions with other members of the House of Commons what Quebec wants. We have asked this question on numerous occasions and we have had different answers. I am being very frank when I say that some of my people in the west think that Quebec hates the union jack and will accept any emblem on the flag other than the union jack. I am told by some of my colleagues on this side of the house that this is not so. I am also told that the premier of Quebec said: "We do not care what flag the House of Commons chooses; we will not fly it anyway because we have our own flag". I do not know whether that is right, but if it is then I say to the members from Quebec: Why should they try to impose on us in the rest of Canada outside of Quebec a flag we do not want?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I suggest that the hon. member try to restrict himself to the plebiscite, why it should be held, how it should be held, when it should be held.

Mr. McIntosh: And the reason why it should be held, Mr. Speaker. That is what I am trying to express. The rest of Canada does not understand Quebec. I have editorials here written by people who are supposed to be authorities in Quebec pointing out what they want, and if this is what they want then certainly the rest of Canada cannot tolerate everything that is written in these editorials. I will not read them.

Mr. Marcoux: They do not understand the Conservatives either.

Mr. Smallwood: You want closure.

Mr. McIntosh: I would say to the hon. member from Quebec who has just interjected that I do not see how he and his party can criticize the rest of us because he entered the house as a member of a party which subsequently split, and now the two groups apparently cannot understand each other.

An hon. Member: Where is the hon. member for Three Rivers?

Mr. Grégoire: Where is Balcer? Where is Martineau?

Mr. Caouette: Where is Pigeon?

Mr. Pigeon: He is here.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcoux: Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to leave the house to attend a meeting of the special joint committee on the Canada pension plan at 3.45?

[*Text*]

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, as my time is rapidly running out I will eliminate some of the remarks I was going to make. I would say that I have been thinking about the decision I must make in regard to this issue and, as I said before, it is an emotional issue. I do not think it is an issue that we as mem-

bers of parliament should decide. However, I have tried to assess it and in doing so I have made a summation of what I believe the red ensign stands for. I also have made a summation of the French Canadian viewpoint, as I see it. I have a great number of citizens of French Canadian origin living in my constituency. I would say that they are real Canadians, and I am not taking anything away from the people of Quebec. I say that the majority of them are great Canadians. There are one or two exceptions, but I do not want to name them.

I say that if there is to be a choice of a flag by means of a plebiscite, you should leave the Canadian red ensign as one choice as the veterans have requested. This is a request of certain Legions in our country, you could say the majority. Certainly it is a flag that we have honoured for a number of years. There may be reasons why it should be changed. I know that I am biased; I am prejudiced about it. Since I am prejudiced, I will lean over backwards because I represent a large number of people of French Canadian origin and let them put on this flag any emblem that they desire. I am proud of the contribution the French people have made to Canada. I am particularly proud of the contribution the French Canadians have made to my constituency. They are great constituents. I may not get many of their votes, perhaps I will not get any of them. Nevertheless, I represent these people at the moment.

In so far as my summation of the red ensign is concerned, I want to say that when its design is examined dispassionately without prejudice or unreasoned emotion, it can be seen that every desire of our multiple religious, racial and cultural backgrounds is answered. If we aspire to religious and racial tolerance and the attainment of our national objective by negotiation, while maintaining loyalty to ideals rather than narrow nationalism, then our Canadian ensign represents us in a manner that no simple combination of colours or numbers could do. A flag with great depth of meaning capable of representing our complex idealism, it also represents not only our varied traditions and cultures, but also the single aspiration of the Canadian people as a whole, in a manner which a new design could not possibly match.

By understanding the ensign through a study of the elements in the flag, we may better understand ourselves, and will see that all of us can proclaim it as our symbol of unity, the ideal flag for a country like ours. The ideal of unity by negotiation is also the very basis of our country, Canada. First, our French forefathers negotiated the Quebec Act which guaranteed the religion, language and civil law of the French. Then our British forefathers refused to join in rebellion and decided to settle their differences with their King by negotiation. They knew that the British system of justice was a tradition of great value, and to save it they were prepared to abandon their homesteads and start anew.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Drouin): I must interrupt the hon. member to inform him that his time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. L. J. Pigeon (Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm): Mr. Speaker, since the flag debate was resumed at the beginning of the week hon. members on both sides of the house have expressed their views and I wish to take this opportunity to state mine.

Mr. Speaker, I know that on both sides of the house, among government members as well as within the ranks of the official opposition, or even within the New Democratic party and the Thompson group, there is no unanimity about the adoption of a distinctive national flag. On the other hand, on the government side there is no unanimity on the choice of a distinctive flag, whether it be the three maple leaf design already proposed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) or the single maple leaf design recommended by the committee.

At the outset of the session the Prime Minister himself introduced legislation concerning the adoption of a three maple leaf flag, as well as the union jack, to indicate our membership in the commonwealth and our allegiance to the crown.

Generally speaking the Canadian people did not like the way the Prime Minister—

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I submit that the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm is continuously out of order when he talks about the three maple leaf flag while the house is considering the proposed single maple leaf flag. Therefore, I would ask you to call the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm to order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It is customary for the Chair to give all members taking part in a debate some time to come to the point and I suggest that the hon. member for Joli-

ette-L'Assomption-Montcalm did not go beyond the rights usually granted.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, yesterday—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member rising on a point of order or on a question of privilege?

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order. While a Conservative member had the floor yesterday, the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes (Mr. Drouin) interrupted for the same reasons as those referred to a while ago by the hon. member for Lapointe.

I wonder if the hon. member for Lapointe is not right when he very humbly and respectfully submits that the remarks of the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm are entirely irrelevant since he is dealing with something else than the amendment now before us.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I should like to draw to your attention that the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes (Mr. Drouin) is not in his seat at the present time.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote a few legal precedents and parliamentary citations in connection with the point of order raised by the hon. member for Lapointe, and I apologize for not being able to quote them in French but Mr. May's treatise has not yet been translated from English to French.

I shall read the citation in question—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I think I am sufficiently informed to make a ruling now.

The present Speaker does not have to follow the line of conduct adopted yesterday by the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes, but should rather make rulings in accordance with the attitude taken since the beginning of the debate by the Speaker himself.

The Chair is of the opinion that the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm has complied with standing orders until now and I suggest that he resume his remarks.

Mr. Langlois: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I wish to speak to the point of order that has just been raised and I maintain that, according to Beauchesne—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Chair has given its ruling on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) and the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Pigeon) now has the floor.

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Speaker, I think—

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I only wish to quote Beauchesne and May on the matter. Otherwise, I will have to appeal your ruling.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Chair was satisfied with the comments put forth a moment ago and gave its ruling. If I may, I would suggest to the hon. member that if he is not satisfied with that ruling, he is not following the proper procedure. There is another one, and I invite him to use it if he is not satisfied with the Chair's ruling.

Mr. Langlois: I respectfully accept your advice and I appeal your ruling.

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Speaker, I congratulate you on your impartiality in the chair.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Did the hon. member for Mégantic say that he appealed the ruling of the Speaker or that he accepted it? I did not quite understand him.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I appeal your ruling.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I understand the hon. member for Mégantic has some doubt about a ruling made by the Deputy Speaker. We might now inform the Speaker of the objections made against the ruling.

Mr. Langlois: With pleasure, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm has been out of order since the beginning of his speech.

I spoke to a point of order raised by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) and I tried to quote, in support of my point, the fourth edition of Beauchesne and the sixteenth edition of May, but the acting speaker merely said that the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm was in order.

I respectfully submit that the hon. member was out of order and I sought to quote May and Beauchesne to prove my point.

Mr. Speaker, I appealed your ruling, because I could not quote May and Beauchesne.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Mégantic will undoubtedly have the courtesy of allowing me to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm so that I can reach my own decision as to their relevancy.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, considering that an hon. member is appealing a ruling, should you not call a vote on the ruling?

Canadian Flag

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sure the hon. member for Villeneuve will be the first one here to take into consideration the special circumstances involved and to co-operate with me so that I can judge whether or not the remarks of the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm are related to the matter now before the house.

Mr. Pigeon: On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I would not want you to overrule the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes who was in the chair previously. I think his ruling was made honestly and according to his experience and conscience.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would ask the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm to co-operate also with the Chair and to proceed with his remarks.

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying a while ago, at the beginning of this session the Prime Minister brought forward legislation concerning the adoption of a flag with three maple leaves, and of the union jack to symbolize our ties with the crown and the commonwealth.

Hon. members on both sides of the house were dissatisfied with the Prime Minister's move. There was no unanimity either on this side of the house or on the government side.

Later on the Prime Minister retreated four or five times and decided that the whole matter would be referred to a committee of the house.

I wonder why at the beginning of the session, instead of selecting himself the flag design with three maple leaves and the union jack, the Prime Minister did not choose to refer the whole matter to a committee of the house which would have selected a national distinctive flag and then reported to the house—

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

It seems to me that the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm has now had enough time to come to the heart of the matter. I think it would be high time to call him to order and to ask him to speak to the amendment before the house, which deals with referring back to the committee the report on the flag, so that certain recommendations included in that report—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member wishes to take part in the debate at this time. In my opinion, he should allow the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm, who had merely started his remarks when the Speaker took the chair, to resume his remarks so that the Speaker may rule as to whether or not they are relevant.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, may I make a remark?

I agree with the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes on that point because that is precisely what I meant to say a few moments ago.

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes in the chair. It was decided to rule out—

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

In my opinion, the remark made by the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm was not at all considerate of you. He said that he would like to see someone else in the chair. And yet, you are performing your duties remarkably well. I feel that is an insult on the part of the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hold the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes in high esteem and I was flattered by the remark.

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Chairman, since the three leaf flag proposed by the Prime Minister has been rejected by the committee, we are now being asked to adopt a flag with a single red maple leaf and two red stripes.

I consulted an expert in botany who told me that red maples grow mainly in the United States, especially in the state of Virginia.

I would have preferred a green maple leaf representing the sugar maple which grows in several Canadian provinces, though not in every one, I admit.

Some hon. members are against the inclusion of one or three maple leaves in the Canadian national flag, because maple trees do not grow in all Canadian provinces.

I must point out to those members that lions appear in the Canadian coat of arms. I have never seen a single one in our forests and yet they appear in the Canadian coat of arms.

As for me, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the maple leaf flag, even though I would have liked it to contain a green leaf instead of a red one, and two blue stripes instead of red ones to represent the oceans.

In my opinion, it is time our country had a single distinctive flag.

If our flag were to contain symbols of our past, either English or French, or those

of German, Italian or other minorities, it would be quite complicated and uninteresting.

I support the flag with a single maple leaf and will vote for it and against the union jack.

I cannot understand why—

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

In my opinion, the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm is still not speaking to the matter under discussion. If you will allow me, this time, to give you the opinion I wanted to express a while ago, it might throw some light on the point of order I raised.

I maintain that the Speaker of the house used an argument which seems based on a citation found at page 111 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, which reads as follows:

[*Text*]

Relevancy is not easy to define. A wrong comprehension of it may have a serious effect on the freedom of speech.

[*Translation*]

I agree with that, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

Members are often deprived of their right to speak on the pretext that their remarks are irrelevant when as a matter of fact they refer to matters perhaps remote but yet related, even indirectly, to the question under debate. In borderline cases the member should be given the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. Speaker, if we consider the matter under discussion, which is the resumption of debate on the motion of the hon. member for Humber-St. George's (Mr. Batten), seconded by the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott), that the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, be now concurred in, and the amendment thereto of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith), and refer to May's sixteenth edition, page 451, we find the following:

Debate must not stray from the question before the house to matters which have been decided during the current session—

This is the part which Beauchesne does not stress:

—or anticipate a matter appointed for the consideration of the house—

Right now what the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Pigeon) is speaking about is a matter anticipated to be taken into consideration later, after we have disposed of this motion and the amendment thereto of the hon. member for Perth. I humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm is out of order. I base my argument on May's sixteenth edition, page 451, in submitting that the hon. member is anticipating the subject of a future debate and is not considering what is the question before the house at the moment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I think that the argument which the hon. member for Mégantic is now submitting to the Chair is fully justified. The hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm knows the rules; he must keep to the matter under discussion and limit his remarks thereto. What is relevant is not so much how he will vote on the main motion but the stand he wants to take on the amendment submitted to the house. Therefore, I ask him to limit his remarks to the specific matter now before the house.

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Speaker, I noticed earlier that some members have referred to farm problems in eastern Canada and they have been permitted to elaborate easily on that subject, although we are now discussing the motion under consideration.

I am going to end my remarks by saying this: It would be a pity for the house to adopt two flags, instead of just one, namely the single maple leaf flag and the union jack, because I know that even on the government side the second flag is far from being unanimously accepted—I mean the union jack, which is the symbol of our membership in the commonwealth of British nations and of our allegiance to the crown.

Mr. Cyr: Will the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. Pigeon: By all means.

Mr. Cyr: Since as he pointed out, the hon. member will soon be through with his speech, in order to help him, could he tell the house whether he will vote for or against the motion for the holding of a plebiscite?

Mr. Paul: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who just asked a question is not in his seat and, consequently, he should not be recognized, in my opinion.

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks I said how I would vote but I do hope that this parliament, while respecting the opinion of those who do not share mine, will choose one national flag, not two.

Mr. Choquette: Hear, hear.

Canadian Flag

Mr. Pigeon: I hope the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) and the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska (Mr. Pepin), as well as other hon. members, will vote against the second part of the resolution calling for the adoption of the union jack.

I expressed my point of view and I hope this flag is adopted without delay.

Mr. Cyr: Might the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. Pigeon: Certainly.

Mr. Cyr: Will the hon member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm vote for or against the motion concerning a plebiscite?

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Speaker, I wish to tell the house that I shall vote against a plebiscite.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Gundlock).

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Caouette: Dispense.

Mr. D. R. Gundlock (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I see that I have some friends in the house today who are not always here when I have the honour to speak. I would say at the outset of my remarks that I rise to support this amendment and agree wholeheartedly that a plebiscite should be held to settle this very controversial question. I know that hon. members and the Canadian public, as a matter of fact, have heard a great deal about the flag. Some hon. members have stated very clearly inside and outside the house that we have probably heard too much about it. However, this is the point we are considering at the moment, and I do not believe we should be guilty of merely passing it over. We have our duty to carry out in the house as representatives of the people. As I have said previously on several occasions, I believe in my view we are here almost as delegates. This is certainly my view when we consider the correspondence we have received on this question, some of which I have here. We are not just here to represent our constituencies, but in view of the representations that have been made to us I believe we have to take the further step of making up our own minds. It is my view that we are delegated to putting forth our views on the different aspects and facets of the flag question.

The question before us at the moment is whether there should be a plebiscite to decide this issue. I said earlier that I support the amendment. I want to say a few words later as to my reasons for supporting it. I believe this amendment is necessary. It was necessary earlier, as many hon. members have said when advocating an amendment of this kind, but it is more than ever necessary today. In my view it is necessary that we have a plebiscite on this issue because it is one that is so important to the people of Canada; it is one that has so much emotion wrapped up in it. But even more than that, many people feel it is almost an issue of conscience. Frankly and personally, Mr. Speaker, I feel that way myself. It has gone beyond being a political matter; it has gone beyond being an emotional matter and I think it is one of conscience, not only to members of this house but to the country as a whole—and I mean Canada as we know it. A great deal has been said about what Quebec wants and what other parts of Canada want.

I think it is a matter of conscience which Canada as a whole might be able to settle. There are many arguments against a plebiscite and it does have drawbacks. But in an issue such as this I would firmly support it, and I believe the question would be settled much more readily. There are reasons—here I am not necessarily speaking for the members of the official opposition—why all members of the house, including members opposite should support the plebiscite, and I should like to put forward as reasons for holding a plebiscite today more than at any time previously one or two arguments.

On August 22 last the Toronto *Telegram* in an editorial carried headings such as this : "Ask the people"; "Too big for compromise"; "A vote cannot be free"—referring to a vote in this house. This brings up the point that there was a time when many of us in this house thought that if we were allowed a free vote we could probably come up with a flag suitable to many people in Canada. I am referring to a distinctive flag. I am not speaking of any particular flag at the moment, although as I pointed out before on several occasions in this house I am obliged to put forth the views of my constituents in this matter, and I have a few of their letters here. Many of them date back as far as May and run through to October. Many support a plebiscite and I will refer to them in a moment. I also have letters criticizing some of the action which I have taken in the house, and some of the words I have spoken. But as I said a moment ago, we members of parliament are delegated to put forward our views. I have had at least two letters which have

criticized what I have said in the house in connection with the vast number of letters I have received concerning my presentation of the views of the majority of the people I represent.

I referred a moment ago to an editorial in the Toronto *Telegram*. This editorial contained some very strong statements which I think are relevant today. For instance, the editorial commences:

> The Canadian ensign must not be lowered without the consent of the people.

I agree with that, Mr. Speaker. This is not a new view; the editorial is dated last August. The editorial continues:

> No decision of the House of Commons, by free vote or otherwise to strike our historic ensign and replace it with a pennant of the Prime Minister's choosing can be construed as expressing the consensus of the nation.
>
> The voice of the people can be heard, on this issue, only through a national plebiscite.

These words appeared in a paper which is not usually known for supporting a particular political party, certainly not the one sitting on this side of the house at the moment. But I think it is quite a fair editorial, which is the reason I am quoting from it. It goes on:

> None would seriously suggest that all controversial issues before parliament should be resolved by plebiscite or referendum. That is not the way our system works. A government having received its mandate pushes ahead with its legislative program and stakes its life on its success or failure.
>
> But the flag issue is different.

I should like to take exception to the way the government has handled this question. A moment ago I referred to an editorial which said that the government, having received its mandate, pushes ahead with its legislative program. As I recall it, the flag question did not appear on any legislative program; in other words, it was not in the throne speech. As was said earlier many times in this house we now conceive it to be a political flag. Even after the question has been sent to a committee I still feel this way. That is why I agree with the amendment to refer the matter at some time—I am not urging that it be done quickly—to the people on a plebiscite, perhaps at the time of an election or at some other opportune time.

I mentioned earlier that I thought there was all the more reason to hold a plesbiscite now than even at so short a time ago as ten days. I know you will forgive me, Mr. Speaker, if I transgress a moment, but I am sure you will call me to order if I go too far. I should like to mention some actions taken by the government particularly in the very recent past. As far as I am concerned all through this session there have been examples of government ineptitude. In spite of things which I have said in the past, things I am saying today and things I will say in the future, I am proud to stand here and think that I have a few friends in the house on both sides. But whether that is so or not, I do have a great deal of respect for the cabinet.

Another point to give strength to my argument that we should support a plesbiscite at this time is this.

Should a government with that kind of record bring in a flag in the manner it has done, in spite of all the arguments which have been presented against it both inside and outside this chamber?

We in this party have been accused of speaking during this debate because it is politically expedient to do so. Quite frankly I think the government in pushing forward its present design as quickly as it possibly can is doing nothing more than indulging in political expediency.

On occasions we have sat quietly in this chamber listening to a good deal of talk, and I do not wish to become involved in a wrangle this afternoon; but on some occasions when we have been on our feet we have been fulfilling our duty here, by using the only means open to us to prevent the government from acting only on the principle of political expediency.

Many derogatory remarks have been made by hon. members on the opposite side about the speeches we have been making in the past about the flag question. Many of those statements have been made outside this house, or carried from this house and presented to the Canadian public through the news media. A great many people in Canada have little or no access to events taking place in this country, other than by radio, television or newspaper. I am not in any way being critical, but it is for that reason we get on our feet in this chamber and make statements about the actions of this government.

I do not intend to go into detail about the actions of the government, which have been under discussion in this house in the past few days, but it is because of those actions and the attitude of the government that I pose a question as my strongest argument against this government's procedure on the flag question. That is, should a government with such a record be allowed to present its choice of a

Canadian national flag in this hurried, politically expedient manner?

The editorial to which I referred a moment ago stated that the question was too big for compromise. I think that editorial is of such importance it bears repeating at this time, although I am not sure that it has been read.

An hon. Member: Repetition.

Mr. Gundlock: I have not said that I am repeating this article, but only that it may have been read before in this chamber. If the hon. member knows it has been read, I hope he will correct me and indicate where on the record it is to be found. If the hon. member cannot do so, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that I should be allowed to read it in support of the argument I am making this afternoon.

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

An hon. Member: Oh, sit down.

Mr. Byrne: The hon. member has invited someone to point out the grounds on which he is out of order. The hon. member is patently out of order when reading from documents reflecting upon debates of the House of Commons or matters that are before the house. I draw your attention to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, fourth edition, citation 157 (5) at page 132, which reads as follows:

> It is not in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or communications emanating from persons outside the house and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the house.

I hesitate to call the member to order in view of the fact he is reading from the *Globe and Mail*, which is a newspaper recognized as reflecting the opinions of the party itself and not of individual members.

I should like to further read from citation 157 (6) as follows:

> "The rule is quite clear, that the quoting of a newspaper, an author or a book which reflects upon debate before the house, either directly or indirectly is entirely out of order, because members are here to give their own opinion and not to quote the opinion of others..."

It is quite clear that the hon. member is out of order in this respect, but I hesitate to bring him to order because he is quoting from a recognized Tory newspaper.

Mr. Gundlock: In regard to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I should perhaps state that I have apologized to you on several occasions for being a member who is not too conversant with the rules, however, in this case I am not quoting from the *Globe and Mail*, and in the second place the hon. member has only made one of his usual contributions to this house.

Mr. Byrne: Would the hon. member identify the document from which he has read?

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, I think, now that the hon. member for Kootenay East has indicated to his electors that he is present in the house today, we can get on with the debate.

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Speaker, I am present on every occasion the house is sitting, so that remark was unnecessary. Will the hon. member identify the document from which he read, or intends to read?

Mr. Gundlock: Mr. Speaker, I think I identified the article earlier. I am quoting from the Toronto *Telegram* of Saturday, August 22. I hope you will correct me if I am wrong, but I have observed members on all sides of this house almost every day quoting from newspaper articles.

Mr. Byrne: That does not make it right.

Mr. Gundlock: They have done so in substantiation of their arguments, and I think quite rightly so. I have attempted by quoting from certain articles to indicate public opinion to this house, and if I am wrong in doing so I hope you will inform me, Mr. Speaker. I have no wish to offend the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne), any other member of this house, or the rules.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I think the hon. member for Lethbridge might be allowed to read at least part of the editorial, if not the whole of it, because the citation referred to by the hon. member for Kootenay East relates only to an editorial to the extent that it reflects on the proceedings within the house. If the editorial from which the hon. member for Lethbridge wishes to quote has reference only to a debate in the house, then he is not out of order. To be out of order the article would have to reflect on the proceedings of this chamber. I might say it is very difficult for the Chair to rule in respect of this particular article until such time as it has been read.

Mr. Gundlock: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have placed anything on the record which reflects on the proceedings of this house, and I certainly have not quoted the article completely. I should like to quote it, but if it is offensive in any way perhaps you will so

inform me and I will then go on to another part of my speech.

An hon. Member: Carried.

Mr. Gundlock: It is not carried. This is the usual contribution that I hear from certain members. I said earlier that there were strong views on this issue a long time ago, and I think there are even stronger views today in support of a plebiscite than some months ago or even as recently as two weeks ago. I could quote letters I have containing strong views expressed by my constituents. I have one letter here to which I might refer. As a matter of fact, I will quote it exactly:

> It would be unthinkable for me to do anything but support the red ensign because my son, Douglas, who won the D.F.C., flew under that flag for 52 trips over Germany. Unfortunately he was shot down on his 52nd trip.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, he goes on to support the action of the French and sympathizes with the other racial group. He supports them, but yet he says it is unthinkable for him to do anything other than support the red ensign. How then in the light of all the arguments that have been put forward in the house can we really settle this matter in the house, particularly at this stage of the discussion?

Much has been made of the divisions in the ranks of parties. I suppose there are, but I really do not see anything wrong with that. I think it is a very good thing so far as a matter of this type is concerned. As I said earlier, if we had had a completely free vote it would have been nice. I think we could have accomplished something because I have heard of no one in the house or outside it who is not in favour of a distinctive Canadian flag and always has been. Some people prefer this, some people prefer that and some people prefer something else, but in the first place there is no one who does not consider that we should have a distinctive Canadian flag. So we go on from there.

The committee considered the matter and made a recommendation to the house which has resulted in the amendment now before us that many of us are supporting. The situation became impossible when the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) indicated very frankly that we would not have a free vote in the house. It was stated very clearly outside and inside the house that the government would stand or fall on the matter. Then there was a battle, which I do not need to review, that led to the establishment of a committee. So I think the only proper way out is to have a plebiscite.

We do not have to rush. We do not have to have the plebiscite now or even at the next election. I think there is plenty of time and I believe that time would do a great deal to solve this problem. I am only expressing a personal opinion, but if the national anthem suggested in another resolution had been put forward 20 years ago as the flag issue has been at this time the issue would probably have been a much more controversial one than the flag issue is today. What do we hear today? Very little, if anything, about a national anthem. Yet 20 years ago it would have been a very hot issue in my opinion. I am not quoting anybody but only offering this opinion in support of the idea that time might help to resolve the whole situation so far as the flag is concerned. If lots of time were taken and a plebiscite were held I think a great deal of the animosity would disappear.

I am going to conclude shortly, Mr. Speaker, so that those who are impatient may have an opportunity to put forward whatever views they like. Some time ago in the debate I pointed out something with respect to my constituency in particular, about which I am very proud. I have not heard of any other area doing the same thing in order to promote good relations between residents of Quebec and those of the other provinces of Canada. I mention this again because I think it is one more argument in favour of a plebiscite. I am referring to students going back and forth all summer between Alberta and Quebec for the purpose of spending even as short a period as two weeks in the other province. I think this is a great example. It provides us with the courage to support this sort of thing and adds some weight to the argument I put forth a moment ago.

Let us take a little more time, whether it be a year, ten years or 15 years. Let us have a little more of this sort of co-operation. I will be through in a moment if the hon. member wants to ask a question. With a little more of this sort of thing I think the animosity would break down very rapidly. Once again—I use the word "again" because I think there has been some deterioration—Canadians would appreciate one another as they did a short time ago and would go on from there to a much greater fulfilment. I cannot conceive that a plebiscite on this matter could do any harm whatsoever so far as this kind of relationship is concerned.

Does the hon. member want to ask a question?

Canadian Flag

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the energy of the hon. member now holding the floor seems to be gradually failing him, would you grant him the privilege of sitting down to end his speech?

Mr. Speaker, somehow I feel you did not hear my question.

I should like you to allow the member to terminate his speech sitting down.

[*Text*]

Mr. Gundlock: Mr. Speaker, I did not quite understand the question but I think I got the tail end of it. I want to tell the hon. member that if he thinks I am weak it is only because I was trying to be rather calm and nice this afternoon. On some previous occasions I have become a little excited, but if the hon. member wants something along that line, that is fine with me. I thought I was putting forward certain arguments this afternoon in a calm and reasonable way. Quite frankly, it is such interjections as that which has just been made that sometimes spoil the relationship here in the house. I guess I am speaking on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, but this is one of the reasons that the house itself, not this party nor that party but the whole house, is blamed and criticized throughout the country for spending so much time and doing so little. I was very careful to stay away from touchy subjects this afternoon. There are a great many things along this line that I should like to emphasize. This is the kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, that is spoiling the image of this house. I was speaking in a very calm, and I thought a reasonable way.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; there was really no point of order in the matter raised by the hon. member for Lotbinière. I suggest that the hon. member for Lethbridge return to his subject.

Mr. Choquette: Remain seated.

Mr. Gundlock: There are some members of this house, Mr. Speaker, who make their remarks through you. I would be glad to continue my speech seated if the Speaker would allow it.

The other day an hon. member said he was of the opinion the Prime Minister had revealed to the house and to the country that, so far as he was concerned, the work of the committee had been little more than a sham. He had introduced this most controversial subject in the worst and most political way possible, and he expected the committee would bring in something that would allow the government to get rid of this embarrassment as quickly as possible. Therefore, the time element was the only point that mattered at all.

There is something happening right here in the house, at the moment, during the debate on this amendment. Why are we not allowed a question period?

Some hon. Members: Order.

Miss LaMarsh: We are sticking to the rules of the house.

Mr. Gundlock: Yes, but I ask why? Would you like to explain it?

Miss LaMarsh: If my hon. friend will permit a question, may I ask him if he is not aware of the rules of the house? He inquires why a question period is not allowed. May I suggest to the hon. member that the simplest way possible of achieving that is to sit down, shut up and let the matter come to a vote.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I ask you to rule whether or not the intervention by the Minister of National Health and Welfare is a point of order or just one of those irrelevant interventions that should be ruled out entirely? I ask, was it a point of order raised by the minister?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; the minister rose to ask a question and the hon. member for Lethbridge sat down. I assumed he was allowing the question. Whether or not it was in order, the Chair has very serious doubts. Perhaps I should suggest that it was out of order to the same extent as the remarks which were being made by the hon. member for Lethbridge, which I assume prompted the question.

Mr. Gundlock: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not refer to the interjection. I will be through in just a moment, and I know I will get a hand for that.

This question was not part of the legislative program. I said earlier, and I would now inform the minister who just came in, that I was sorry other members had to leave this debate to go to a committee. I believe the minister has just come from the committee, and I wish I had been able to attend. However we cannot be in two places at the same time and I felt it was important that I take part in this particular debate. Before the minister returned to the house, and you will bear me out in this Mr. Speaker, I expressed great admiration for the ministers of this

government, not the government as a whole but the individual ministers. I do not believe I can say very much against any of them. I say this for the information of the minister.

I see my time is just about up, so I shall not embark upon another subject. We may have other opportunities to do so. I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members opposite for their patience.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): The intervention of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) in this very important debate reflected an attitude typical of government arrogance when she said that everyone should sit down and shut up. This has been her only contribution to national unity in this respect. I want to make my first remarks in this debate relevant to the remarks that were made by the restless member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) who, in his egotism as the leader of an 11 member party which includes himself, said yesterday that he knew the opinions—

Mr. Langlois: I rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Starr: —of all Canadians in every riding.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; the hon. member for Mégantic is rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Langlois: It will not be long, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. member for Ontario, who is a former minister of the crown, aware of the fact that there are 13 members in our party and not 11? He should learn to count up to 13 at least before he makes any such remarks.

Mr. Starr: Let it be 13. They will have a lot less after the next election because Liberals will be elected in their seats in Quebec. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, it is still a provincial party. This hon. member professes to know and understand the feelings of the people of Canada, in every riding in Canada. I am making my remarks relevant to his speech of yesterday on this same amendment. He says that what we are trying to do in submitting an amendment for a plebiscite is to play politics with this issue. In the next breath he says that what he is doing is what the people in his riding want him to do. Well, what is playing politics? We are doing what we believe the people in our ridings want us to do, and that is to preserve the traditions of this country as well as its symbols.

I wonder if the people in his riding wanted the Canadian red ensign what his position would be? I have no doubt in my mind he would play politics by asking that the Canadian red ensign be retained in order that he may satisfy the people in his riding. If that is playing politics, then he is playing the worst type of politics on this issue that anyone has played in this House of Commons yet. I was rather ashamed to listen to him yesterday when he compared Canada to the emerging nations of Africa and other places in this world. He said they were proud to wave a new emblem in conjunction with their emergence as a nation. I was ashamed, because we in Canada have existed as a nation for almost 100 years. We have traditions of which to be proud. We are not emerging as a nation.

This is his attitude: He wants to do away with the traditions of this country; he wants to start fresh with Canada as an emerging nation like those in Africa and Asia. He does not want to be reminded of what has gone on in the past. I ask him this: What about those Canadians who have memories of the past, memories that are deeply rooted in their hearts? Has he no feeling for those people? Is he not prepared to give them an opportunity to express their views on the type of flag they want? This is what a plebiscite would do.

Why is there such tremendous impatience on the part of the government, and of certain other hon. members, regarding this important question? Why are these tremendous pressures being imposed? Why is there this terrific pressure on parliament to get this through at a certain period of time? They say a symbol has no significance. If that is so then I ask the Prime Minister, the government and other hon. members, why are they so determined to change the present symbol for one that has no tradition of any kind at all?

The flag committee was set up by parliament, but the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) made it very clear at the outset that this party would only be satisfied if a substantial portion of the membership of that committee came up with a recommendation, and it was pointed out very clearly that this would have to be 80 per cent or more.

Mr. Robichaud: Is this democracy in action?

Mr. Starr: I will come to you later. You should look after the baby seals. You are not doing a good job on that yet.

The whole attitude has been to wipe out all tradition. It has been one of "anything at all

for a flag; let us get rid of tradition." The committee had under consideration a compromise flag which, if submitted with other designs to the Canadian people, I feel would have been agreeable to them. A poll has been taken which indicates that over 60 per cent of the population want an opportunity to say what flag they will have from now on for all time. The people want that opportunity, but this government and certain other hon. members in the house refuse to give them that opportunity.

They have refused to give the people the privilege of expressing their opinions. They are adamant in their attitude. They tell the people, "We will give you a flag and you will have to take what we are giving you." It has been argued that this new emblem will bring about national unity. This is a fable, Mr. Speaker, because already it has created disunity in Canada where disunity never existed previously.

Unity is a very important matter to discuss. I feel that a plebiscite would bring about unity in Canada. The government and others say that the flag is a symbol of unity, but I do not believe that issues so emotional as the flag are the root of the troubles between Quebec and Canada.

Does anybody for a moment think that the issuing of bilingual cheques will bring about unity in this country? Does anybody think that the translation of Beauchesne into French will bring about unity? Does anybody think bilingual stewardesses on the air lines will bring about unity? Does anybody think that the parliamentary telephone book being translated into French will bring about unity? Does anybody think the flag will bring about unity? No. The causes of disunity are more deeply rooted. To say that the flag will bring about unity is a complete fable.

I want to say with all sincerity and honesty to hon. members opposite, particularly to those who are members from Quebec and to the members of the Creditiste party, led by the egotistic member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette), it is obvious that there is an organized effort on the part of those members of this Grit government, from the province of Quebec, and on the part of others, to inject themselves into this debate from their seats on points of orders, and in any other way they possibly can. We had an example of it here today and it is shameful, disgraceful conduct.

This is an important subject and they should be on their feet expressing their opinions, not trying to interject while other hon. members are speaking. I say to them in all sincerity, because I believe this is true, that they are doing something which is a discredit to themselves and to the province of Quebec, and I say that by that sort of behaviour they are antagonizing the rest of Canada against them—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Starr: —and that they have no one else to blame but themselves for that attitude. I think they should take part in this debate and express their opinions rather than trying to stop others from doing so.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, may I—

Mr. Winkler: What are you rising on?

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be put off by any phony point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Is the hon. member for Leeds rising on a point of order or a question of privilege?

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, I challenge the comments of the hon. member on the matter of relevancy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I asked the hon. member for Leeds whether he is rising on a point of order?

Mr. Matheson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My point of order is this, that the fourth edition of Beauchesne, page 111, citation 119(3) says:

> Relevancy is not easy to define. A wrong comprehension of it may have a serious effect on the freedom of speech...in borderline cases the member should be given the benefit of the doubt.

We agree with this; but may I point out that Sir Erskine May, at page 451 of his book on parliamentary practice, dealing with the relevancy of debate says:

> A member, when called to speak, must direct his speech to the question then under discussion, or to a motion or amendment. ...Debate must not stray from the question before the house...or anticipate—

And that is the word I stress, the word anticipate—

> —or anticipate a matter appointed for the consideration of the house—

The present motion is one which reads as follows:

> That the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, be now concurred in.

We are not now debating that motion. We are debating the amendment moved by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith), seconded by the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Rapp), which reads in part:

—your committee therefore recommends that the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to conduct a plebiscite to be held at the next general election in order that the Canadian people may be given their rightful opportunity to declare their choice concerning a national flag; and that the committee for such purpose be revived.

I point out that we have before us the motion to which I have referred, the motion of the hon. member for Humber-St. George's (Mr. Batten), seconded by the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott), and that there is anticipation on the part of the hon. member, who is talking about things not strictly related to the question of returning this matter to the committee. In this case there is no possible limitation of debate because we have the broad motion before us, but we have listened for some 13 minutes to the hon. member and I do not recollect any real reference on his part to a plebiscite or referral to committee. Certainly I think this is out of order, and the only way we can bring some kind of order to the debate is to have a ruling.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the difficulties facing the Speaker on a matter such as this in applying the rule of relevancy; but may I point out that I have been checking the debate of yesterday and have found that the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) was not interrupted by the Chair at all and failed to observe the rule of relevancy until he got to the last five minutes of his speech. The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Cameron) mentioned the word "plebiscite" once in the course of a scholarly and philosophical discussion on symbols and he was not interrupted, any more than was the hon. member for Villeneuve, by anybody on the Liberal side of the house nor by the Chair. Therefore I would say that when on those occasions the rule of relevancy was not strictly enforced, it can hardly be invoked now against members on this side of the house who are surely at liberty to make comments on statements made in the course of the debate by various other members, and discuss general matters pertaining to the subject under discussion. To be held down strictly, as is now suggested by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson), when other members of this house were not held down strictly, would be an infringement of the rights of Her Majesty's loyal opposition.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson), I also appreciate the difficulty the Speaker has in determining whether this may be a borderline case when considering the question of relevancy. I do not think, however, it is a satisfactory argument to say that because one member was able to violate the rules of the house, all speakers following him ought to be granted that same privilege.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Olson: At page 451 of May's sixteenth edition it states very clearly:

Debate must not stray from the question before the house...or anticipate a matter appointed for the consideration of the house—

I think the hon. member for Leeds made a good and sufficient argument when he said that there is a matter before the house, namely the main motion, that does in fact allow members to deal with all things such as the matter of design, the question of the maple leaf, be it a single maple leaf or three, the red ensign and anything else relating to the flag question. But I believe debate on the amendment to the motion that the committee's report be concurred in must be restricted to whether or not the committee, considering the whole question of a flag, should be given instructions to recommend to this house that a plebiscite be held.

I think it is perfectly clear from the citation in May's sixteenth edition to which I have referred that until we get back to the main motion, and while we are discussing this amendment, any discussion of any matter related to the flag other than whether or not it is desirable to give the committee instructions on a plebiscite, is out of order. I believe that while, as the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) said, a number of members have violated this rule of relevancy, that certainly cannot be considered a reason for allowing all those speaking afterwards to transgress the rules of the house.

Mr. Smallwood: That should be worth a trip to Africa.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member going to speak to the point of order?

Mr. Starr: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Speaking to this point of order, I would say that I am not a learned member like those who have expressed themselves so far; as a matter of fact I have not read some of the citations to which reference has been made today. It is good for one to hear these things. But, Mr. Speaker, I have to rely upon your fair judg-

ment, for which I have a great deal of respect, and whatever Your Honour rules will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: One hon. member who participated in the discussion of this point of order referred particularly to the speech made yesterday by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette). While the point of order was being discussed I glanced for a minute or two at the speech delivered yesterday by that hon. member and saw a number of references to the question of a plebiscite. But be that as it may, certainly the rules are there and there is nothing the Chair or hon. members can do about that. It is the responsibility of individual members taking part in debate to keep in mind these rules and try to abide by them. Certainly the point made by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) is well taken; the citations that he gave are exact and to the point. I know that the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr) who has the floor at the moment will keep this in mind in the course of his remarks.

Mr. Starr: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, in the remarks I have been making today I have at all times kept this amendment and the plebiscite in mind.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Starr: I believe that if a plebiscite were submitted to the people of this country we would come out of this with one national flag. If we do not have a plebiscite and we adopt the flag that has been recommended, we will have four or five different flags flying throughout this country forever. We would have this flag; no doubt Ontario would adopt the red ensign—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Starr: —the union jack will be flown in Newfoundland and probably other provinces, and the fleur-de-lis will continue to fly proudly, as it has in the past, in Quebec. No one will know which is the Canadian flag, because wherever he travels he will see a different type of flag. This is what is going to happen. But, Mr. Speaker, through a plebiscite being held there will be the opportunity for the majority of the people of this country to express their opinion in a democratic fashion as to what the national flag should be; and the rest of the people will certainly accept the decision of the majority of Canadians.

I personally believe in tradition, but this flag has no tradition whatsoever, in my view, and it has not in the view of thousands of people across this country. There is now a very concentrated and fanatical effort to do away with traditions in this country; they are being chipped away a little at a time, until eventually they will all have gone. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is a definite fanaticism on the part of the Prime Minister and the government to do away with these traditions. They believe we should have anything but the red ensign. First of all they introduced the three maple leaf flag; we had to have that. Then the flag question was submitted to a committee. Now another design has emerged and they have forgotten about the three maple leaf design. If that design was so important to them then, why is it not important now? Now this design is the most important thing. This leads me to believe that the design is not so important as the fact that this is the culmination of an effort to do away with traditions in this country. In no other way can the government's attitude be explained. They want to obliterate these traditions. They want to tear down the red ensign. When you do that, Mr. Speaker, I submit you are tearing out of the hearts of many Canadians a symbol which they hold dear and have held dear for many years.

The question posed in one's mind is, why is this being done? Why not give the people of this country an opportunity to say what they want in this regard? Why is parliament trying to ram this design down the throat of everyone in this country? Well, it is not parliament because we in this party certainly do not believe it is right; but this government is trying to ram this design down the throat of parliament and the throat of the people of this country. I submit that this question should be referred back to the committee. I believe they finally decided on three or four designs out of the thousands submitted to them. They could look at them again. Among the three or four designs there may be a choice for the people, and these designs could be submitted to them in a plebiscite.

It has been said that a new flag was promised. It has been said Canada needs a distinctive flag, I ask, Mr. Speaker, how distinctive is this new design recommended by ten members out of 14 on this committee? Is it more distinctive than the red ensign was? Is it distinctive when you cannot tell it apart from the flag of another country? I do not think the word "distinctive" should be used at all. I think that is a camouflage, because cer-

tainly this flag will not be distinctive in any shape or form with another country flying a flag similar to it.

Why are we rushing through this very important issue? It is said that we are doing this because it was a political promise made during the heat of an election. Many promises were made at that time. Why try to jam this through? Why not concentrate on the scholarships promised the students of this country 10,000 of them?

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Starr: What about the national development corporation?

Mr. Robichaud: On a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Well, before a point of order is brought by the minister, I assume he wants to suggest that the hon. member who has the floor is not strictly relevant, and by anticipation I think I would agree with this. The hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr) will, I am sure, wish to heed once again the suggestion of the Chair and try to be relevant to the subject before the house.

Mr. Starr: You are quite right, Mr. Speaker, and I bow to your ruling. I can only say that I get carried away by what has been foisted on parliament and the people of the country, instead of our considering other matters more important to the economic situation than this symbol the government tries to camouflage as unity in Canada.

In conclusion I would appeal to the Prime Minister and to the government to unite together in this matter, refer it to the committee, and have the committee come back with a recommendation that the issue be submitted to the people at the next available opportunity when cost would be minimal—probably at the next election. The good judgment of the people of the country will be known through the ballots cast, and I think all of us can unite under a flag which will be acceptable to all of Canada.

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Grégoire: Dispense.

Mr. Simpson: —this is the second opportunity I have had to take part in this very controversial and very important debate on a very important subject. I should like to point out, as I did on the other occasion I spoke on this matter that I wish to represent the feelings of the people of my constituency on this question. In that respect I will be brief, Mr. Speaker, as I particularly wish to deal with the question of a plebiscite.

First of all, I should like to say that I feel it is the duty of every member of this house to bring to the attention of the house the views of the people he or she represents. I think we should all respect those views. We know there are a number of members, particularly on the government side, who have not taken part in this debate. That is their business, but I do not think they should criticize members on this side of the house who know it is their duty to express the views of their constituents. As I have said before, the people of Churchill constituency have on many occasions shown me in no uncertain terms that they are strongly in favour of retaining the red ensign. But knowing them as I do I am quite sure they would be perfectly willing to accept a modification of the ensign. I also know they are extremely willing for me to express their views and are also anxious to express their own views on the matter by way of a plebiscite.

I have mentioned before that I have received between 150 and 200 letters dealing with the flag question during the summer. Without exception each and every one of the people who wrote to me personally expressed his or her strong support for the red ensign. I am sure that for the past day or so all members have been receiving mail in this regard, and my mail has continued as well. I received a letter from a lady in Bowsman, Manitoba, pleading that the opportunity be given the people of Canada to decide the issue for themselves. Another letter which I received yesterday is one of a kind which I doubt very much any other members have received. Actually it is a telegram sent by an ordinary working man whom I know very well, and I can stand here and state that I do not know for certain his political affiliations. However, he has seen fit to spend $2.50 or $3—whatever it costs—in order to send this telegram from Thompson, Manitoba. He says:

> If you settle for anything other than the red ensign I will leave Canada and settle in some other country.

That is the feeling of a person who has spent good money to send me a telegram.

An hon. Member: Let him go.

Mr. Simpson: It might be one less vote for the hon. member, I do not know. But these are the views of the people I represent. Hon. members may say I am standing here obstructing the business of the house or wasting our time, but I would be perfectly willing to

sit here for a very long time listening to the opinions of constituents of members on the other side of the house with regard to this question.

Mr. Grégoire: Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I would suggest that members who speak from behind the curtain should not be permitted to do so. If they have not the courtesy to stay in their seats they should certainly not be allowed to make comments from behind the curtain.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Simpson) has the floor and he should not be interrupted.

Mr. Grégoire: Question.

Mr. Simpson: The hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) is standing behind the curtain calling "Question". I do not know whether he wants to ask me a question, but I will say to him at this time that he cannot expect to learn anything unless he does ask a few questions. However—

Mr. Rock: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. gentleman a question if he would permit it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Churchill has the floor. If he wishes to receive a question the hon. member can, of course, put one. But unless he relinquishes the floor he should not be interrupted.

Mr. Simpson: Mr. Speaker, I was just replying to the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), who was asking a question. As I said, my time is limited, and I am sorry I have to put a roadblock in the way of his lifelong drive for higher education.

It is very interesting, having been the subject of criticism from government members, for members on this side of the house to consider the views of those members, and to consider the views expressed through editorials in various newspapers across the country. I should like to read several paragraphs from an editorial which appeared in the Toronto *Telegram* of August 22, and in view of the many quotations by government members from editorials I suspect they must heartily respect the views contained therein.

This particular editorial in part states:

> The Canadian ensign must not be lowered without the consent of the people.

That is a very interesting and understandable statement. The editorial then continues as follows:

> The voice of the people can be heard on this issue only through a national plebiscite.
>
> None would seriously suggest that all controversial issues before parliament should be resolved by plebiscite or referendum. That is not the way our system works. A government having received its mandate, pushes ahead with its legislative program and stakes its life on its success or failure.
>
> But the flag issue is different.

We have been criticized on many occasions by government supporters because of our previous contributions to the flag debate. How they ridiculed us for not accepting a suggestion to have a hasty vote in this house which might have adopted the three maple leaf design, the choice of the Prime Minister, as Canada's national flag. That is the flag which many of them said—as they did about the first version of the Canada pension plan —was the ultimate. It is interesting now to note what many of them said in this regard. Let us look at some of the statements of those members who criticized us and suggested we were obstructing the business of parliament.

First of all I should like to refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Sharp), as recorded at page 6957 of *Hansard* for August 18, 1964. The following question was asked:

> In view of the minister's statement that it will be a free vote, will he say whether the government would continue in office if the motion were accepted?

The minister replied:

> Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of Canada speaks for this party and is the house leader. He will answer. I say this to my hon. friend, that it will make no difference to the votes of the people on this side of the house whether this is a free vote or whether it is a vote that may result in the defeat of the government.

I should like to underline the next line which reads:

> We believe in this flag individually.

At that time the Minister of Trade and Commerce was referring to the three maple leaf flag, and he said, "We believe in this flag individually." In view of that statement we on this side can only assume that the vast majority of the members sitting on that side of the house at that time believed in the three maple leaf flag, although perhaps individually.

At page 6962 of *Hansard* for the same date the hon. member for Eglinton said:

> Mr. Speaker, there is only one way by which Canada will have a national flag, and that is by the decision of this parliament. Let us live up to our responsibilities; let us get down to the business of making a decision. I do not mind a

debate, but let us not have a filibuster; let us not have indefinite debate which has no purpose other than to avoid the taking of decision.

Again the minister at that time was speaking about the three maple leaf flag. While he is not in the house at the present time, I hope he will have some very serious second thoughts about those remarks.

The minister then went on to say, as reported at page 6963 of *Hansard*:

I invite my hon. friends opposite, and particularly the Leader of the Opposition, to abandon their negative role, which gets its best representation by this futile subamendment and which is doing so much damage to his party, and for that reason to the country, and join with the Prime Minister in achieving—

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Simpson:

—another great step forward in our development as a nation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring to a debate which took place during this session, and which is certainly not relevant to the amendment now before this house. I should again like to put on the record and quote from a decision made yesterday by Mr. Speaker who said:

I implied that in my statement, in saying that during the previous days on which this question had been discussed the Chair had been extremely lenient in order to give ample opportunity to any hon. member who wanted to say anything on the flag question, but that in future I thought that the rules of relevancy should be strictly applied.

For the last ten minutes the hon. member has been discussing matters which are not pertinent to the amendment.

Mr. Simpson: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I say this. I have been leading up to the point of showing why a plebiscite should be held in this regard. If the Minister of Fisheries will contain himself and remain in his seat until I have completed my remarks, I am sure he will agree that I have made a valid point.

I will continue on from the point at which I was interrupted.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The point of order raised by the hon. Minister of Fisheries is well taken, and I take this opportunity to remind the hon. member who has the floor that the rules of relevancy have to be respected. I invite him to limit his remarks, as quickly as possible, to the subject matter of the discussion now before the house.

Mr. Simpson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was attempting to bring attention to the fact that, at the time of the previous debate, hon. members on the government side of this house also discussed matters such as a plebiscite, and at that time said there should be no plebiscite and no subamendment. They suggested we were only holding up the business of parliament and that what we should do is vote on the flag before parliament at that time. Had we followed their suggestion this house may have made a very bad decision.

There remain only two lines to the paragraph from which I was quoting and I should like to put them on the record. The Minister of Trade and Commerce then said:

—and join with the Prime Minister in achieving another great step forward in our development as a nation.

The minister was inviting the Leader of the Opposition to join with the Prime Minister in voting in favour of the adoption of the flag design before the house at that time.

I would just like to quote very briefly a few remarks made by the Prime Minister during that same debate, as part of my argument that a plebiscite should be held. On June 15 the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) said, as found on page 4318 of *Hansard*:

The government's responsibility is to decide on policy, to present that policy to parliament for consideration, and they hope support, and to stand or fall on the decisions parliament takes. If parliament decides that it cannot support a government on a matter of major policy, our system does then provide for a referendum, a referendum to the people in an election.

That was one of the first times we heard an election threatened in the flag debate. The Prime Minister, of course, goes across the country and says that the opposition is trying to force an election. I come now to the important words of the Prime Minister as found on page 4319 of *Hansard*.

Mr. Greene: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. Member: You are not in your own seat.

An hon. Member: Yes, he is.

Mr. Churchill: He has been moved.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Renfrew South has the floor on a point of order.

Mr. Greene: I would refer Your Honour, if I can be heard above the cackle of the geese across the floor, to citation 148 of Beauchesne,

fourth edition, page 127. Paragraph 3 of that citation reads as follows:

> Reference to debates of the current session is discouraged even if such reference is not irrelevant, as it tends to reopen matters already decided.

Mr. Bell: What has been decided?

Mr. Greene: With respect, Your Honour, I submit that the hon. member's speech such as it is, apart from being directed at taking up the time of the house and for no other purpose—

Mr. Winkler: That is not for you to decide.

Mr. Greene: —is based entirely on references to other speeches that have been made, and I submit with respect that this is contrary to citation 148, paragraph 3. In view of the Speaker's admonition of yesterday, I submit with respect that the hon. member should be ruled out of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. With regard to the point raised by the hon. member for Renfrew South, he will have noticed while reading three lines from paragraph 3 of citation 148 of Beauchesne that the learned author has reference to matters already decided. Unfortunately the matter now before the house has not yet been decided.

Mr. Simpson: I have only three more brief references to make to the remarks made by the Prime Minister and then I will lay my case before the house. On June 15, as I mentioned, the Prime Minister said as found on page 4319 of *Hansard*:

> Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time has now come for the government, in our tradition of responsible government, to take action by submitting this resolution to parliament for decision. Parliament will then take the responsibility and parliament will decide. If the government resolution is defeated, then on a matter of such major importance the government has obviously lost the confidence of parliament.

In the same speech, as found at page 4321 of *Hansard*, the Prime Minister went on to say:

> In my view, the time has come for a further and final change.

I want you to take note of this, Mr. Speaker, because this is one reason I say there should be a plebiscite. The Prime Minister said that the time has now come for a further and final change. He made this remark following remarks he made outlining the history of the red ensign. So we can take it from this statement that the Prime Minister feels that when a final decision is made by the house on the flag, that is it for all time.

There are further interesting remarks of the Prime Minister to be found on page 4323 of *Hansard*. After reviewing events leading up to approval of the three maple leaves conjoined on one stem as the national emblem of Canada, he had this to say:

> In the light of this, Mr. Speaker, can there be any doubt that the design recommended in the resolution is a proper one, with Canadian history, Canadian tradition and official sanction on the highest levels behind it?
>
> It is because this design has such a history and because, with the blue sea to sea border, it makes a striking and beautiful flag, that the government is putting it before parliament in this resolution. The single maple leaf, I repeat, has not the same historical and heraldic significance—

These are the words of the Prime Minister on June 15.

> —even though it also, with the blue borders, I am told, makes a very attractive flag.

So we have the words of the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Sharp) and of the Prime Minister lauding the design which they proposed at that time as being just about the ultimate in flag design; and not only were they quite prepared to accept it but they expected the house to accept it also as quickly as possible. It is also very interesting to read an editorial that appeared in the Ottawa *Journal* of August 28 in relation to the very matter about which I am talking. The editorial is entitled, "Mr. Pearson's 'Discovery'" and reads as follows:

> The government lacks gumption. N.D.P. leader Douglas asked whether committees could be put to work while the house is engrossed in the flag debate. The question appeared to take the Prime Minister by surprise. He understood there would be a meeting of one committee next Tuesday. Then he brightened. Why, yes, he said, Mr. Douglas' suggestion should be considered so that while the flag debate went on "some useful work might be accomplished".
>
> Mr. Pearson has been ready enough to groan about the flag debate taking more than 15 sitting days in the house. But whatever he may think of opposition tactics, it is his duty to see that the business of parliament is done. After 15 days of debate Mr. Pearson has to be told by the opposition to get the committees to work and the idea suddenly hits him as a good one! Leadership?

So far as obstructing the business of the house is concerned, we all remember the action taken by government members on September 3 of this year—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether the remarks of the hon. member at this point are relevant to the question before the house. To my mind it seems to me he is discussing the question of proceedings of the house and this seems to be rather

remote from the point which we should be discussing, the amendment to the motion.

Mr. Simpson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will just conclude these brief remarks and then I will refer—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. If the hon. member's remarks are not relevant I do not think he should continue to put them on the record. To my mind the editorial he has just quoted has nothing at all to do with the subject matter of the discussion at this time.

Mr. Simpson: I have completed the editorial, Mr. Speaker. I am referring to the charges of the government in regard to obstruction and I am saying that we all remember the action taken—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Simpson: —by the government supporters on the 3rd of September when the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher) moved the adjournment of the flag debate which was then in progress so that the house could get on with other important business. His motion was supported by the official opposition but it was opposed—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether the hon. member would kindly revert to the specific question we are supposed to be considering at this time, namely the amendment having reference to a plebiscite.

Mr. Simpson: Very good, Mr. Speaker, I am going to introduce the reason why I feel a plebiscite should be held, but I should like to refer very briefly to remarks made by the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto). In his speech during the flag debate he said in his concluding paragraph, as found on page 7034 of *Hansard* of August 19 last:

> I plead with all hon. gentlemen to say what they have to say in loud and clear tones. By all means, all members should express their opinions, but they should not pervert this debate by moving amendments, subamendments and more subamendments. I beg you to help in concluding this debate, so that we may give the Canadian flag back to the people, to whom it belongs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he says we should give it back to the Canadian people to whom it belongs. I say we will do that by means of a plebiscite. Yesterday, I believe it was, the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Cadieux) made an impassioned speech in which he referred to the diligent work of the flag committee. I agree wholeheartedly with him, that they worked very diligently in performing the task which we put before them. As I recall the words of the hon. member for Terrebonne, he wanted to know, with reference to the plebiscite, what kind of majority we—meaning the Conservatives—would accept when we were not willing to accept a majority of 72 per cent of the committee?

Now, with all due respect to this statement by the hon. member for Terrebonne, I feel this was a political vote recorded by members who, two months ago, undoubtedly would have voted for the three maple leaf flag had they been given that opportunity. I say that the justification for a plebiscite on this issue is that the flag issue differs vastly from any legislation which may come before this house. When legislation comes before this house, it must be admitted by all hon. members, on most occasions members will vote along party lines. They vote knowing that they are fully responsible to their constituents. If their constituents do not like the party line they are following when they vote on this legislation, then they will suffer the fate of many politicians at the next election. However, the legislation can then be amended or changed by future governments or parliaments. As the Prime Minister said, when this issue is settled by parliament it will be final.

Mr. Byrne: It does not say that in the resolution.

Mr. Simpson: Your Prime Minister said it. If you do not believe your Prime Minister, that is not my fault.

Mr. Byrne: He is not going to be there forever; he is not going to live forever.

Mr. Simpson: It is a good thing he is not in the house to hear you say that.

The difference between the flag issue and legislation is that we do not send legislation to a plebiscite. As I pointed out, and as I will point out further, we are being asked by the government to decide on the question of a flag. Many members who would have voted for the three maple leaf flag were certainly not voicing the opinions of their constituents and therefore may have been tossed out at the next election. However, these people would have been stuck with that flag.

Mr. Byrne: It was not a bad flag, after all.

Mr. Simpson: He says it was not a bad flag. The hon. member says we have a new choice in front of us, so let us get on with the job so that we can all get home.

You may rule, Mr. Speaker, that what I am about to say is not relevant to the debate.

However, I am wondering why it is we have not heard anything about the Prime Minister's plan to fly this new flag in front of the parliament buildings. He flew his own design for three or four days so the people could get a look at it. I did not agree with that policy at the time. I am wondering why he wished to fly his own flag but apparently has no intention of flying this flag in front of the buildings.

If I may return to the question of the flag committee and the plebiscite, the hon. member for Terrebonne was quite perturbed to think that 72 per cent of the members of the flag committee voted in favour of the one maple leaf flag, so why should we have a plebiscite? As I said before, we must realize that the same 72 per cent that voted for the one maple leaf flag were more than anxious to vote for the three maple leaf flag a little less than two months ago. The people of Canada do not change their views that quickly. I tell you that is the reason we think this question should go to the people.

I should like also to leave this thought with the house, Mr. Speaker, and particularly with the citizens of Canada who may be harbouring any thoughts that the official opposition have been belabouring this matter unduly long, or that they have been obstructing parliament. I leave this thought with those people who have been so vocal in lauding the special committee that was set up to decide the flag question. Again I say I respect the diligence which they displayed. However, I say to you, and I say to them, if it had not been for the diligence and noble work of the official opposition during the previous flag debate, Canada would now have foisted upon it the three maple leaf flag which this committee about which we are talking rejected.

Mr. Byrne: It was a compromise; be fair.

Mr. Simpson: I agree that compromise is a very worthy means of doing business. However, all you people have been doing who sit on that side of the house has been ridiculing the job of the opposition. They have already proven their point, that the committee and the house did not support the three maple leaf flag. Again I say this matter should definitely go to the people to be decided upon. I know how the people in my area are going to vote because they have told me so.

Mr. Byrne: All of them; what percentage?

Mr. Winkler: There are two Grits, we think.

Mr. Simpson: There are a few of them I have not seen during the summer, but not too many.

Mr. Rock: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Simpson: Not now; my time is coming to a close.

Mr. Rock: After your time has been exhausted?

Mr. Simpson: Yes. I know the way the people I represent feel about this matter. I know they want to have a voice. They have been told by the Prime Minister that when parliament decides on the kind of flag Canada is going to have, it is going to be final. If something is going to be that final, then the people themselves are the ones who should decide it. Hon. members across the way do not go along with the suggestion that this be done. However, they will probably find out, to their sorrow, that they are wrong.

It is my opinion that if a majority of the people of Canada decided on a particular design then practically everybody in the country would be willing to support it. The people I represent would be willing to support it if they were given an opportunity to vote on it, but they are not going to support something decided by a group of people voting along party lines.

We on this side have been criticized because some of our group are going to vote one way and some another. I would like the members opposite to know we are proud of this. We feel everybody should have the opportunity to vote according to conscience, as our constituents desire us to do. But that is not the way hon. members wanted it when they were trying to get the three maple leaf flag through so rapidly earlier this year. The majority of them, with but one or two exceptions, signified their intention of accepting that design knowing full well, as I said previously, that the Prime Minister announced it would be final.

What do they think of their members on the flag committee who have now indicated their preference for the one maple leaf flag? I think they should be very appreciative of the fact that the official opposition took the attitude it did earlier this session and made such a noble effort to prove to the government and other supporters of the three maple leaf design that it was not what they thought it was.

Mr. Rock: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said he would allow me to ask him a question when he finished.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Simpson) had the floor. Does he allow a question at this stage?

Mr. Simpson: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Rock: Last February, when the leadership of your party was in question—

An hon. Member: It never was.

Mr. Rock: —why did the Conservative party adopt a resolution at the Chateau Laurier favouring a distinctive national flag for Canada?

Mr. Churchill: What relevancy has that?

Mr. Rock: If your party wanted the red ensign as a distinctive flag you would have said so in the words of that resolution.

Mr. Simpson: May I ask the hon. member what he is reading from?

Mr. Rock: I am not reading.

Mr. Simpson: Then I am very sorry I cannot accept his interpretation of what went on at our conference.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, when the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Simpson) was speaking the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne), and some of the other less bright members on the benches over there, were making snide remarks that neither you nor the hon. member for Churchill could hear, and I think this is not parliamentary. It is not good manners and should not happen.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I fully agree with the hon. member, but I can assure him the Chair is cognizant of this type of remark from both sides of the house.

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member moved forward in his seat and pointed his finger and asked us to answer his question. We were simply complying with his request.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More).

Royal Assent

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, on rising—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. I beg the indulgence of the hon. member for Regina City but there are some messages which should be read by the Chair.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that a communication has been received, which is as follows:

Ottawa, December 2, 1964

Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Robert Taschereau, P.C., Chief Justice of Canada, acting as deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber today, the 2nd December, at 5.45 p.m. for the purpose of giving the royal assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

A. G. Cherrier

Assistant Secretary to the Governor General

A message was delivered by Major C. R. Lamoureux, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, it is the desire of the Honourable the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General that this honourable house attend him immediately in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the house went up to the Senate chamber.

And being returned:

Mr. Speaker informed the house that the Deputy Governor General had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bill:

An act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1965.

It being eleven minutes after six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, December 3, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TELEGRAM ON NINETIETH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have the pleasure to inform the house that I have received the following telegram:

The Honourable Alan Macnaughton,
Speaker of the House of Commons, Ottawa.

I am deeply grateful Mr. Speaker for your charming telegram of good wishes.

Winston Churchill

PRIVILEGE

MR. DOUGLAS—DECISION ON COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE OF CONVICTED MURDERER

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Yesterday the hon. member for Danforth complained about the fact that the Minister of Justice had not made a statement with reference to the Marcotte case. I understand that in the interim a decision has been reached by the cabinet and a public statement made by the Minister of Justice. It seems to me that the House of Commons is entitled to first hand information on a matter of such far reaching importance as this, and I think it only proper that on motions a statement should be made by the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice with respect to this case.

CANADIAN FLAG

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SIXTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Wednesday, December 2, consideration of the motion of Mr. Batten that the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, be now concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Monteith.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, after my colleagues who also sat on the flag committee, I wish to express my congratulations to the member for Humber-St. George's (Mr. Batten) for the manner he chairmanned such an important committee as the flag committee.

I also wish to express my gratitude to every member of that committee and state how glad I was to work with them on that committee. When he asked me to sit on that committee, my leader greatly honoured me, together with the citizens of St. Hyacinthe-Bagot, whom I am pleased to represent in the House of Commons.

Like other members before me, I wish to say that, once I had accepted to sit on the flag committee, I dedicated myself to this task with the utmost sincerity and attended the various meetings feeling completely free and willing to make the best possible choice for a flag. I refrained from speaking to the Leader of the Opposition for the duration of our proceedings.

I want to say right away that no order was given to me, directly or indirectly, as to the position I was to take at the meetings of the committee. If instructions or orders had been given, either directly or indirectly, I would simply have resigned, because I felt absolutely free to act as I saw fit and to the best of my ability.

I would not wish to review the whole report submitted the other day by my colleague, the member for Humber-St. George's. However, I would like to draw the attention of the house to some of the resolutions or decisions arrived at during our meetings.

First of all, I wish to say that the result of the vote, recommending a national plebiscite speaks for itself. I would also like to point out the fact that all our discussions were centred on the adoption of a single flag.

Subparagraph (b) of the fifth paragraph of the report clearly indicates that we all agreed, since the adoption of a single national flag was passed by 14 to 0.

I also wish to point out to the house that throughout the sittings of the committee, which lasted about five weeks, and during the debate in this house, government members sitting on the committee made much of the three-leaf flag. Referring to tradition, they pointed out that the three red maple leaves

on a single stem were the only emblem which could appear on our national flag. However, after such a lengthy discussion, they all voted against a national flag with three maple leaves. Many suspicions are aroused and we are prompted to ask ourselves if it was not previously arranged before the establishment of the committee, that the flag contain a single maple leaf. But I will not dwell on this subject and will immediately refer to other considerations.

However, I must emphasize most especially the resolution introduced on October 22, 1964, which reads as follows:

[*Text*]

—that this committee select only one national flag, and that such selected flag be recommended for adoption by parliament.

[*Translation*]

Obviously, up to that time, it was our intention to select a single flag for Canada; yet, the resolution now before us calls for the adoption of two flags.

It is well known that I have always been in favour of a single flag, as is my party. All my efforts were directed toward that end during the discussions of the flag committee.

I must admit, however, that I was sorely disappointed at the final meeting when another resolution asking for the adoption of a second flag, that of a foreign country, was submitted to the committee.

I like clearcut attitudes and I propose, before going ahead with my remarks and to avoid interruptions from my friends opposite, to clearly establish my stand on the national flag issue. My views are based on information I gathered in two questionnaires completed by my constituents.

Before going any further, as I said, I put the question to the members of the committee during its deliberations. Here was my question: Why adopt two Canadian flags? What is the purpose—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Ricard: —of having two Canadian flags? Give me the name of another commonwealth nation which has two flags, if you can. Why go against the aspirations—

Mr. Speaker: The house is now considering the matter of a plebiscite and not that of one, two, five, six or seven flags. I would therefore ask the hon. member to deal with the plebiscite.

Mr. Ricard: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your direction, but I was laying down the basis of my argument to justify my position toward the plebiscite, and as some members opposite are anxious to hear my views on the matter, I want to say forthwith that I shall vote in favour of a plebiscite.

Some hon. Members: Oh.

Mr. Ricard: In this, I do respect the will of my electors. I have here before me a questionnaire I sent to my electors and in which I asked the following question:

Do you believe it would be preferable to hold a referendum on this matter?

There were 216 answers favouring a referendum, whereas 155 were against. I am therefore respecting in every respect the wishes of my constituents and to those who dare shout in the house, I would say: Stand up and tell us how you intend to express your opinion in regard to the plebiscite.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that you will go on maintaining order as you have done so well up to now and that you will pay no more attention than I do myself to those interjections from the other side of the house.

In the event that the plebiscite should be refused and that we are called upon to vote on the choice of a distinctive flag, I will act as I did during the proceedings of the committee and I will vote for the flag with a maple leaf on a white field and two red stripes. However, I want to add that, as far as the second part of the resolution is concerned, I shall support neither the red ensign nor the union jack, and I would ask hon. members, especially those of the province of Quebec, to make their position known as clearly, honestly and sincerely as I am doing now. That will take only 30 seconds of their time. I therefore ask the members from Quebec to rise, if they still have the courage to do so, if they are not entirely silenced by party discipline, and to tell their constituents how they intend to vote. I am convinced that the constituents of hon. members on the other side of the house would be interested to know the latter's views on that matter.

Since committee meetings began I have received a number of representations and letters, which I forwarded to the committee chairman, and which I also acknowledged.

It is interesting to note that I have received until now—the last letter reached me yesterday—a total of 100 letters from various parts of the country. For instance, I got 28 from the province of Quebec and they are all in favour of a distinctive flag. Out of 34 letters from the province of Ontario, 14 were in favour of a distinctive flag, 18 for the red

ensign while two of my correspondents would like to see a mixture of both so as to show our dual culture. Out of 14 letters from British Columbia three are in favour of a distinctive flag, nine for the red ensign and two for the union jack with the fleur-de-lis. I received eight letters from Alberta, out of which one was in favour of a distinctive flag and seven for the red ensign. In short, out of those 100 letters, 52 were in favour of a distinctive national flag, 44 in favour of the red ensign, while 14 were for the red ensign with the fleur-de-lis.

All this simply indicates that opinions vary concerning the choice of a flag for Canada. I am saying that by giving the people of Canada an opportunity to express their opinion on this question, we would simply acknowledge a privilege of which they would like to avail themselves. In urging a plebiscite there is no question of trying to hide facts or to prevent the people of Canada from expressing their views but merely of giving all Canadian citizens an opportunity to make their opinions known to their members of parliament and to the government, so that there will be no danger of causing a rift in the nation.

During the discussions before the appointment of the committee as well as during those that followed, members of parliament, especially those from the province of Quebec, said that the question was one of national unity and that the adoption of a flag would promote national unity.

During the proceedings of the committee, you should have heard certain members of the province of Quebec declaim their speeches and tell us how much national unity would be damaged or hurt, if we were to adopt a flag in which the union jack or the red ensign would be included.

I suggest that Liberal members should read in particular the speech made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, on February 5, 1896. I also suggest that they should read the recommendations made by Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King and Louis St. Laurent, who are considered the most brilliant prime ministers Canada ever had. They will see that, far from discrediting the union jack and the red ensign, those former prime ministers recognized and stated that there could be no Canadian national flag which would not include the union jack or the red ensign.

I ask my hon. friends opposite why they now deny what their leaders themselves have always professed?

Mr. Drouin: That is not true.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes says: "That is not true". I suggest he read page 2096 of the *Hansard* for November 13, 1945, where he will find the words spoken by Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent and Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King.

But there is an authority even closer to us who gave us his appreciation on national unity. I am speaking of the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate, the present Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), who made an explicit statement at a press conference in Quebec as published by the *Quebec Chronicle* on February 2, 1962, and I quote:

[*Text*]

He warned that if the union jack is dropped completely from a Canadian flag this might cause a deep rift among Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, our party has not advocated anything else since the beginning of the debate, and it is not because I wish to be recognized as a supporter of the union jack or the red ensign that I quoted these words; on the contrary, I only wish to allow the house to judge by itself the soundness and value of the allegations of our friends opposite.

We were also told that the fleur-de-lis had no signification for French Canada—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I must confess that I am wondering about the relevancy of the remarks of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot in connection with the amendment now being considered.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, it is simply because a plebiscite was suggested in which the Canadian people would be asked to decide on the symbols of the French race as well as those of the English race, and this is the reason why I am presently making these remarks.

We were told that the fleur-de-lis had no meaning for French Canada—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Ricard: —and I will point out, Mr. Speaker, that if you read the speech delivered by the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Cadieux), you will find that he followed the very course of action I am advocating at this moment. Furthermore, knowing you have always discharged your duties with impartiality, I do not see how you could deny me a privilege which has been granted to other members.

Mr. Drouin: The hon. member for Terrebonne spoke before the amendment was proposed.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, you will admit that it is difficult for a member to follow closely the text or the notes he prepared, while members from the other side of the house are continually interrupting.

With your leave, I should like to say this: "If you have the courage to stand up and give us your impressions, do so"; you will at least gain the admiration and confidence of your constituents.

Mr. Drouin: We are so convinced that we are ready to vote at once.

Mr. Ricard: Just tell the house how you will vote on the second part of the resolution. Are you going to vote for the union jack?

Mr. Girouard: Go on, say it.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, as I said, we have nothing to conceal. We do not intend to deprive the people of anything. All we want is that the flag which will be flown throughout Canada will be acceptable to every part of the country and, in my opinion, a plebiscite is the best and the fairest way of allowing the Canadian people to vote on the flag issue.

Mr. Speaker, it is claimed that Canada must have a flag within two years because such was the promise made by the present government.

Let our hon. friends opposite tell us what their government has done about appointing a minister for eastern agriculture.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I must admit to the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot that I fail to see how the comments he is now making could be truly relevant to the matter before us.

An hon. Member: He was out of order right from the start.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to give an opportunity—

An hon. Member: He is not "pertinent"; he is "patineux"—skating.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I only wanted to give the members who are not courageous enough to speak up, the opportunity of showing that the only thing they can do is to interrupt the one who has the floor and who is making remarks of which they do not approve.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I can but repeat that the only purpose of the Conservative party in advocating a plebiscite is to afford the Canadian people an opportunity to express their views—

An hon. Member: Filibuster.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I have just heard a member on the government side shout: "Filibuster".

It must be remembered that if it had not been for this filibuster, Canada would now be endowed with the three maple leaf flag, which flag even the Grits have disavowed, after having sung its praise for at least three months.

This was the result of the attitude of our group. If, on the other hand, people were allowed to speak their minds, several would stand up and express their own aspirations and those of their constituents.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, I repeat that I shall vote for the plebiscite, for I am convinced that it is the best way to provide the people with an opportunity to state their views.

If the plebiscite is turned down, and so that nobody will be able to say that I have opposed a distinctive flag, although this flag is not entirely to my taste, I shall vote for the recommendation of the committee.

I challenge Liberal hon. members of the province of Quebec to give their views on that matter. But, as far as I am concerned, I shall vote neither for the red ensign nor for the union jack.

Again, I ask hon. members opposite to have enough courage to rise and put their views on record.

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

A while ago the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot imputed feelings and opinions to Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent concerning the flag issue. I would like to refer to *Hansard*—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. This is not a question of privilege but an argument. If the hon. member wants to set forth his point, he will be able to do so by taking part in the debate.

[*Text*]

Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Speaker, I should like to—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege which concerns all members of this house.

I would like to point out that with the present speaker, we have just broken a record in the house. It seems that the fact is worth mentioning: This is the 200th speech given on the same subject. It is like a hockey game; when Maurice Richard scored his 500th goal the game was stopped so that the puck could be presented to him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Grégoire: If you allow me to state my question of privilege—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member should come to the point quickly because there does not seem to be a question of privilege in what he has just said.

On the other hand, the Chair realizes that the hon. member should have the opportunity to submit his argument.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege deals precisely with what is going on today for the first time in the House of Commons. I should like us to confer the "Order of filibuster" upon the hon. member who is about to deliver the 200th speech on this matter.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The alleged question of privilege raised by the hon. member is not any more legitimate than the one raised by the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes. I recognize the hon. member for Kent (Ont.).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I feel the hon. member who raised the question of privilege should have enough knowledge of what takes place in this house to know that he did not have a question of privilege, and that he was interrupting the debate on a phony point. He also stood up while you were on your feet, defying the Speaker. He has been doing so constantly ever since he came to this House of Commons.

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent, Ont.): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I should like to point out through you to the hon. member for Lapointe that in rising to speak on this question I make no apology to the house or to him. I want the record to show how I feel about the flag question and this debate, and how the constituents I represent feel about the flag question and this debate. I intend to support the amendment because it will give the people in my riding and across Canada an opportunity to express their views. Once those views have been expressed perhaps some of the members of this house will realize that they have not been presenting the views of the people they represent but rather their own views when speaking about this emotional and delicate subject.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Speaker, in spite of the levity of the remarks coming from the opposite side of this chamber, some of us feel that this is a very serious and emotional matter which affects all people in Canada and has a direct bearing on this so-called unity the government has been trying to promote. Some of the actions of the government are having exactly the opposite effect across Canada.

In my riding we have residents of both basic Anglo-Saxon and French origins, of whom we are very proud. We do not have any bilingual or bicultural problems because we all went to school together, grew up together and work together, and are proud of each other's culture, heritage and efforts as Canadians. That is as it should be.

A plebiscite is necessary on this flag question because of the great diversity of opinion which exists in Canada, and certainly in that part of southwestern Ontario I represent. I am sure that most Canadians want a distinctive national flag. The question is not whether we want a distinctive flag but, as we all appreciate, what symbols should appear on such a flag.

As we have heard today, whenever we stand in our places to put opinions on the record we hear charges of filibuster and charges that we are prolonging this debate. How can those accusers justify that criticism in view of the fact that during the 60 days the government has been proposing a distinctive Canadian flag it has wholeheartedly proposed two distinctive flags? That fact in my opinion justifies the belief of the Conservative party that the people of Canada should have a choice as to what should be Canada's distinctive national flag.

A great deal of criticism has been expressed through the press and on the radio about the character and length of this debate, suggesting that perhaps nothing new can be said regardless of the number of speakers taking part. Some of that criticism may be justifiable; we all make mistakes, and none of us is per-

fect. However, anyone who runs down parliament is certainly not doing this country any service whatsoever. The fact that there has been a difference of opinion as to the flag to be chosen, resulting in the production of a second distinctive national flag within a few months, justifies the stand taken by this party in this house. While it is true that ordinary citizens, men and women whom I am very proud to call my neighbours and friends, are sometimes confused, saddened and disgusted by what has transpired during the course of this debate, surely they should have an opportunity to hear the arguments on all sides of the question so as to be able to make up their own minds and decide by plebiscite what flag should be adopted.

In the early stages of this debate it is true that perhaps most hon. members of this house felt we had reached an impasse. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that when the solution of a committee was arrived at there were sighs of relief on both sides of the house and throughout the entire country. We felt that here was the solution we had been seeking for days; here was an opportunity for members of the house, working together on an all-party basis, working earnestly and in harmony, to provide a solution for this thorny problem that would meet with the favour of parliament and the country at large.

I know that my colleagues who were members of that committee went to its meetings with a desire to come up with a compromise flag that would settle this problem once and for all throughout Canada. I assume that the members of all other parties who took part in the deliberations of the committee went to its meetings with the same desire. We are all aware that the committee worked hard day after day to resolve this very problem. The citizens of this country, like all members of the house, thought it was the aim of the committee to come up with a compromise that would take into consideration the views expressed in every part of the house, and that the committee would try to decide upon a flag that would be acceptable to all the people of Canada; not to a political party, not to a certain section of Canada, but a flag that would represent what all members of the house were striving to obtain, a flag of which all Canadians could be proud. We know that the decision made by the committee would provide a flag for Canada for years to come, and this was why its deliberations were so important and why the committee was regarded so seriously by all members of parliament.

We feel that a plebiscite is now necessary, Mr. Speaker, because in my personal opinion the committee did not come up with the compromise that was expected of them. As far as I can ascertain, and I have followed the debate very closely, there were three basic divisions in the house. First of all there was the government's proposal of a flag with three maple leaves on a white background. There was the proposal on this side of the house that the union jack should be retained as part of any new flag. There was the proposal that the fleur-de-lis of France should have a prominent place on the flag. There was also the proposal that there should be a single maple leaf. It was my feeling, and I am sure that of many members of the house, that the committee would take into consideration the desires expressed in all parts of the house and come up with a composite flag embodying the principles that had been advocated for days, a flag perfect in its composition and pleasing in design, a flag that would be acceptable to members in all parts of the house and to people in every corner of this great nation.

Not only were many members of the house disappointed with the committee's recommendation, Mr. Speaker, but there was tremendous disappointment throughout the entire nation that such a flag did not materialize. Indeed, when we learned following the sittings of the committee that such a flag design had been submitted there was absolute dismay. We felt that such a flag was free from any political implications, that it embodied the principles expressed in all parts of the house, and we personally felt after seeing it that it was a flag that could be justifiably displayed with pride in every part of this nation because on it were the traditional sysmbols of the two great founding races and the traditional symbol of one red maple leaf representing the very Canada we are trying to preserve.

There is a play on words, Mr. Speaker, involved in any consideration of the report of the committee. One can either say "what a compromise" or "what compromise". This is one of the basic issues we are faced with today. Many of us feel that the suggested flag was no compromise but simply an alteration. We still have a flag of one party for the nation. This is not what the people of Canada want. This is what we feel is wrong so far as the flag proposed by the committee is concerned.

In assessing the whole situation we could be wrong, Mr. Speaker, and all we are ask-

ing is that the government give the people of Canada the opportunity to indicate whether the government is wrong in its assumption that the people want the one red maple leaf flag, or that we are wrong in assuming that the people of this great nation do not want such a flag. Such a course seems completely justifiable and fair.

We have heard that a plebiscite can be too expensive. We have heard that the mechanics of a plebiscite are such that it would be a cumbersome procedure. We have been told that it is the function of parliament to make decisions, and that there should be no need for a plebiscite. But, Mr. Speaker, are these justifiable arguments to use when we are speaking about the future of our nation, when we are worried about the problems of unity or disunity, when we are dealing with a subject that has so great an emotional impact? Are these arguments not futile? Do they not have the taint of partisan politics? Do government members opposite honestly feel that a plebiscite would not solve this problem, or are they not taking the position that because the opposition has suggested a plesbiscite it must necessarily be wrong? Do they feel they should be ashamed if they allow the people of Canada to make a choice? Do they feel that people will look down on them as having retreated from a policy? Is this what the trouble is?

In a situation as serious and important as this, I think any political party on either side of the house that provides a solution as workable, as simple and as conclusive as a plebiscite will serve the nation's interests and carry out the obligation that parliament is established to fulfil. A plesbiscite would do something that has been necessary from the very beginning of the discussion of this matter. It would take the problem out of partisan politics where it never should have been put in the first place.

As I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for taking the time of the house to express my views, because I feel very strongly about this most serious matter. I know the people in Ontario and all the other provinces are really concerned and worked up about this matter. When we go out amongst the people we represent, and I think this is true in every riding in Canada, the people say they are tired of debate; they are tired of the flag question, they want to see an end to it, they want a solution. But, Mr. Speaker, they still take sides; they still have their original convictions. A man who is a red ensign supporter when asked if we should let it go to a vote and if he would accept the new red maple leaf flag, will invariably answer "Let us settle the issue; let us get on with the business of the nation, but don't dare let them replace the red ensign."

The same situation exists on the other side. The advocates of the maple leaf flag want the issue settled. They feel we are wasting time; but if there were a danger of the issue being settled by the adoption of a compromise flag, the union jack or a red ensign, they would be the first to object. They would say "Keep on with the battle".

This is the position in which we find ourselves. We were at an impasse before, and we are at an impasse now. It is my opinion that the men on the flag committee should have had the fortitude, the diligence or the courage to set aside partisan politics, to set aside outside influences, to start thinking about Canada as a nation and come up with a compromise flag that included all the basic principles. What a golden opportunity, Mr. Speaker, they had to go down in the history of this nation as statesmen. This was not done, and it is most unfortunate that it was not.

Here we are. We must ask for a plebiscite. I must ask for a plebiscite. The people I represent are overwhelmingly in favour of being given an opportunity to make their wishes known. There is one other factor that we have in a plebiscite. There is always the basic fear that if a government promoted flag becomes the standard of the nation and the government should change in the years ahead, then since a precedent has been set the same dreary process could be gone through again to change the Canadian flag. It is true that after the experience of this parliament no government in power would be likely to attempt such a step. However, the mechanics of our system do lend themselves to such an event taking place.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that this government should allow a plebiscite. Then this matter would be taken out of partisan politics, not only for today but in the future as well. Once a majority of the people say "This is our flag", there would be no attempt by any political party, short of a revolution, to make a change.

It is for this reason I find it difficult to understand why we are running into opposition when we make this request of the government to have a plebiscite. Let the people decide. Let the people vote. We on this side

of the house are not sure whether 37 per cent of the population favour our stand or 97 per cent. It is equally true that the government are not certain whether 37 per cent of the population favour their stand or 97 per cent. If we had a plebiscite and the people decided, it would not matter one iota; politically the flag would be a dead issue. Let the people decide.

I am uneasy about the fact that the government is blocking the attempt to have a plebiscite. It causes me concern, because if we do not have a plebiscite we are only hiding our heads in the sand, since in my opinion at the next general election the people are going to decide this flag issue. If we have an election now, six months from now or three years from now, this is going to be an issue. How can we avoid it? We can say, as members of parliament, that we cannot go to the people on this issue; we cannot have a division in the country on this issue. We all know that out in the open this will not be a political issue. We all know there are major differences between the political parties in this house with which the parties will go on the hustings. We will have our political battles on the platforms, in the newspapers and over the radio.

However, we all know as well that in the bitter battles on the side roads, in the villages and little towns, those people who feel that their desire for the red ensign was not carried out will be attempting a vendetta against the present government. Conversely, it is equally true that those who are in favour of the three maple leaf flag will feel that their wishes have been trampled upon and they will be determined to make this an issue. It does not matter how we try to deal with this issue, we are going to have to vote on it. Why not have the issue out in the open? Why not have a plebiscite?

There is one basic difference if we do not have a plebiscite. If we have an election campaign in which the flag will be a *fait accompli,* regardless of the wishes of the people, we will create havoc with the unity of this country. I feel I speak for every member in this house when I say that national unity is our prime concern. We have had too many speakers who have tried to drive a wedge between groups, perhaps not by their speeches but by their actions. When we try, as we have done in this party, to put across our proposals we are told we are putting forward proposals for Anglo-Saxon Canada.

This is not true, Mr. Speaker, because most of us on this side of the house represent dual ridings. When we try to put our side of the question on the record we hear challenges of filibuster and of our holding up the work of the house. We in the house realize this is an exchange between parties, but the damaging impact back in the country is that our people think this is Anglo-Saxon versus French Canadian, and the damage done is immeasurable. That is why I feel so badly when I hear hon. members opposite interrupting us. This is too serious a matter to treat with levity. It is too serious for the well being of our nation in both the near and distant future.

As I have pointed out, the members of the flag committee had an opportunity to become statesmen, and to go down in history as statesmen. I say the members of the government could go down in history as statesmen if they let the people of Canada decide this issue. If there is one thing Canadians cannot stand it is arrogance, and the one thing which will make a Canadian madder than anything else is for him to be told what he must do now and what he must do in the future.

It would be so simple to have a plebiscite so that Canadians from coast to coast could be Canadians and could feel proud of the fact that they had their little say in the choice of a Canadian flag. It would not matter one iota what was on the flag if the people of Canada, not a political party, put it there.

We speak of Canadian unity. How can we have Canadian unity when the most emotional problem we have faced in a decade is thrown into the political arena? So long as it is there, there will be two sides to the question, not only in each province but in each county, township and town. This problem has created division, and the only way out of the impasse into which we as a parliament have got ourselves, and into which the government has got itself, is to let the people of Canada make the decision. That is an honourable way out, and we as an opposition are not proposing it for political gain. We cannot take the credit for it, but I feel the government would be commended if it agreed to hold a plebiscite. Further, the people would be proud of the government if it gave them the opportunity to vote on this issue.

As I say, we cannot take the credit for suggesting this because the idea did not come from us but from our constituents, who earlier this session flooded our desks with their letters and telegrams on the matter. I

would not want my name to go down in history as one who advocated a rigid, uncompromising design for a Canadian flag, and that is why I am proud to have the opportunity to stand up this afternoon and give my views frankly and openly.

Despite the publicity that has been generated from coast to coast about the stand taken by our party on this issue, may I point out we are the party which said "Let there be a compromise". We are the party which said "Let there be a plebiscite". We are the party which said "Let the people of Canada decide". This is our position, and it would be interesting to know what position will be taken by hon. members opposite. Are they more concerned with partisan politics than with the wishes of the people they represent? Are they more concerned with the tally of votes than with the basic principle we are facing today?

I am sure hon. members opposite do not want to find themselves in that position, and I respectfully suggest that a plebiscite gives them an out. If they advocated a plebiscite they would have nothing to be ashamed of and could walk with pride. But how can they justify taking a position which tells the people of this nation "You cannot decide this. We as members of the Canadian government will make your decision for you, and what we decide will be your flag from now on". I do not want to be put in that position, and I fail to see how hon. members opposite could want to either. This is why I find it hard to understand why they do not at once accept the plebiscite proposition. If they did then we could get on with the business of the nation, something which I believe all hon. members want to do. It is as simple as that. Let the people decide.

Mr. Rock: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? He has suggested that if there is no plebiscite there will be strong feelings among those who support the ensign and those who support a new flag. Is he suggesting that if there is a plebiscite there will be no feelings between groups which adamantly support the red ensign and other groups which support the new flag? Is he suggesting a limit on campaigning in a plebiscite?

Mr. Danforth: If we put this matter into the hands of the people and held a plebiscite, then with the majority of the Canadian people having taken a decision there would be nothing to be gained for political purposes. There would no longer be partisan politics in the flag issue, something with which the House of Commons is swamped today.

Mr. J. N. Ormiston (Melville): Mr. Speaker, since the debate this afternoon must necessarily centre on the topic of a plebiscite I trust I may be allowed to develop a theme which arises when national symbols are changed without recourse to such a method of doing it.

As most hon. members of the house are aware, I am a supporter of the red ensign as the flag of Canada, and for several sessions I have had a bill on the order paper proposing its official adoption by parliament. But because I and many of my colleagues support that flag we have been accused of jingoism, phony patriotism, extremism, sometimes English colonialism and other times sentimental symbolism, and other diversionary epithets of the new nationalism.

I believe I must repudiate the arguments of those who say it is childish to cherish a symbol of man's aspirations or achievements. A symbol can sum up the best or worst of a man's mind or a man's soul. Symbols are the essence of communication between man and his God. The art and science of symbolism distinguishes man from animal.

Man's alphabets are written symbols; his languages are sound symbols; his religions are rich in symbols; his music, sculptures and paintings are symbols. It has been said of one cathedral raised by man to the greater glory of God that it is "frozen music"; it has been said of another that it is a "nightmare in stone". Symbols attend man's birth, his marriage, his religious, social and other activities as he goes to and from upon the earth; they wait upon his death. By them, he creates; by them, he destroys. Not least of all, they symbolize his political conceptions and his political perversions.

The memory of man will not forget for a very long time to come a certain man who took the symbol of the swastika—a good luck symbol older than ancient India—reversed it and made it a symbol of genocide as a political art. Another man, lesser in evil than he, took the fasces, for 2000 years a symbol of the grandeur of Roman achievement in law and political administration, and perverted it into the obscene symbol of a political mafia.

Only last week members of this house paid tribute to a man who symbolizes for millions of people of diverse tongues and races what we may call the terrible twentieth century in which we live. Our own Prime

Minister described him as "a man of parliament". Perhaps because he is a man of parliament that man did not mock symbols. When winged swastikas fired the skies over England's cities and the earth opened to swallow the women and children of England and bury them beneath the wrecked symbols of their homes, then was seen the V for victory sign; then was heard its counterpart in music.

These symbols were evident everywhere. They were important not only to those in Great Britain but to members in this House of Commons who were aware of them in their offices in this building, and who returned to this chamber from those offices to lead Canadians to make the greatest effort and sacrifice in men, money and material that this nation has ever made. Mr. Speaker, the man who led the greatest effort against the greatest odds we have ever seen spoke and achieved through symbols. Which of us will forget the defiant arrogance of his words "Some chicken, some neck", uttered in this chamber to the French prophets of doom.

Of this man of symbols Mr. Harold Wilson has said "If Winston Churchill could write his own epitaph it would simply be this:— 'He was a good House of Commons man'." And as a good House of Commons man, Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill holds dear the symbols of the House of Commons, the symbols of parliament and the symbols of the Queen in parliament. No one is more rationally aware than he that the principles of the United Kingdom constitution which are in turn the principles of the Canadian constitution are the principles of republic. But no one is more rationally aware than Winston Churchill, that man of parliament, of the role of tradition, habit and symbols in preserving ancient institutions after effective power has passed elsewhere. No one knows better than he how important this role is to political stability. It is those principles, in combination with those traditions, habits, symbols and institutions, which make parliamentary government of the United Kingdom type the kind of government which is most deliberately initiated today.

We know that many times in recent years attempts have been made to transplant the British parliamentary system. Many of these efforts have failed and the nations which have made this experiment have slipped into dictatorship because the leaders imported the machinery of the British parliamentary system but scorned the symbols, or mistook the meaning of the symbols. These were not men of evil intent; they were either men of the intellectual elite who looked upon a symbol as an emotional crutch for a lame-brain, or they were irrational men who read into the symbols the meanings of their private hates and fears.

Let us consider another symbol, one which lies before us. In the centre of the chamber rests the mace. It is a symbol of royal authority, the symbol of the authority of this house, a symbol of your own authority, Mr. Speaker. In ancient times it was a symbol of the union of church and state.

Mr. Byrne: I think this would be an appropriate moment to raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker, since a reference has been made to your authority. Simply for the record I wish to draw to your attention the fact that the hon. member is out of order on two counts. First, he is reading his speech, in the second place he is in no way discussing the question of a plebiscite.

Mr. Speaker: I must disagree with the hon. member's last contention. Symbols are important to this country, and the hon. member is relating that to the value, in his opinion, of a plebiscite. As to his reading his speech, he has rather full notes but it is not the first time members have had full notes.

Mr. Ormiston: I appreciate the observations of the hon. member for Kootenay East. I hope that at some suitable time we may hear his views on this whole subject. I was certainly trying to associate the symbolism of the past with the symbolism of the age in which we live. We must attempt to do this if we are to be in a proper position to carry out a plebiscite, because in the event of a plebiscite there will be a need for the study of symbols.

I was referring to the symbol which we see before us, and I was about to say that in ancient times archbishops carried it as they rode beside their kings into battle. They carried a mace instead of a cutting weapon so they might do their duty to their king by bludgeoning his enemies instead of offending God by shedding blood. Upon such niceties of symbolism have the multiracial British tolerated one another's eccentricities and survived. Some of those eccentricities and traditions survive in this chamber to the present day. I can recall from a study of English history that at the time Cromwell was in the British House of Commons he noticed the

mace lying on the table and cried "Take away that bauble".

That is what has happened today, Mr. Speaker. I believe that in this chamber today we again hear this cry "Take away that bauble!" in that we are taking away some of our symbols. I am afraid we hear this on the treasury benches too, benches so largely filled with ministers who were schooled and trained in the dictatorial branch of our democracy. We hear it from their men in the grey flannel suits, men bought and paid to erase the symbols of monarchy and to substitute the symbolic image of a man who never was—a man who was not in this house when his ministers two-faced a crisis—

Mr. Byrne: Order.

Mr. Ormiston: —a man who was not in the house because his ministers sent him to a prairie Coventry, not because he had broken our constitutional principles but because he might observe them. We hear: "Take away the red ensign". We hear: "Take away the Queen's picture from the citizenship courts". We hear: "Take away the word 'dominion' and the word 'national' from government doors and letterheads."

Mr. Speaker: Order. I must agree with one of the recent objections that this is not really germane to the question of a plebiscite. The hon. member is giving a personal opinion. I was trying to follow the hon. member in his symbolism as it dealt with a plebiscite and I thought he had a point, but when he goes on to pictures and things like that he is away off the mark.

Mr. Ormiston: Mr. Speaker, I will try to confine my remarks to the true meaning of symbolism.

Mr. Byrne: How are going to do that if you keep reading?

Mr. Ormiston: If we take away everything which reminds us that we inherited a democracy—our traditions, our habits, and most of all our symbols—certainly we have lost part of the element of democracy. The men who say this have now come to the point where they are prepared to move, and I would suggest that some members on the other side of the house are moving, not openly but stealthily, slyly and surreptitiously on the floor of this house against the prerogative of the crown.

This may seem a harsh statement to those not schooled in constitutional matters, but only the Queen of Canada can appoint a flag for Canada. Yet never in all the statements made over the months inside and outside the house by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and some other ministers of the crown, or in the motions drafted by them and placed upon the official records of the house, has there been reference to that constitutional fact. Surely at some period or other, upon some occasion or other, it might be thought that the Prime Minister would be proud to tell this house, in the manner in which Right Hon. Mr. St. Laurent was proud to tell the house on February 3, 1953 with respect to the royal style and title, that: "It is Her Majesty who will determine, who will announce by proclamation what the flag will be for Canada". Right Hon. Mr. St. Laurent was, and is, a great constitutional lawyer. He was a good minister of justice and a good prime minister of Canada. He left those two positions, the two highest political offices in the gift of the Canadian people, the better for his holding them.

I ask now, Mr. Speaker, do those ministers of the crown who sat to the left and to the right of Prime Minister St. Laurent when he spoke those words, and who sit on the front benches today, believe that he demeaned himself when he said:

> It is Her Majesty who will determine, who will announce by proclamation what her royal style and titles will be for each one of the several realms of the commonwealth.

Do these individuals who listened so intently at that time now repudiate as colonialism the words of this Liberal, this constitutional lawyer, this minister of justice and attorney general of Canada—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me that in the present circumstances the hon. member is entitled to criticize the action of the government in bringing forward this matter for discussion, or the terms of the motion or anything else of that nature; but to impute motives to ministers which, to say the least, are subject to suspicion as stated by my hon. friend, is not correct. The hon. member may disagree with the actions which have been taken but I do not think it is right to impute motives to ministers who happen to hold a different opinion from that which is held by the hon. member. It seems to me that he is away off the point of a plebiscite, how it should be held, where it should be held, when it should be held and if it should be held.

Mr. Ormiston: I thank you for your direction Mr. Speaker, but I was just pointing out that there was a great deal of difference between the statements of the former prime

minister and the terms of the resolution, which asks that the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to establish officially the flag of Canada. I am sure I can join with the previous member who spoke in saying that there must be some recourse to the people of Canada, because certainly the government has not taken the option which has presented itself.

I read into the record the Queen's prerogative. This has not been considered at all, and it seems to me it is only fair that the government should use every available opportunity and every channel to make sure that the people of Canada are given a fair voice in what will be a national symbol for many years to come. It is beyond me why the government are reticent to take this step. Surely if the government is sure of its judgment it should not be afraid to call a plebiscite at a suitable time, which of course would be at the time of the next election. On that occasion the government would be able to judge by the results of the plebiscite whether or not they were justified in their actions.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would only say that the situation which we are presenting gives the government that alternative. It gives the people of Canada a choice and it will destroy forever the statements, or the thoughts which are behind the statements, that what we have today is a political flag.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment before this Chamber, which asks the government to hold a plebiscite whereby the people of Canada would have the opportunity at the next federal election to express their views on the adoption of a distinctive flag for Canada. Before I commence my remarks, Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate you on reaching the very difficult decision you had to make—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think in the present circumstances no reference at all should be made to the Speaker. I hope there will be no bad references, but there do not have to be any good ones either.

Mr. Hales: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and will proceed with my remarks.

I should like to say at the outset that the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne) will not have occasion to accuse me of reading from notes because I will try to keep away from notes as much as possible; I intend to speak from the heart. I intend to speak on behalf of the conscience of thousands of people in my riding—yes, millions of people in Canada—who want a chance to express their views by means of a plebiscite. I plead for them, Mr. Speaker. These people have a right to be heard, in my opinion, and I think it is up to the government to provide them with the opportunity to say which flag they prefer. This may be my last opportunity to speak on behalf of these people, so before this government pulls down the Canadian red ensign, which has stood for so much—honour, history, love, sentiment and tradition—and replace it with another flag, I would beg the government to let the people make their choice. Whatever steps are taken, or whatever choice is made we should remind ourselves that it will be made for our children and our children's children, and will be our flag for centuries and centuries to come.

This is an emotional matter involving a moral and personal choice, and with all the power and persuasion at my command I plead with this government, and particularly the Prime Minister, to let the conscience of the people of Canada be heard. Let us have a plebiscite at the next election. It would not be costly and could be handled very easily, allowing the people of this country an opportunity to express their views. I am sure the Canadian people feel that this debate has lasted long enough. The public polls which have been held in recent days indicate that over 60 per cent of the people want a plebiscite. Why do they want a plebiscite? I suggest it is because they desire an opportunity to express their views and because they want this flag question taken from the House of Commons.

It is within the power of the Prime Minister to remove this question from this chamber and allow the people to voice an opinion by plebiscite. He brought this flag question into the house and he is the man who can take it out. We as the opposition did not bring this subject before parliament. I am sure that every loyal Canadian, given the chance to express an opinion, would accept a choice made by a plebiscite. Why does the Prime Minister delay putting this question to the people in the form of a plebiscite? Important business which this house should now be considering, such as the labour code legislation, implementation of the Gill report recommendations, pension and railway legislation and all the other important matters could then be dealt with.

There are those who will ask why a plebiscite is necessary. The hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) just asked whether we

did not think that by holding a plebiscite we would arouse hard feelings. May I suggest to him that perhaps hard feelings might be aroused; but at least the people would have a chance to express their feelings, and that is the opportunity we wish to give them. In answer to those who ask why a plebiscite is necessary, I should like to remind them that we want to see the other side of the coin during this debate. Why have we not heard from those on the government side of the house, their reasons why a plebiscite should not be held? What is wrong with putting this question to a plebiscite?

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) did on one occasion make reference to a plebiscite and suggested that if Sir John A. Macdonald had held a plebiscite we may never have had confederation. My answer to that suggestion is that Sir John A. Macdonald was a man of sound judgment and knew that confederation was a matter concerning legislation and constitution, and therefore that a plebiscite was not necessary. However, on an emotional issue, such as the choice of a flag, different considerations must be studied.

I challenge my friends on the government side of this house to stand in their places and tell us their reasons for thinking a plebiscite is not the proper way of deciding this issue. When I spoke on August 31 I challenged my hon. friends to defend the position they have adopted. I refer to them sincerely as my friends, members such as the hon. members for Durham (Mr. Honey), Brantford (Mr. Brown), Renfrew South (Mr. Greene), Carleton (Mr. Francis), Wentworth (Mr. Morison), Halton (Mr. Harley), Hastings South (Mr. Temple), Peel (Mr. Beer), and Norfolk (Mr. Roxburgh). Have any of those hon. members risen in their places and defended their position on the flag debate or told us why a plebiscite should not be held? The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) was so anxious to give the report of the flag committee he gave it to the press before the committee presented it to the house. Why has he not been on his feet in this chamber to defend the position his party has taken on the flag issue, and told us why there should not be a plebiscite?

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have made my position very clear on the question of a plebiscite, and if the hon. member would take the time to turn up my speech in *Hansard,* and the speeches made by many other members on this side of the house, during the 22 days of debate covering this whole subject, he would find ample information as to why we take this position. I think he should read my address in this chamber before making such remarks.

Mr. Hales: He still has an opportunity to express his views as to why we should or should not hold a plebiscite, and I invite the hon. member to take the opportunity of doing so.

Have we heard from the members of the treasury benches on this subject? Out of 26 we have heard from only four. Is that an honest and sincere effort on their part? I think Her Majesty's loyal opposition is entitled to the views of members on the opposite side on this subject, and they should partake freely in this debate. Let them stand in their places and present their views.

A plebiscite is necessary in my opinion for the following reasons. It is necessary because this issue affects the conscience of every Canadian. It is necessary because the symbols making up a Canadian flag are based on tradition and history and are held near and dear to the hearts of every Canadian. I do not think such a thing as a flag can be the subject of legislation. People must be given a choice, and a chance to express their view on something so important to them as a flag. The people want a voice in this matter, and who is to know how they feel unless they are given an opportunity to voice their opinions.

No one can tell exactly what are the views of the public on such an important matter as a Canadian flag. We have had ample evidence of that fact here in this chamber. The right hon. Prime Minister and his government introduced a flag in this house that he felt was the flag which would be accepted by the whole of Canada. In spite of the fanfare, public relations, bumper stickers and miniature flags, that flag was turned down by a committee of this house by a vote of 14 to nothing. That would indicate a great difference of opinion within this house; yet we are now being asked to accept another distinctive flag for Canada. I do not think such a choice can be made properly here in this chamber.

One cannot assess public opinion accurately without holding a plebiscite. Perhaps I can illustrate that point in this way. A plebiscite was held in 1942 on the subject of conscription. One might have expected that in a riding such as Waterloo North, the residents of which are predominantly of German extraction, the vote would be two to one against conscription. When the vote was counted the

outcome was exactly the opposite. The people had voted two to one in favour of conscription. The same holds true of the province of Quebec. When the vote was taken on the question of conscription it was expected that perhaps 5,000 or 10,000 people would vote for conscription, but when the ballots were counted it was found that 376,188 in Quebec had voted for conscription. So one never knows what the public are thinking on these matters that are so close and dear to them. Just as the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) found out that the flag he introduced into the house was not acceptable, so we might be quite surprised to find out in a plebiscite how people are thinking on this very important matter.

Let us briefly look into the history of plebiscites. I am a great believer in turning back the pages of history to find out what has been done, and what we should do. As far back as 1517 Erasmus, the great philosopher, stated in very precise language that all power and authority over people rests on their consent and that title by conquest is a fallacy. In 1527 Francis I of France, perceiving the political value of the principle, used it as a weapon of diplomacy. Henry II used self-determination; it is very interesting to note it was not referred to as a plebiscite in those days, but rather self-determination, for assuming control of Toal, Metz and Verdun.

Now we come to the period when the method of popular consultation or self-determination enjoyed its greatest use. From 1855 to 1866 scarcely a year passed without some endorsement of the plebiscite method. Napoleon's treaty with Cavour contained a clause providing for consultation of the inhabitants. The treaty of Prague on August 23, 1866, terminated the war between Prussia and Austria over the spoils they had seized from Denmark in 1864. Article V stated that Prussia could only incorporate the duchies if a free vote or plebiscite was taken.

In the case of the separation of Norway from Sweden in 1905 several joint committees were set up and meeting after meeting was held to decide what the solution should be. A plebiscite was proposed. The result settled the issue and today we have the two separate countries of Norway and Sweden. The island of Bartholomew in the West Indies was given to France by the Swedish cabinet in 1877 but not until a plebiscite or self-determination vote had been held.

Australia has used the plebiscite on several occasions and most recently to determine whether or not the communist party should be allowed to operate in Australia. New Zealand used the plebiscite on the liquor question. Ghana used a plebiscite for deciding whether or not it would be a republic and so did South Africa in 1960. We are all aware that in the United States all state constitutions except one contain provision for taking a poll of the people, or holding a plebiscite. So we find plebiscites have been used down through the years. They are very necessary and have played a part in solving many difficult problems.

We only have to think of how often plebiscites are used at the municipal level. Right in my own city this month two plebiscites are being held, one on the question of Sunday sports and movies and the other on fluoridation. Why are they being held? Because these are matters that are personal to the people and close to their consciences. Do the people of my city criticize the aldermen for using a plebiscite? Do they accuse them of not being able to make up their minds as members of the council? No. No such suggestion has ever been made. The people are anxious to have the opportunity to express their views according to their own consciences on matters so personal to them.

Therefore I maintain that in deciding the flag issue, an issue so close to the consciences of the people of Canada, we should give the people the opportunity to decide through a plebiscite. As I said, plebiscites are not new. They have been used through the ages. I cannot understand why the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) does not see the advantage of a plebiscite. One would think he would jump at the opportunity. Even Francis I of France, as I stated, recognized the political value of the plebiscite as far back as 1527 and used it as a weapon of diplomacy. Great diplomat that the Prime Minister is, one would think that he too would use the plebiscite, this weapon of diplomacy, as one way to find the answer to this difficult problem.

Indeed, Liberal governments have used plebiscites on two occasions. One was held in 1898 to settle the issue of prohibition and one was held in 1942 on the question of conscription. So this would not be the first time that a Liberal government has used the plebiscite.

I believe I have given enough examples, Mr. Speaker, of the many instances in which a plebiscite has been used to settle major issues to prove the value of a plebiscite from the point of view of the results that can be obtained. Finally, I say, not only what I said at the beginning of my speech, but also

when speaking in the flag debate on August 31st last: A plebiscite should be held. It is the only answer I can see for such an important issue involving a moral and personal choice, an issue which 265 people out of 20 million cannot decide. This has been proven over and over again.

It is quite evident, Mr. Speaker, that public opinion is snowballing in favour of a plebiscite. People realize it is the only answer and the only way to settle this great problem. People are even expressing their great gratitude now to Her Majesty's loyal opposition for saving Canada from adopting the three maple leaf flag which this Liberal government intended should be thrust upon us. That same flag was turned down by the Liberal members of the committee. Yet that was the flag that the government would have had Canada adopt. To my mind this illustrates what a difficult problem is involved in settling this issue and how easily it might be settled by means of a plebiscite. We want an opportunity for self-determination. In my opinion it is the only way out. I say again that I will vote for a plebiscite. I will vote for self-determination. I should like to close by quoting a paraphrase of an ancient Nordic policy to this effect:

> On minor affairs the few decide; on great affairs the many.

Mr. Gene Rhéaume (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have an opportunity, along with many other members, to put on the record my beliefs and the beliefs of my constituents on this issue. There are many members on all sides of the chamber who will not be speaking on either the amendment or the motion itself. Whether this course has been chosen either because they feel that the issue can best be handled by not speaking at all, or they feel that others have already adequately expressed their own feelings, I commend those members for their self-restraint. If, however, there are members in this chamber whose silence has been prompted solely by partisan considerations or, even worse, implicit or explicit threats, I pass on to those members of parliament my sympathy for their situation and my scorn for their cowardice. For my own part, I intend to speak now but not again on this subject. I apologize to no one for this decision which I arrived at fully and freely after a soul-searching consideration of my duties to the people of the Northwest Territories whom I represent, in so far as I am able to understand those duties.

The house is about to vote on an amendment to instruct the special flag committee to change the recommendation which that committee arrived at by a majority vote of its members. This committee was, as we know, an all party committee, and numerically speaking its decision was absolutely clear. Why then, it is asked, should the matter be sent back? The answer to this question, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely clear also. At no time has a case been made in this house as to why we should have a new flag at all. In the absence of such instructions from the Canadian people, none of us as individuals and no political party in this house, has either a mandate or even the right to tamper with the symbols and the feelings of the Canadian people.

Who was it, I want to know, who took it upon himself to decide that a change was not only necessary but that it must be made now? What evidence did the government have that had been accumulated to cause it to forsake other social and economic national goals to pursue this matter now? This afternoon, as I walked over to this chamber and looked up at the peace tower with the Canadian red ensign flying from it, as I do quite often, I had to ask myself again, what is all this about? I for one am not dedicated to the retention of this particular flag. However, I do not find it offensive, nor am I in the throes of some demoniac obsession to tear it down from the flagstaffs all over this nation. Before I can support a vote that would change this flag, someone is going to have to convince me that not only is such a change warranted now but that that change would somehow or other make better Canadians out of all of us.

I have serious doubts also, Mr. Speaker, if most Canadians, given a choice through a plebiscite, would insist on the urgency of the change at this time or perhaps even a change at all. So far, the only argument I have heard is the claim by some, but not all, of the government supporters that this flag is a commitment of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) to the Canadian people. Well, I for one have to have a more serious reason than that for the removal of a traditional flag and its replacement by another. Surely the need for a flag must be based on reasons that we can see here and now, and that historians will be able to see in the future, and that are more serious than the suggestion that we must now change the flag solely as an attempt to placate an insecure and accident prone Prime Minister who may otherwise not achieve a place in Canadian history.

Like most other Canadians this week, however, I felt sorry for the Prime Minister in this matter that he is trying to handle. However, I do not intend to help tear up the red ensign to bind the wounds that the Prime Minister and his fellow cabinet ministers have inflicted on themselves and the country. Aside from the fact that no case has been made for this change of flag, there are other reasons, compelling reasons, why no further action should be taken unless at the specific request of the Canadian people through a plebiscite. There is ample evidence from the speeches made in this House of Commons, that some members are either totally misjudging the moods and desires of their constituents or are purposely misstating the situation. I am not here talking about members like the hon. member for Northumberland (Miss Jewett) who said in this house during the flag debate on July 2, 1964, as reported at page 4949 of *Hansard*, that members should pay no attention to their constituents' wishes in this matter, but should rather follow their own intellectual inclinations. I have difficulty believing that in constituencies of similar make-up, located side by side in this country, two extreme and diametrically opposed positions on the flag actually exist. However, if one were to believe the Liberal members of parliament, that is the situation.

I contrast this situation, Mr. Speaker, with the way in which the Conservative party know and respect the attitude of our fellow colleagues in this party from the province of Quebec on this issue. These members have reached a conclusion on this matter and, generally speaking, all of the members from the province of Quebec from all parties in this house reflect a unity of objective and purpose on this matter. I know that; I understand it. I respect it, and it makes sense to me that that situation exists. But how in the light of this can you explain the stand being taken by some government members from other parts of the country, other than as blind obedience to the whim of a Prime Minister who has lost his grasp on reality?

I suggest that a national plebiscite would show whether or not a majority of Canadians want the present flag removed and replaced. I would even go a step further. I sincerely believe the only reason the Prime Minister is refusing to accept a plebiscite is not so much because he and his cabinet members have no regard for the opinion of Canadian people but because he is terrified of the outcome of such a straw vote taken from one end of the nation to the other. He is desperately afraid that a majority of Canadians would see no urgency in this matter, that same majority of Canadians who denied his party and himself political support in the last general election.

The Prime Minister has said in the house that he is a great believer in the majority decision of a special flag committee, a committee which he can load with Liberals and those of similar easy principle. But he is not willing to listen to a majority of Canadians and I want to know why not. I want to know what commitments were made by the Prime Minister, and to whom, that he would obliterate the union jack before the end of 1964, for there is no other explanation to clear up this weird and pathetic obsession with the flag.

There is another reason why I believe we should hold a plebiscite. It is because no Canadian can seriously accept, as the serious choice of parliament, the design recommended by the flag committee. For that reason the amendment should be supported. You will remember some months ago the ecstasy with which the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) and the Prime Minister regarded the three maple leaves on the white background with the two blue bars. This was Canada. This was the flag of the Prime Minister's dreams. It was perfect; but now the same Prime Minister and the same hon. member for Leeds say, "If you think that was good contemplate, if you will, a white background with two red bars and one red leaf, because this represents Canada."

In the Montreal *Star* of November 20 I notice a report relating to symbols, in which the government announced the appointment of a man to handle the merchandising of the Arctic owl, Ookpik. I want to read the pertinent sentence where it says this man will have particular responsibility for Ookpik, the Arctic owl used internationally as a Canadian emblem. Yet we are told the reason we must proceed with the flag committee report is that one red leaf is Canada from coast to coast to coast, that this is Canada around the world. But now we find the government appointing someone to promote Ookpik as another international Canadian emblem. One is led to wonder what might have happened to the Canadian flag had the Eskimos of the north been transferred to the province of Quebec. Perhaps it would have been Ookpik on a red background with two white bars.

I mention these things to highlight the point I am trying to make, that in view of what has

happened no Canadian can take seriously the sort of nonsense the government is advancing as a Canadian flag for all time.

I am a young man, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact only 32 years of age this very day.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Rhéaume: I am not completely devoid of a sense of historical or traditional values, nor am I unmindful of the sacrifice of two world wars that many people, particularly veterans, whether rightly or wrongly have come to associate with the Canadian red ensign. Of course I am equally sure that it is only because there are many people in the country who escaped the sacrifice of those times, and who do not associate that sacrifice with the flag under which Canadians fought, that the Liberal party has dared to make the Canadian Legion and veterans official organizations objects of ridicule.

In 1945 when some, but not all, of the boys were coming home the Prime Minister we have now would not have dared this. His courage would not have been up to this, just as it has deserted him so often in the presence of other serious domestic issues. It is very easy now, in 1964, for the Liberal government with its professional image builders to go about the country debasing the traditions of the past, following an old Liberal tactic of building themselves up by tearing others down.

I urge the house to vote for a plebiscite as the way of giving the people of Canada a chance to show whether or not they want the traditional symbols in the red ensign replaced. I want a plebiscite to give the Canadian people an opportunity to say whether from an aesthetic or an historical point of view they are happy with a flag which has nothing on it to link it either with the future or with the past. This country was French for many years and my own ancestors lived here during the time it was under French rule. They played a small part in helping to build it. It is equally true that after the battle of the plains of Abraham Canadian history took a new turn under the English. I do not think the adoption of a new flag devoid of all reference to those two founding races would in any way change history or in any way make up for those previous conflicts.

At the present time our country is very conscious, in a bitter and hurt way, that it was founded originally by the French and the English. Perhaps hon. members will say it is not very important for us in 1964 to put anything on our flag which will serve to remind people of the contribution of the English and the French. But the flag we are choosing, or the flag which will be chosen, should be flying 200 years from now and it should be extremely important to every member of this house that 200 years from now, regardless of where Canada has gone in those centuries our people are reminded of the fact that for mny years this country was French and that for many years it was English and that those in the Canadian House of Commons in 1964 were not ashamed to put symbols on the flag to remind people of these facts.

I have said that no one has yet convinced me there is a compelling and urgent reason to change the flag we have. Although I have no particular personal commitment to the Canadian red ensign, before I will participate in the removal of this flag, someone on the government side has to convince me that the need to change it is founded on something more important than the fact that on April 8, 1963, the government of this country changed.

I am happy to see the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) back in his place.

An hon. Member: We have missed him.

Mr. Rhéaume: It would not be accurate to say we have missed him. But it is still nice to have him back because on this very subject, the necessity for a change, the hon. gentleman said one evening that we had to have a distinctive flag and that his definition of "distinctive" was "anything without the union jack on it".

Mr. Dupuis: Or the fleur-de-lis. Put the facts straight.

Mr. Rhéaume: I am happy to have the minister back because I should like to get the latest quotation on those three leaf bumper stickers. Last time I heard, they were about $25 a thousand—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member has for the last several minutes been straying from the question before the house, that is, the question of the plebiscite.

Mr. Rhéaume: You must admit, Mr. Speaker, I am responding to interruptions from the Minister without Portfolio who insists on trying to put something on the record.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I realize the minister interjected a remark, but he interjected that

remark in reply to a part of the hon. member's speech which was out of order.

Mr. Rhéaume: The minister is aware he can always rise on a question of privilege if he wishes to do so. But he should not interject from his seat because it may be difficult for the *Hansard* reporters to identify the source of the interruption.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. A moment ago the hon. member quoted me as saying that, to me, a distinctive flag is any emblem which does not bear a union jack. I want him to know that this is not true.

When referring to my remark, he forgot to add what I said at the end: any emblem bearing neither the union jack nor the fleur-de-lis.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is no question of privilege. The hon. minister merely wishes to correct what he considers to be a mistake in the hon. member's reference.

[*Text*]

It being five o'clock the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely private bills, notices of motions for papers, public bills.

PRIVATE BILLS

BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF CANADA

The house resumed from Thursday, October 22, consideration in committee of Bill No. S-27 respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada—Mr. Brown—Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

On clause 1—*Number of directors.*

The Chairman: When the committee rose on October 22 last, clause 1 of the bill with an amendment proposed thereto by the hon. member for Timiskaming and an amendment to the amendment by the hon. member for Lapointe was being considered. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Cowan: You may remember, Mr. Chairman, that when this bill was up for consideration six weeks ago today I was making some remarks with regard to the subamendment. I am quite prepared to support the subamendment because I believe the general telephone users of Canada are entitled to more representation on this board than is now accorded to them.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

When I spoke six weeks ago I referred to the letter which the presidents of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railways had written in 1961 to the hon. member for Three Rivers. In this letter they pointed out they had lost a 30 year contract with the C.B.C. which went to the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, which company, the Bell, had undercut them on the tender by 25 per cent. When I read the letter to the house on December 21, 1963, on our discussion of the C.B.C. estimates, I read these two paragraphs from the joint letter which was signed by Mr. Donald Gordon and Mr. Emerson:

> Assuming that it is in the national interest to maintain competition in the communications industry, we think you will agree that such competition cannot be preserved if one group is permitted to quote depressed rates in the competitive situation and to obtain recompense through higher rates for other services.
>
> Public long distance telephone rates in Canada are 50 per cent or more above comparable rates in the United States which are regulated by the federal communications commission.

They went on to point out that the Bell Telephone Company, having undercut competitors by 25 per cent in a competitive field, would make good the losses on that contract by raising rates elsewhere in other fields of endeavour.

And better prophets, Mr. Chairman, never spoke, because we now have a report that the Bell Telephone Company is seeking an increase in rates in ten exchanges in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec at this very moment. There is a very interesting angle to this application for increases. I was interrupted by the clock six weeks ago today as I was about to read a Canadian Press dispatch which I saw in the Quebec *Chronicle-Telegraph* for May 2, 1964. I think the committee will be interested in a little history on this matter. This small dispatch says:

> Bell wants to increase rates; Montreal. (CP)
>
> The Bell Telephone Company said Friday, May 1, it has asked the board of transport commissioners for permission to boost rates in ten telephone exchanges in Quebec and Ontario.
>
> A company spokesman said the exchanges in question have all outgrown their present rate group, and should be reclassified.
>
> The increases would range from ten cents a month for a two-party line in St. Remi, Quebec, to $1.35 on a one-party business line in Kitchener, Ontario. The two Quebec exchanges involved are Grand Remous and St. Remi.
>
> The company announcement said telephone rates for an exchange are governed by the number of phones in its local dialing area.

Immediately after this debate concluded six weeks ago I wrote a letter to the board

of transport commissioners of this government asking them for a formal announcement regarding the rate increase that the Bell Telephone was seeking, as it was stated that a hearing was about to be held. You will be very interested, Mr. Chairman, in the reply which I received from the board under date October 28, a letter signed by Mr. C. W. Rump, secretary. The upshot of this letter, which runs to three pages with appendices attached, is very interesting. Mr. Rump tells me that the Bell Telephone Company has not asked for an increase in rates. He simply says it automatically gets an increase in rates. So you can see, Mr. Chairman, that the board of transport commissioners is taking very good care of one of the organizations placed under their control. The three page letter advises us that as the number of telephones in an exchange area increases or decreases, the board of transport commissioners requires that the rates go up as the number increases in view of the increased service which becomes available, and that the rates go down in an area where the number of telephones decreases. One of the interesting statements in this letter is as follows:

> The grouping of local exchange service for rate-making purposes is designed to recognize the varying value of service as between exchanges of different size and the factor of increased expenses associated with increases in the size of exchange areas. Growth of telephone service within a particular exchange area not only increases the range of calling available to customers but also increases the cost of furnishing service as a result of the necessity of interconnecting all customers within the exchange area.

You will be interested to know, Mr. Chairman, that in this letter the board has sent me, every single one of the ten applications pointed out there were now more telephones in the area concerned than there were before, and all have been authorized to move up to a higher rate grouping. Arthur, Ontario, for instance, moves up from group 2 to group 3. Cardinal, Ontario, moves up from group 2 to group 3 and Grand Remous, Quebec, from group 4 to group 5. Kitchener-Waterloo goes up from group 7 to group 8 and Victoria, Ontario, goes up from group 6 to group 7. St. Remi, Quebec, went up from group 3 to group 4. It is very interesting to note that the Bell does not even ask for a rate increase for its phone service. They have the board of transport commissioners hogtied to the point that the commissioners have established a table which gives the Bell Telephone Company the right to increase its rates every six months if a survey of the number of phones in operation in a given area proves that the number has gone up.

You may remember, Mr. Chairman, that several members of the railway committee last July, when the Bell Telephone Company officials were before it, asked whether it was not correct that as the number of telephones went up the rate to the individual subscriber might go down, on the mistaken belief that the larger the sales the lower the unit price. We were given the very smiling answer that as the number of telephones went up, of course the rate went up because you were able to talk to more people.

When we pressed the officials of the Bell Telephone Company on that point, we were advised that the cost of servicing an increased number of telephones was astronomical. I was advised that it took one telephone line to connect one phone to another. If there are three phones it took three telephone lines, and as the number of telephones increased the cost of putting up the lines greatly increased. As reported at page 429 of the committee report for Tuesday, July 7 last, Mr. Scrivener said:

> The economics of communications are such that every user must be interconnected with every other user. If you have two telephones, it takes one line to connect them.

I thanked him for the information and then he went on:

> If you have three telephones, then it takes three lines to interconnect them. The more telephones you have, the more complex are the interconnections in order to permit each telephone user to speak to the other. This involves us in the complexity of a metropolitan area like Ottawa, Montreal or Toronto as opposed to a small rural community where there are a few telephones and where a simple switchboard will interconnect them. Therefore, with telephone service, the cost of providing it tends to be upward as you increase the complexity of the interconnection.

We should like to see a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada for a hearing with regard to the interconnections between the Northern Electric Company and the Bell Telephone Company, as there are many questions about the Bell Telephone Company to which the board of transport commissioners is either unwilling or unable to secure the answers. I sincerely believe that if we had as members of the increased board of directors people suggested by the hon. member for Lapointe and the hon. member for Roberval we would get some of these answers in a hurry.

In connection with the July 31, 1964 mailing of dividend cheques to the shareholders of the Bell Telephone Company they had a very nice piece of puffery regarding how

well the Bell Telephone Company were doing, and this interesting statement was made. Previously they had told me that as the number of phones goes up so does the rate, because it takes more wires to connect each individual subscriber. But here we have enclosed with the dividend cheques for the period ending July 31, 1964 a pamphlet which states, among other things:

Improved training and better operating procedures have had something to do with these reductions, but they are mainly the result of the increasing use of automatic switching equipment—

It is funny how this economic method does not apply to local service.

—represented by direct distance dialing service, and the development of more economic long distance transmission facilities, such as microwave radio relay—

Intercity calls that at one time required the attention of at least four operators, and ten minutes to establish a connection, can now be dialed by the subscriber himself, in mere seconds, without an operator's help.

I am happy to tell the committee that I spent eight days hunting in Labrador at the beginning of October. I was 36 miles east of Wabush City near Ross Bay junction, and in flying around the area not only hunting but also inspecting the Grand falls of Labrador the pilot showed me the Emeril station of the Bell Telephone Company and the Sauna lake station of the Bell Telephone Company, and he advised me that I could telephone all over Labrador and that these stations took phone calls through to Scotland. I was quite interested in the fact that there are no lines between the stations, that I could see. In fact, when I got down on the ground I wanted to call for an extra aircraft to fly to Grand falls. We went over to the telephone on the railway line at Ross Bay junction and we called Wabush lake and Labrador City. As I said, they have no telephone wires, but operate this service through a microwave system. We made our call successfully.

This little pamphlet then goes on to state:

Microwave systems can transmit large quantities of information over great distances and difficult terrain more economically than is possible with wire and cable systems.

Mr. Scrivener told me that with a normal system a wire was required for every telephone. The pamphlet continues as follows:

Savings through the use of microwave do not generally apply on short range intercity calls, but are substantial on long-mileage transmissions.

Technological advances are benefiting all long distance telephone users—

[Mr. Cowan.]

This pamphlet then states:

Improved long distance service and rate reductions have been accompanied by rapidly growing use of the company's long distance facilities.

Then they give us the very interesting information that within the last 25 years, between 1939 to 1964, long distance rates for a three minute, daytime, station-to-station call have come down drastically. The examples they give are terrific. This is one example. In 1939 a three minute, daytime, station-to-station call between Ottawa and Quebec cost $1.40, and in 1964 the same call cost $1.10. That is a reduction of 30 cents, or a reduction of 21.4 per cent.

Here is another example. In 1939 a three minute, daytime, station-to-station call from North Bay to Montreal cost $1.70, and in 1964 the same call would cost $1.20, or a reduction of 29.4 per cent. Those calls are between points serviced by the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.

They give two more examples of terrific savings. A three minute, daytime, station-to-station call between Montreal and Vancouver cost in 1939, $7, whereas in 1964 the same call would cost $3. That represents a reduction of 57.1 per cent. That phone call would have to travel over publicly owned telephone services in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. There has been a reduction in the same type of call between Toronto and Calgary. In 1939 the call would cost $5.50 and in 1964 would cost $2.70, or a reduction of 50.9 per cent. Those calls would have to go over publicly owned telephone services in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

It is very interesting that in respect of the long distance call examples they give where the service is entirely within the confines of the Bell Telephone system the reductions are 21.4 per cent and 29.4 per cent whereas, when they have to use publicly-owned services, such as for a call between Montreal and Vancouver, or Toronto and Calgary, the reductions are 57.1 per cent and 50.9 per cent.

When we were examining the Bell Telephone people during the railway committee meetings we asked them why they wanted to increase the number of directors from 15 to 20, and received the rather interesting reply that sometimes their vice presidents are sick. I imagine their vice presidents must suffer from gout more than any other disease. They said they wanted to be able to maintain a quorum and could do so by increasing the number of directors to 20. I do not believe that is the right answer, because if you make an examination of the financial set-up of the Bell

Telephone Company you will find that more than one third of the stock, or 34.6 per cent is held by large financial institutions. Institutional investors, insurance companies and pension and mutual funds own one quarter of the company. The 93 largest investors, none of which is an individual, own six million shares of Bell Telephone Company, or 21.5 per cent. You can well imagine the scrapping that is going on among those 93 larger investors about who is going to be represented on the board of directors.

The Bell Telephone Company has issued some publicity in connection with a hearing that the board of transport commissioners has called. Personally I would like to label that hearing in advance as a joke. The Bell Telephone Company officials have pointed out that the company requires 7 per cent return on its money and they are going to have to raise another $1,250 million in the immediate future for expansion purposes. If they require that much money for expansion purposes in the immediate future one can rest assured that these large insurance companies, investment institutions and banks are going to be asked to buy Bell Telephone Company stock, and one can well imagine that those companies will want to be represented by a director on the board of directors of the Bell Telephone Company in order to have a finger in controlling their heavy investments in this monopoly.

I could not agree more than I do with the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm, who suggested a while ago that this monopoly should be nationalized. I could not agree more than I do with the hon. member for Lapointe and the hon. member for Roberval in their wish to have representatives of the common people on the board of directors of this monopoly. I back up the hon. member for Greenwood and the junior member for Halifax in their demands that there be a supreme court ruling requested by the cabinet as to the ownership of the Northern Electric Company by Bell Telephone. If the company's interest in the Northern Electric Company were sold it would have money on hand that is needed for the expansion required, to which they refer in the publicity which is now being released prior to the hearing called for by the board of transport commissioners.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on reading extracts about the history of the Bell Telephone Company. I have exposed the fact that they receive a special rate from the Canada Post Office Department for sending out their bills each month. This special rate does not apply to other organizations. The Bell company prints its own bills and calls them service charges, because the service charge is the same month after month, such as $5.75, and they get a preferred rate from the Canada Post Office Department. This preferred rate is made available to a few other giant companies which are able to print their statements with regard to indebtedness, but the small grocer or coal man whose bills vary from month to month has to send them out sealed as first class mail.

In the province of Ontario we have a special tax exemption applied to the Bell Telephone Company in the city of Toronto. The Bell Telephone Company receives a tax exemption on a large proportion of their real property. I have a letter in my hand from Allan A. Lamport, an ex-mayor of Toronto, dated October 26, 1964 which states:

> I am enclosing clipping as per my promise Friday night when I saw you.

The clipping is from the Toronto *Telegram* of October 1 and states:

> Board of control yesterday backed Con. Lamport's demand that the Bell Telephone Co. be required to pay full city realty taxes.
>
> The Bell, by special provincial legislation, receives an annual exemption amounting to $455,000. The firm still pays $3,000,000.

Mr. Lamport's letter reads as follows:

> This is also to advise you that the legislation is provincial which relieves the Bell Telephone Company, as shown in the clipping. We do not relieve the hydro or the gas company of part of their assessment. The Bell Telephone Company do a good job and a creditable one, but it is difficult to understand why they can get exclusive and specific special treatment. You could compare them with the wiring system of the hydro or the piping system of the gas company. Neither of these is relieved and one is publicly-owned. The other, namely the gas company, is privately-owned by the stockholders in the same way as the Bell Telephone Company. I trust this covers the query about which you had asked me.

I draw this to your attention to show you the way in which the Bell Telephone Company argues for special consideration. Yet, as the member for Halifax has stated, this company has grown beyond the bounds of a monopoly and has become an empire, and requires more serious control than is now being exercised by the board of transport commissioners.

I support the subamendment wholeheartedly, because five more directors of the type outlined by the two hon. members would provide a searching examination of the Bell Telephone Company, which is long overdue.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Plourde: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing once again today with the notorious Bill S-27 providing for an increase from 15 to 20 in the number of directors of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.

An amendment was moved providing that five directors should represent various groups, namely the federal government, the province, the municipalities and the last two, various organizations that have a certain importance and can exercise an influence on the general public so that the company would not set up all alone the rates to be charged to the customers.

It is generally realized that the rates charged by the Bell Telephone Company of Canada are much too high, especially in the Quebec region because in the case of municipalities located ten or 15 miles away, the company has doubled its long distance rates.

In my opinion, the more customers one has, the lower rates should be. However, if you examine the company's operations, you will see that the contrary happens. Its rates increase with the number of telephones and extensions.

The speech made on October 22 by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) contains a very important point that I should like to draw to your attention.

I shall speak right away of the ownership of Northern Electric Company by the Bell Company of Canada. It must be remembered that we are not speaking merely of a telephone company but of an empire; we are speaking of an organization whose gross income amounts to $471 million a year. This company has gained so much importance that it is more powerful than many governments in the world today. Its services should at all times be carefully controlled.

As for the subsidiary of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, namely the Northern Electric Company, other members have pointed out that the Bell Telephone Company of Canada owns all the shares of the Northern Electric Company as the result of an interpretation of the clause empowering the company to be a shareholder or to conclude agreements with other companies doing business in the telephone field.

The fact that the Northern Electric Company has a short telephone line in the city of Montreal was used by the Bell Telephone Company of Canada as a pretext to take over that giant Northern Electric Company which provides the Bell Telephone Company with all the wires, cables and other fittings it requires.

I am not necessarily scandalized by the fact that the Bell Telephone Company produces the cables and wires it needs. But it must not be forgotten that the Northern Electric Company is not satisfied with the large market guaranteed by the Bell Telephone monopoly, but the customers of the latter have to buy from the Northern Electric Company everything they need in that field. The Bell Telephone Company of Canada then turns to its subsidiary, the Northern Electric Company, to meet the demands of that vast market.

Northern Electric, on the other hand, competes with small Canadian companies on the everyday market by manufacturing cable, wire and other similar equipment. In my opinion, it is almost impossible for these small Canadian companies to compete with Northern Electric under the circumstances we have just described.

This famous Bill S-27, in my opinion should not have been taken up today; if the Conservatives had continued their filibuster with regard to the flag issue, an hour would have been saved and thus a vote could have been taken one hour earlier. But as we are now studying Bill S-27, we must talk on and on to say that we do not object so much to its object, namely to increase the number of directors on the board from 15 to 20, for this may not have much effect on their actions. But, once again, if we could have known exactly what the reason was for requesting an increase in the number of directors from 15 to 20. Is it to pay a little less income tax? Is it only that? I think that instead they should have reduced the rates to their subscribers, which in turn would have much reduced their income by that much and, consequently, their income tax would have been reduced accordingly.

One must not forget that we refer to a gross income of $471 million a year. I believe this is a huge amount of money. Therefore, instead of arranging for the shareholders only to benefit from this large amount, the rates should have been lowered in order to give satisfaction to subscribers who are using the telephone a great deal, particularly the industries and trades of all kinds where the telephone is absolutely essential, as otherwise business would suffer. Therefore, this service is absolutely necessary.

In my opinion, the government should have an observer in that industry which has become very important, and it should appoint a rep-

resentative. Also, if the province had a representative to see what is happening within that firm and to defend the interests of the public, we might see that some changes are occurring in many areas, and it may become easier and less expensive to obtain a telephone.

As I already stated, in view of modern inventions, space, distance, roads are shortened, if I may say so, because telephone communications may be established for instance, between Quebec city and Ottawa, within a few moments. The telephone is, therefore, a public necessity for a multitude of persons.

In my opinion, we should avail ourselves of the opportunity afforded by the consideration of Bill No. S-27 to discuss the opportunity of delaying for six months the passage of this bill, in order to allow the Bell Telephone Company of Canada to reconsider its point of view and admit on its board five directors representing, in short, the general population in each of the provinces where the company operates.

I believe that the federal government should, in such quarters, have a spokesman possessing in this field the knowledge required to assert the rights of the subscribers, since it is very hard for a subscriber to assert his rights.

Today in the province of Quebec when a claim is made to the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, it is not even possible to enter an office to state one's point of view. You go in a room, and you find there a series of telephones you have to use to state your grievances, without being able to see the claims attendant at the other end of the line. You just have to speak in a small black hole, in the telephone mouthpiece, while the other voice comes to you from the other end of the line.

You no longer have democracy, it seems to me, when things reach that stage because a company, as such, ought to have representatives. When we want to make a complaint, we should be given the opportunity to do so personally to somebody in an office instead of being compelled to use the telephone to speak to some unknown and invisible person. I think they have become a little too independent. That company has become so big that its unsatisfactory way of doing things is achieving damaging results.

There is also the matter of the "princess" telephone, which was supposed to be some kind of a marvel. The user is charged $12 or $13 for it, in addition to $1.25 a month for service. But if he has the service discontinued for six or seven months and then wants it again, he literally loses the sum of $15 and has to pay for the telephone once again.

I think it is time to tell this company to take the time to reconsider the facts. If company directors wish to increase their numbers they should agree in the future to the appointment of men who would represent plain ordinary people, the mass, who, when they have grudges against the company, could then get in touch with an individual representing either the provincial or municipal authorities. This representative could then speak his mind, insist on and protect the rights of the subscribers, because nowadays one is not free to subscribe to the telephone service and cancel it the day after. It has become a must in this century. We have to subscribe to telephone service even if we do not like it and are not too pleased with the service.

Nowadays the telephone is often used to play hoaxes. Those who complain are told that it is impossible to track down the culprit, that the system is automatic. Rather than have his telephone cut off, the subscriber must put up with those phone calls night and day. Moreover, the subscriber must continue to pay all the time and his complaints are to no avail.

I think that that passage of Bill No. S-27 should be delayed six months, because there are several more important pieces of legislation to study. We do not care whether the number of directors is increased to 20, but we would like to obtain justice for the subscribers, to have the service improved and representatives appointed to hear the complaints and deal with the matter when necessary. There is something else, Mr. Chairman, when we have to use telephones during an election we are charged an extra $50 at the outset. This can become unreasonable when 10, 15 or 20 telephones are installed in various committees. The telephone is very useful at election time, just as at any other time, and extra charges should not be made during an election.

Why pay more at election time for identical service? It might be objected that, since the phone is used more often, this might explain the higher rates. I do not think a telephone is used constantly during the 60 days of an election campaign. It is there to receive calls rather than to make them. I am of the opinion that it is also to the discredit of the company that it should ask so much for its service simply because they know that during an election campaign, people have to use the telephone. It is not surprising, therefore, to see the company register a

gross income of $471 million a year. I think it is preposterous that such a company should have an income like that.

If there were a federal representative among the directors of the company, we could have questioned him this afternoon and secured from him the necessary information, that is to say why rates go up when there are more telephones, whereas the greater the number of subscribers to a newspaper, the cheaper the cost of printing it. Should it not be the same in the case of the Bell Telephone Company? If in one week 100 new subscribers are accepted, 100 new telephones will have to be paid at once but after a few months that expense will be written off.

A $6 or $6.50 charge is made when a telephone is installed but that gives rise to paradoxes. I have a telephone at home at 3200 St. Vallier east, in Quebec city, and another one at 576 St. Vallier. One moves but keeps the same telephone number and asks the company to change one's address in the telephone directory and to register the telephone in the name of Lucien instead of Georges; I was then told that such a change could be made, that it would be the same as having a new telephone, and that I would have to pay another $6.50. That is utterly ridiculous. Last year the number at 3200 St. Vallier was 172; the city changed the civic number but the subscriber was not charged any surplus at that time. However, there is a charge if you change Christian names.

Mr. Chairman, whenever things like that happen, it makes me a little angry. If in order to change a number some moving about were required; but no, they can remain at their desk and correct the name and address in the telephone directory, and the Bell Telephone Company collects $13 or $14 immediately. This is a net profit, not a gross one.

We would have many other things to say on this matter but our time is limited, 20 minutes only; so we must merely attend to the most pressing things.

What I think is most disgusting today, is that we have to discuss a bill like this one, whereas we could have allowed our hon. friends to keep on speaking about the flag—and they enjoy it indeed—and we could thus have saved the house a whole hour which would have enabled us to vote sooner.

[*Text*]

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Chairman, I think about a month ago somebody referred to this hour as the telephone hour. I believe it is an appropriate name. It not only signifies the number of hours that have been devoted to this bill but I suppose it is an indirect compliment to the type of advertising that has made the Bell Telephone Company famous. In the many sessions during which I have listened to the debate surrounding this particular bill, I have heard outlined all of the sins of which the Bell Telephone Company is supposed to be guilty. During the earlier part of the debate I heard reference made to a point which I am not going to pursue because it was adequately refuted, namely that the Bell Telephone Company has been unfair to French speaking Canadians in Quebec. I think the point was adequately refuted, principally by members who realize that the president of the Bell Telephone Company, Mr. Marcel Vincent, is an excellent example of the type of business people that the French speaking community of Canada can produce.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I think that—

Mr. Grégoire: Are you trying to make a racial issue of it?

Mr. Mackasey: I cannot say whether the hon. member is standing or sitting because basically there is not that much difference.

Mr. Grégoire: I was just asking whether you are going to make it a racial issue. You would be doing wrong if you did.

Mr. Mackasey: Well, Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the hon. member if I misunderstood his remarks. I think they were speculative.

The main charge made against the Bell Telephone Company is that it is big and that it is operating in a semi-monopolistic field. I do not feel it has anything to be ashamed of on either count. As I mentioned previously in debate, I can understand the philosophy of socialism and I respect those who believe in it. They feel that Bell is the type of company that should be crown operated, or placed under the jurisdiction of the federal government. I have no intention of debating the pros and cons of that philosophy but, Mr. Chairman, I do not think this hour is the appropriate time to bring forward the many grievances raised by the hon. member for York-Humber and others. There is a proper medium through which such grievances should be exposed, factually supported, or rejected by representatives of the company.

I do not always disagree with my good friend from York-Humber. I am one of those who are happy he did come back from his hunting trip in the north, and I think all of

us shared in his bounty by having a little bit of caribou meat. Further, I am always happy when he is gathering up bits and pieces of information to present to the house in his very unique style; but in all fairness to the Bell Telephone Company I do not think these are the type of things that should be discussed on this bill.

The bill simply asks that the board of directors be increased from 15 to 20. I agree with many of the things said during the debate by members of the Social Credit party and other hon. members. I think we are entitled to a fair explanation of why things are so paradoxical in the pricing of the Bell Telephone Company commodity, and why an increase in subscribership should mean an increase in price rather than the reverse. But I do suggest this is not the time for such explanation.

Many things have been said about Northern Electric. I do not think that normally I have to spring to its defence, but I feel very close to it since so many thousands of its employees reside in my constituency. But whether the relationship between Bell and Northern Electric is legitimate or logical is again something for the board of transport to determine, and not for hon. members during private members' hour.

There is, however, a fundamental issue at stake, namely the degree to which members of the house desire to go in interfering with the actual administration of companies, whether they be semi-monopolistic or private corporations. I feel it would be a dangerous precedent to place on the board of directors a number of persons not named by the shareholders of the company, but by the governor in council.

The fundamental thing which has been overlooked throughout this debate is that the Bell Telephone Company is a perfect example of what we like to think should be a large corporation, one that spends its money in this country, one that is owned by the people of Canada, one that operates as fairly and squarely as it can under the rules specified by the board of transport, one whose financial balance sheet can stand the close scrutiny not only of members of the house but of those watchdogs who at all times are looking for abuses of the rules and regulations which permit the company to operate.

Recently the Bell company pleaded that it cannot operate on its present ceiling of rates. Perhaps it is wrong. We cannot determine that now, but at least we know that the relationship last year between its profit and operating capital was just slightly over 6 per cent. There are other facts we cannot refute, such as the fact 97 per cent of the shareholders are Canadian citizens and that 93 per cent of the shares are held by Canadian citizens. What other criteria do we want for any company that operates in Canada?

The Minister of Finance has a desire, as he expresses it, to Canadianize corporations operating in this country. Whether it is possible to do this through legislation, raising Canadian ownership 25 per cent, is a question which is debated in all financial circles. Many think it is impossible and others think it is imperative. But here we have a company, admittedly operating in a field that is semi-monopolistic, which is 97 per cent Canadian owned numerically, with 93 per cent of the total value of its shares owned by Canadians.

So far as I am concerned it is simply a matter of philosophy as to whether this type of operation is best administered through crown corporations or is best left in the hands of private industry. I respect people whose views differ from mine in this regard, except that I cannot see, if the Bell Telephone Company were made a crown corporation, that it would be any smaller, any more efficient or any more Canadian than the 93 per cent content it has at the moment. Further I have to say I would shudder to see the Bell Telephone Company made a crown corporation and subjected to the criticisms levelled at such organizations as the C.B.C. and the C.N.R. by people who, at times, are more interested in headlines than in facts.

The Social Credit party has moved an amendment which is simply an expansion of the original amendment proposed by the New Democratic party. The N.D.P. amendment asked that one of the new directors be appointed by the governor in council, and the Social Credit, with their usual generosity, have suggested that three be named by the governor in council.

As an admirer of the N.D.P. I am rather amazed that its philosophy in this particular instance and that of the Social Credit party could be so similar. Charles Lynch's column today advances a different theory. He comments on a speech made out west by one of the Tory members which suggested that the head of Social Credit out west become, what he knows he is, a good Conservative.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I suggest we treat the Bell Telephone Company during private members' hour in the same way as we treat all other corporations, namely

objectively. Legislation of this type involving a request for changes in internal management is usually treated objectively on the basis of the particular question before the house. The problem before the house is not whether the Bell Telephone Company's rates are justified or whether its relationship with Northern Electric is good or bad. It is simply whether approval should be given to a request to increase the number of directors from 15 to 20.

On the basis of the testimony which was given in an objective manner by representatives of the telephone company, as will be found in the fourth report of the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines we have no right to assume that the company wishes to increase the number of its directors merely in order to satisfy some people who hold large blocks of shares. It could be so, but we have no right to assume it is the case. The hon. member for York-Humber, advancing this theory, told us that large blocks of shares were held by banks, lending institutions and trust companies. I would say: What better endorsation of the company could there be? The regulations protecting the safety of investments and of people's savings are strict, yet trust companies and the like are permitted to invest in the Bell Telephone Company. I think this is something on which the company should be commended. We who are close to the insurance act know that an endorsation of this type is not given to every corporation.

I would appeal to members of the committee to allow this bill to go through. All the grievances which may or may not be justified can very well be aired at the proper time and in the proper place, that is before the board of transport commissioners. If the relationship between the Bell Telephone Company and Northern Electric is not a proper one, then the courts of the land can be asked to make a decision on that question. It is not proper for us to take advantage of the private members' hour to hold up a legitimate request by the company, that in order to modernize its activities in a period of expansion it should be permitted to increase the membership of its board from 15 to 20. So I appeal to the committee to get back to a sense of objectivity and reach a decision strictly on the merits of the case, and on the particular question which is before us.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Chairman, the arguments used by the hon. member for Verdun (Mr. Mackasey) in favour of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada did not convince too many of us.

[Mr. Mackasey.]

In my opinion, the fact that this company is not government-owned constitutes an injustice to the people of Ontario, Quebec and elsewhere. It is an injustice because this is an essential public utility.

I feel it is urgent for the provincial governments concerned to take over, not only the Bell Telephone Company, but the other independent telephone companies.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see why some people persist in defending such company. I am not ready to say that the whole administration of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada is bad. Sure there are gaps; but a principle is involved here: such a public utility service should become publicly owned by the provincial governments concerned.

Besides, in the province of Quebec—

Mr. Choquette: May I ask a question?

Do you know that Mr. René Lévesque is in favour of nationalizing the telephone?

Mr. Pigeon: I thank the hon. member. I was precisely coming to this question.

The Catholic farmers' union, at its last convention, recommended that the government of the province of Quebec should take appropriate steps to nationalize the Bell Telephone Company of Canada; St. Jean Baptiste societies did likewise.

I hope that at its next session the Quebec government will introduce a legislation to nationalize the Bell Telephone Company of Canada. Moreover, I am convinced that the province of Ontario will do the same if Quebec acts first.

[*Text*]

Mr. Brown: Could I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the amendment?

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Chairman, you will decide whether I am out of order.

Power companies of the province of Quebec have been nationalized. Are the people of Quebec worse off for all that?

Mr. Turner: May I put a question to the hon. member?

Does he advocate the nationalization of that company for economic or nationalistic reasons?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Chairman, there are both economic and nationalistic reasons. It is dis-

graceful that in the 20th century such a company could have so much control.

In Montreal, for instance, there is no competition against the Bell Telephone Company of Canada. The people are at the mercy of a single company.

I feel that it is abnormal in a democratic country for the Canadian people to put up with a trust of that kind.

I hope that Mr. René Lévesque will follow his convictions in a positive way by introducing at the next session of the provincial legislature a bill to nationalize that company. I am convinced that the province of Ontario will follow suit as well as the other provinces.

Mr. Béchard: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Did the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm advocate the same thing about nationalizing electricity during the 1962 provincial election campaign?

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I did not take part in the 1962 election campaign.

It is a matter of principle. The arguments put forward by the hon. member for Verdun are, in my opinion, out of date. They do not stand up in 1964.

[*Text*]

Mr. Peters: I rise to ask through you, Mr. Chairman, whether in view of the number of inquiries which have been raised with regard to this bill the sponsor would be willing to withdraw it?

Some hon. Members: Six o'clock.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

CANADIAN FLAG

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SIXTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Batten that the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, be now concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Monteith.

Mr. Gene Rhéaume (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, when we interrupted the debate at five o'clock to go into private members' hour I had been describing what seemed to me to be an obsession of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) to push the report of the special flag committee through the house as quickly as possible to avoid letting the people of this country have a say in whether or not they wanted a new flag at all, and I remain unconvinced that the government has any evidence whatsoever that the majority of the people of this country find the Canadian red ensign offensive.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, no sooner had this special committee been set up than the Prime Minister took to the press, in keeping with what I call his pathetic obsession, and said, "We shall have a flag by Christmas that will be based on the maple leaf design." I ask you, are these the actions of a responsible person in touch with reality?

I asked about this strange compulsion of his and I wondered if in fact a commitment was being pursued, not a commitment to the people of Canada as a group, but to people within his own party within regions of this country, a commitment to the effect that he would wipe out the traditional symbols of this country before the end of 1964.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member may remember that before five o'clock the Chair enjoined him to limit his remarks to the matter before the house at the moment. Perhaps his remarks at this point are introductory, but I would ask him to revert as quickly as possible to the particular point we have to consider at the moment.

Mr. Pugh: If I might speak on the point of order raised by Your Honour, may I say I think the hon. member is speaking on the necessity for a plebiscite. When he says the people of Canada want this opportunity rather than be at the mercy of the strange compulsion of one who wanted to thrust the flag on us, two things bear relation to the fact that the people of Canada do want a plebiscite—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. This is not a point of order at all.

Mr. Rhéaume: Mr. Speaker, with deference I shall accept your advice. I believe myself to be in order, but in view of the fact that this is the second time the Chair has brought it to my attention I shall discuss specifically the need for a plebiscite.

I shall close my statement with words to the effect that I shall be voting in favour of

a plebiscite, in favour of the amendment. There is no doubt in my mind what will be the fate of the amendment and the main motion. I expect the amendment will be defeated and the motion itself subsequently passed. I believe that the Canadian red ensign will be hauled down from the flagstaffs of this country before Christmas. I believe it will be the responsibility of the Prime Minister alone that this great UN man, this un-man and his ungovernment will be remembered in history as being in 1964 a petulant and perverse Santa Claus, the man who, as a Christmas present for his nation took away from his people their cherished national symbols and left in their place a petty division that will remain in this country for a hundred Christmases to come.

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak at this time about this problem before the house I must express my appreciation that I have not been greeted with the levity from the other side of this chamber that met an earlier speaker today. I only rise to speak because I think there is nothing in this debate which should give cause for levity. I speak, not because I care about the flag we might have but because I care about Canada and the unity we must achieve if we are to fufil our destiny.

I do not speak in a happy vein because I do not feel that way about this particular issue. I had hoped I would not have to make this speech in this house, and that before now common sense would have prevailed because of the overwhelming evidence we have observed that, rather than enlarging the feeling of unity, we are destroying what unity we now have.

I remember reading something one philosophical writer wrote who put my position in words which I will have to paraphrase, as I do not have the quotation. He said, as I remember his remarks: Let us at least talk about it, you wisest of men, even though it seems bad; silence is worse because all truths suppressed become poisonous. I think talking about the issue, even though it seems bad, will in the end accomplish something.

I feel something has been accomplished since I spoke last, when I introduced a subamendment dealing with what I thought should be included in a plebiscite. At that time I remember saying that I did not think anyone who wished to achieve anything could build a sound and good case if he had to destroy and demean others who had other ideas. I think you will recall, as will the house, that at that time those who believed and felt emotionally, deep in their hearts, that the Canadian red ensign represented the sacrifices of sons, daughters, mothers and husbands whom they did not wish to forget but wished to see honoured, were demeaned and scoffed at. I have not seen this take place in the debate since that time, and if I have accomplished nothing else by my efforts, I am proud that that sort of nonsense has ceased.

It was rather strange to me, having this assignment put into my hands tonight, and looking forward to carrying it out, that I received a pamphlet, which I gather is published by the C.B.C. This is not indicated, but the material appears on a C.B.C. program. It is entitled "Flanders' Fields", and on the cover it says "They are too near to be great. But our children shall understand when and how our fate was changed and by whose hand." I think those words are prophetic and in line with the reason I am speaking tonight in support of a plebiscite.

Those people can be forgotten and might well be forgotten as a result of the proposed action of an apparently inevitable decision that this house is being rushed into by those whose purposes we just do not understand. I know of no reason whatsoever to deal with the flag issue, unless it is that there are those who are completely impressed with the idea that by doing so they will bring greater unity to Canada. I could support such a move if the evidence was of such a nature, but there is no evidence of this nature.

I take it from what I have read and heard that this may satisfy a group which now has some dissatisfaction. This is not a group confined to one province, and I want to make that clear because I do not speak in that vein. This action will create another group which will not have only a problem, but deep bitterness. This will be a most unfortunate factor in the progress of our country for years to come.

To my way of thinking the amendment proposed is a sensible one, having in mind the evidence we have before us. It is an amendment which will allow the people to make the decision, rather than the decision being made by 265 of us here who, in the ordinary event, would speak convincingly, knowing what was wanted, what we were supposed to do, and what was right. In spite of the heavy mail, I would be the last one to suggest, however, that I have evidence of what all my constituents want. Certainly if my mail gives a similar indication to that given by recent polls, which today are accepted as having a margin of error not

greater than 5 per cent, I have overwhelming evidence that my instruction is to use every effort at my command to see that this apparently inevitable decision is not taken by this house.

One of the members who spoke before me during this debate—one of the few members from the other side who has spoken, the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Cadieux)—asked what more we wanted than 72 per cent of the committee supporting the design as recommended in the report. I suggest to him that that does not mean too much, because 20 years ago a committee of this house, composed of men as dedicated I presume as those who served on the latest flag committee, approved the report by a vote of 95.8 per cent. An astute leader of that time recognized the consequences of adopting a report that had received even such an overwhelming majority as that, and the report was never moved for concurrence and never dealt with by the house.

I wonder, in the present circumstances, which in my limited knowledge appear to me to be far more dangerous in their potential divisiveness than the circumstances surrounding the report of the committee 20 years ago, whether the wise course has been followed in moving concurrence. I have read much about this debate and listened to many expressions of opinion, and when I spoke before I said I did not understand the Prime Minister's apparent obsession with this matter in light of the evidence. One individual who expressed himself on this matter commenced his comments by saying:

> What bugs Pearson? Is it love of exerting power over others against their will? Is it a misguided streak of Tom Sawyer adventure in his nature that leads him to go his own way? It could be; but I am inclined to think he took on a job too big for him and is showing an obduracy that inevitably causes trouble.

I do not like to engage in personal comments on matters of substance such as the one now before us, and it has not been one of my traits. I have a rather charitable nature that precludes me from indulging in personalities. But we have come to the point where I have to speak strongly because I feel I have no other choice.

I am reminded, as I proceed to make my case for a plebiscite, of the remarks of the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott) when he spoke in seconding the motion to concur in the report. As found on page 10694 of *Hansard* he said in his last sentence:

> I hope that in time it will win the allegiance of the Canadian people.

What stronger evidence could you have than that? Even though he is supporting concurrence in the report at this time, he recognizes the dangers in rushing into this inevitable decision. Let us face it. None of us is so silly that he or she does not recognize what that decision will be when the vote comes. I have never indulged or found much pleasure in standing before a mirror and speaking and gesticulating to find out whether or not I was effective. It has tried me sorely in sitting here throughout this debate and listening to those who have been trying to contribute sincerely and with some cause to a proper solution of this matter, to note that in speaking to the other side of the chamber and other sections of the house they have been addressing what appears to be a stone wall. Any member who has looked around the house, seen the attitudes and heard the interjections and the nonsense recognizes what the situation is, because it is evident there are no open minds in other parts of the house.

I think I cannot make my case properly without referring to some of the remarks made by other speakers in this debate. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson), the great lover, spoke in this debate. I have listened to him speak several times on this subject. I know that he would have to cry a wee drop if the red ensign came down. He said that. I know that he would love the Pearson pennant. He belaboured my leader for calling it the troika flag. You would think that my leader was the first to suggest that this pennant was the troika flag. I should like to remind him that the idea of calling it the troika flag originated with the Postmaster General (Mr. Nicholson) who, in speaking outside the house about the three maple leaves design, said that one was for the English, one was for the French and the other was for the rest of us. That was what gave rise to calling it the troika flag. It was the troika love of the hon. member for Leeds. When I heard him say that he loved the flag recommended by the committee I wondered whether he had been playing the old children's game we used to play of picking petals off a daisy and saying "I love you, I love you not". My experience was that you did not always wind up with "I love you"; but apparently he has had a run of luck far beyond anything I have ever heard of before.

In making my case for why I think there should be a plebiscite I want to refer to the speech of my colleague, the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Girouard). I want to quote some of his words as found on page 10731 of *Hansard*.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. More: I am always glad to have evidence of the sort of attention being paid to my remarks by those who most of the time make remarks while seated, and who I think must be handicapped and are probably drawing the disabled allowance. When I have something to say I choose to stand on my feet and to say it in the proper, responsible manner. My colleague from Labelle uttered these words:

> We Quebeckers want to keep jealously our traditions and our civil law. And yet, on the flag issue, when the Conservative party from our leader down want to give us a flag establishing exactly this ethnic, historic and cultural duality we say: No. We want one flag for one Canada.
>
> Just as astonishing is the reaction of our English speaking colleagues who always showed a preference for Canadian standardization and who, all of a sudden, offer us half of the flag to put the French fact on it.

He went on to make a decision that I regret because I cannot accept it as a positive decision in the climate of this country today. I do want to say though that in his remarks there were words that gave me much to consider, words that I think were clear in trying to explain why we have a difference of view on this matter. I think he dealt with the subject very well and had he been able to accept the statements I read and on that basis have reached some degree of conciliation I believe that both of us could have had a part in doing something of great service to our country.

One of the finest speeches I have heard in all the time that this issue has been before the house was made this afternoon by my colleague, the hon. member for Kent (Ont.) (Mr. Danforth). I do not have the ability to speak in the same fashion as he did because he approached the status of an outstanding orator in the way he made his remarks this afternoon, and his evident sincerity could not be denied by anyone. I think his remarks put the case for a plebiscite clearly and distinctly and, as I say, I am sorry that minds seem to be closed to doing anything or considering any course that might accomplish what we want to accomplish and would overcome the difficulties and the results that we now face.

I am not one who appreciates levity when we are speaking about serious matters and I do not appreciate interjections that do not really bear on the subject which comes from the other side of the house. I often regret that remarks made in this way get into *Hansard*. I regret that in a debate of this kind a minister of the crown should be on *Hansard* as having told a member to shut up.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. More: I think it is a shame. I remember that when the hon. lady first entered the house she sat on this side and one day I introduced myself to her in what I thought was a very friendly fashion. She said to me: "I have got a sharp tongue. I am glad you did it today because after I speak you might not feel that way." I said then that if she wanted to be treated like a lady all she had to do was act like one.

I do not challenge that those who were members of the committee were diligent and worked hard at their task. I am not, however, able to agree with the result of that dedication and effort. It has not been what I expected or what the country expected. As I say, without any question they worked extremely long hours and held many meetings. I do not want to make exceptions, but I do want to say that from what I have learned I think the chairman of this committee acted properly at all times. I think we owe it to a chairman in a difficult position like that, when he comes out with completely clean colours, to express our sentiments publicly and give him credit for it. I want to join with all those who have, by their remarks, honoured him. The first time any member of the committee said anything or did anything the chairman felt was not true or was not fair, he immediately stopped him.

The flag this committee brought forward may well become the flag of Canada. At this stage I am not prepared to forecast. I do say that if it does, then the years ahead will be most difficult. I say this, sir, because we have evidence from the polls that have been conducted from time to time that this is an emotional issue charged with the memories of sacrifices that a great many of our people hold dear. We should recognize this fact sincerely and not demean those memories. There will be bitterness if this flag is adopted. I believe all serious minded members of parliament should seek to avoid this at all costs. On the basis of polls conducted in the area, I believe that the overwhelming majority of

people want the Canadian red ensign maintained as our flag.

However, I have no doubts whatever that they are prepared to conciliate and to try to reach common ground with those in Canada who do not agree, on the basis that they would be allowed to participate in this decision. I think they would accept the result, and this would remove the bitterness and bring us all together. Each of us, in our way, would have played a part in solving this problem in our country. The other day I picked up the *Gazette*, I think it was, and found a little poem by Christine L. Henderson entitled "(Don't) Rally Round the Flag!". This refers to the committee report, and reads as follows:

Fifteen learned men for 40 days
They thought and thought,
But alas, why think
When Learned Thought arrives at naught!
Yet for their Nation and with great elation
At 2,000 flags they gaze in a maze
At the wealth of knowledge these displayed!
—Tradition, history, symbols pied,
And heraldry and what else beside!
—Now they come to the Head and present
A Flag, (yes, a flag of sorts) with good intent—
—One leaf and two red blobs, there's nothing in it!
(A child could have done it in a minute.)

Feelings such as these are not confined to one who writes poetry, and I say that knowingly. When large numbers of our Canadian population have sacrifices made on the field of battle which they wish to remember, this parliament is not doing its duty when, for the sake of trying to be on the winning team or to achieve political advantage and become known in history as those who did it, they seek to rush us to this inevitable solution.

Last year I had the privilege of spending a month in Europe. There were some 80 of us, because I joined a tour who went from country to country. Most of us were Canadians. There were Canadians from Quebec and from every part of Canada. We started off by meeting what we felt were some rebuffs as we went along. Finally we discovered we were being mistaken for tourists from another country. We got a Canadian red ensign and put it on our bus. From that time forward our reception was different. It was one that we welcomed because it indicated that everywhere we went this flag was recognized and we were treated as Canadians.

I recall well that our tour did not include Vimy. We were in Brussels at night and we were supposed to head for Paris. There were arrangements that we were going to be pressured to keep. However we said we did not care; we were willing to miss lunch if necessary in order to go to Vimy. We went to Vimy. It was a windy day. We got out of that bus, and there was this beautiful monument to the sacrifices of thousands of Canadians. If I remember correctly there were 6,000 marked graves and about 12,000 names of those who were never found, never identified. The Canadian red ensign was flying in that brisk breeze. I stood there with my Canadian friends from Quebec, and I am telling you that after three weeks on the road in that bus, most of us felt we were home. When you pull that flag down around this world, as you seem set to do now regardless of the consequences, something is going to be lost, and lost forever. I for one, sir, have to make a contribution, regardless of the criticism, to try to wake up the members of this parliament to a situation that, to say the least is dangerous to the future of this country.

I know of no other way, Mr. Speaker, now that we have reached this stage, than to forget that we are on different teams, to forget that we represent different parties, and to conclude that we are all Canadians; that we have one duty in this regard and that is to get politics out of this question in order to give people a chance to play a role in making a choice and contributing toward a better and more united Canada.

Mr. C. S. Smallwood (Battle River-Camrose): Mr. Speaker, I had not expected to speak on this amendment. However, in the last few days I have seen some actions on the part of some hon. members opposite, a very few in number, and especially those in the small group in the corner who have been doing nothing during this flag debate except interjecting, raising phony points of privilege and contributing nothing to the debate.

I support wholeheartedly the request for a plebiscite in this flag issue. This party has fought for the retention of the red ensign, or a modification of it. We have fought for the retention of the symbols which are so dear to many of us in this country—the union jack and the fleur-de-lis. But we have seen our efforts failing. They have failed because the minor parties have co-operated with the government in making agreements behind the curtains, and have left us to fight this issue alone. We had hoped some time ago to get the support of the minor parties, because in 1963 the present Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) said of the N.D.P. that they had received the embrace, if unwelcome, of the communist party of Canada. In the absence of this support of the minor parties we are endeavouring to put the issue before the people on a plebiscite. The Minister of Trans-

port, also in 1963, said that the leader of the Social Credit party was the most pathetic creature he had ever seen in his lifetime. He said he had a Pepsodent smile and a nice hair cut. Therefore we must get this issue before the people.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) has caused great disunity across this country by his appointment of the "B and B gang" and by bringing the flag issue to this house. The only way to settle it is by way of plebiscite. We have looked for support from the other side of the house, but what do we find? The hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) is not afraid to express his opinions. But as for the rest of the members opposite, they seem to be afraid to speak their minds. We have heard nothing from the hon. gentlemen on the front benches, save the intervention of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Robichaud) yesterday when the former minister of labour was speaking. We also heard from the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne) when an hon. member on this side from Nova Scotia was speaking in favour of the red ensign. The hon. member for Kootenay East said that it was a rotten speech; but I would remind him that if we are not to stand up in this house to express our views as to a national flag, then we must take the matter to the people. Then yesterday, to the astonishment of this house—I do not think this has ever happened before—when a member of this party was speaking a minister of the crown, the minister of health and welfare, interjected and said, as reported at page 10780 of *Hansard*:

> May I suggest to the hon. member that the simplest way possible of achieving that is to sit down, shut up and let the matter come to a vote.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Smallwood: Yes; hon. gentlemen opposite clap and enjoy that. I see even the "minister of bumper stickers" is back and is clapping.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I have listened to the hon. member with as much indulgence as possible during the last few minutes but I would invite him to confine his remarks to the matter which is being considered by the house.

Mr. Smallwood: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was explaining why we should have a plebiscite. Hon. members opposite keep interjecting or raising their voices but I am prepared to answer any questions they might like to bring up.

As I say, we want to put this matter to the people, which is the only way to clear up the issue. The Prime Minister brought before the house a flag and informed us it was going to be his flag. He also informed us that the red ensign was too close a resemblance to the merchant flag of Great Britain. He wanted to rescind the red ensign in consequence, and force upon the people of Canada a flag which resembled the Russian merchant flag. This is why we want the people to vote on this issue. We want democracy in this country, which is why we want a plebiscite. I understand that the Prime Minister received a telegram from the communist party supporting the proposal for a new Canadian flag, which makes me stop and wonder why this issue is being forced on the Canadian people. That is why we are demanding a plebiscite.

Mr. Barnett: Then vote for it.

Mr. Smallwood: You see what we are up against, Mr. Speaker? These little babbling brooks down at the end are at it again tonight.

We hear a lot being said to the effect that this is an appeasement to the province of Quebec, and I do not like to hear that. I am sure there are many people in the province of Quebec who would like a plebiscite on the flag. In this connection I should just like to quote this brief article written by Peter Stursberg:

> The Liberal party has drifted toward the right, into the hands of the mediaeval Montreal Liberals who don't really care about Quebec or the French Canadians but are ready to use them to stay in power.

We do not like that, Mr. Speaker. We want the people to vote on the flag. There are hundreds of farmers in the province of Quebec in great need of help. They are starving and neglected. The Prime Minister was questioned when he was at Amherst, Nova Scotia, and was asked whether he thought Quebec would approve of any flag without the fleur-de-lis on it, and he replied that the Quebec members in the cabinet would decide what the design would be. Again I do not agree with that. I think it is time this matter came before the Canadian people.

As I have said before, we have farmers in Quebec in need of assistance. We find there is much more important business to bring before parliament than this flag issue. We should have the labour code before this parliament rather than the flag issue.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Smallwood: I therefore move, seconded by my hon. friend from Kindersley (Mr. Cantelon) that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Aye.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Smallwood) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Alkenbrack	MacInnis
Bell	MacLean (Queens)
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)	Macquarrie
Cantelon	MacRae
Cardiff	McIntosh
Chatterton	Madill
Churchill	Millar
Clancy	Monteith
Coates	Moore
Cowan	More
Danforth	Muir (Cape Breton
Dinsdale	North and Victoria)
Doucett	Muir (Lisgar)
Enns	Nugent
Fane	Ormiston
Fleming (Okanagan-	Pascoe
Revelstoke)	Pugh
Gundlock	Rhéaume
Hales	Ricard
Horner (The Battlefords)	Rynard
Howe (Wellington-	Smallwood
Huron)	Starr
Irvine	Stefanson
Jones, Mrs.	Stenson
Jorgenson	Thomas
Kennedy	Wadds, Mrs.
Kindt	Watson (Assiniboia)
Loney	Webb
MacEwan	Winkler—55.

NAYS

Messrs:

Armstrong	Chapdelaine
Asselin (Notre Dame	Choquette
de Grâce)	Chrétien
Asselin (Richmond-	Côté (Chicoutimi)
Wolfe)	Côté (Longueuil)
Badanai	Crossman
Balcer	Cyr
Barnett	Davis
Basford	Deachman
Batten	Deschatelets
Beaulé	Dionne
Béchard	Douglas
Beer	Drouin
Benidickson	Drury
Benson	Dubé
Blouin	Dupuis
Boulanger	Emard
Boutin	Eudes
Brewin	Fairweather
Brown	Favreau
Byrne	Gauthier
Cadieux (Terrebonne)	Gelber
Cameron (High Park)	Gendron
Cantin	Girouard
Cardin	Godin
Carter	Gordon
Granger	Morison
Gray	Mullally
Greene	Munro
Guay	Nicholson
Hahn	Nixon
Harley	O'Keefe
Hellyer	Olson
Herridge	Otto
Honey	Patterson
Howe (Hamilton South)	Paul
Jewett, Miss	Pennell
Klein	Perron
Knowles	Pigeon
Konantz, Mrs.	Pilon
Lachance	Plourde
LaMarsh, Miss	Prud'homme
Lamontagne	Regan
Laniel	Richard
Latulippe	Rideout, Mrs.
Laverdière	Rinfret
Leblanc	Robichaud
Lessard (Lake St. John)	Rochon
Lessard (St. Henry)	Rock
Lloyd	Rondeau
Loiselle	Rouleau
Legault	Ryan
Macdonald	Sauvé
MacEachen	Stewart
McIlraith	Tardif
McLean (Charlotte)	Teillet
McMillan	Temple
McNulty	Tremblay
McWilliam	Tucker
Marcoux	Turner
Martin (Timmins)	Wahn
Mather	Walker
Matheson	Watson (Châteauguay-
Matte	Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Mitchell	Webster
Moreau	Whelan—129.

Division

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there any additional pairs to be declared?

The hon. member for Moose Jaw-Lake Centre.

Mr. J. E. Pascoe (Moose Jaw-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, the division bells on the motion to adjourn the flag debate brought the moment of truth to the government members. Ever since Monday, government members have been making interjections calling for an end of this debate. When they had the opportunity to put off the flag debate and get on with more pressing business of parliament—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Pascoe: —they voted to keep the debate going.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; the hon. member knows he cannot reflect on a vote of the

house. I suggest that perhaps at this point he should limit his remarks to the amendment now before the house.

Mr. Pascoe: I was just trying to pave the way to asking if now government members would refrain from interjecting.

I am taking part in this debate on the amendment to the report of the flag committee because I consider it is my duty to do so. I consider that it is the duty, the direct obligation, of each member of parliament to explain to his or her constituents how he or she stands on this very emotional flag issue. Each member should have regard for his or her responsibilities to constituents and make a declaration for or against the attempt to thrust on Canadians this red and white flag, when there is no evidence that anyone but the most rabid government supporters want it. There has been no country-wide call for a red maple leaf flag. There is no indication how such a flag would be received. I should say that there is every indication that it will not be received and will arouse nothing but antagonism in the country.

Surely, in a decision as emotional and personal as the selection of a flag under which they and future generations will live, the Canadian people should make the choice. It is for this reason we are calling for a plebiscite. As I have said, it is up to each one in this house, whether on the opposition side or the government side, to state clearly on *Hansard*, the official record, his or her position regarding a plebiscite. We should give the reasons for our stand. I think too, Mr. Speaker, we should put on the record how our constituents feel about a plebiscite. I am sure all members have been told how their constituents feel. I know that I have received many letters, and a little later I will put a few of these on the record. We in the opposition are making our stand for a plebiscite very clear. Government supporters, not only the 47 Liberals from Quebec but those from English speaking areas of Canada, should do the same. As I have said, they have an obligation to their constituents.

Ever since Monday we have heard very little from the government members except hoots and jeers. Apparently government members wish to cut off discussion on the flag as quickly as possible—at least, we thought they wanted to stop the debate, until they had an opportunity a short time ago to do so. Evidently they want to have the red ensign scrapped and a new red and white flag substituted, with as little public involvement as possible. This must be the explanation for their attempts to cut off debate; there is no other reason apparent. They want to force a flag vote in the house and then tell the Canadian people they must accept it. This appears to be government strategy. Apparently the strategists have counted noses in the house and are sure that, with the continued support of the minority groups in the far corner who want anything but the Canadian red ensign, they can win the flag vote. Perhaps they can win the flag vote with the help of those against having the union jack anywhere on our flag. However, this forced vote will not win flag support across Canada. Only a flag decision by plebiscite will do this, and it is for this reason we are calling for a plebiscite. We believe there should be complete public involvement in any choice of a new flag. Only by holding a plebiscite can this be arranged. That is why so many of us will be speaking on the issue between now and Christmas. We will continue to present arguments for a flag plebiscite. If the government members remain silent I am sure their constituents will wonder why. I think their constituents already know why government supporters sit in silence in their seats, and in this connection I have a clipping I should like to read to the silent government members entitled "The folly of silence".

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I should like to bring to the attention of the hon. member that he cannot quote editorials in newspapers which reflect on a current debate in the house.

Mr. Pascoe: With all due deference, Mr. Speaker, this editorial does not reflect on a current debate but on the behaviour of some hon. members. It is dealing with why so few government supporters speak. It is also a very strong argument for a plebiscite, which is why I want to put it on record. The article is as follows:

> It is the utmost folly—it is just short of suicide—to take the position that citizens of any country should hold their tongues for fear of causing distress to the immediate and sometimes tortuous policies of their leaders.

I think that is a good argument for a plebiscite because it refers to the feelings of citizens of the country. This statement was made by the late Wendell L. Willkie. It is folly for citizens not to speak out against stubborn leaders on matters of great concern to them. Ordinary citizens, of course, cannot state their views here in the house, but they can certainly do so outside. That is why we

are supporting a plebiscite, so the people are given a chance to speak outside.

Mr. Byrne: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Pascoe: After I am through. I think this brief quotation sums up the argument for a plebiscite. The reference to holding tongues reminds me that there is a great deal of tongue holding among hon. gentlemen opposite. We have a very emotional issue facing us, involving the possible scrapping of a flag steeped in history and which is symbolic of the foundation and character of our country. There should be no wall of silence anywhere in this house. Every hon. member should get up and explain to their constituents just how they stand on this matter.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) is determined no other government business will be given priority over the flag. He is the one who will decide whether we continue the flag debate or turn the attention of parliament to more pressing items, such as the labour code and the railway question. As a result of the stand which has been taken by the Prime Minister it appears there will be many more days, perhaps weeks, taken up on the flag debate, which means there will be plenty of time for government members to explain why they are determined to foist a new flag on Canadians and why they do not want to give the Canadian people the chance to express their views on a plebiscite. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the people should have the opportunity to decide whether or not they want a flag stripped of all the symbols of our history and tradition. They should be able to vote on an issue brought on by pressure which is not exerted by all parts of Canada. As you yourself said, Mr. Speaker, in your ruling on Wednesday on the amendment, the flag issue has a great emotional impact on everyone.

If most of the government members mean to take no greater part in the debate than to jeer, then at least all members of the flag committee should speak. They should answer these three questions: Why was the Canadian red ensign rejected so flatly by all Liberal committee members? Why was there a unanimous vote in the committee that Canada should have only one flag, and then a sudden change of mind and a later amendment to have two flags? Why was the proposed compromise flag bearing the symbols of our past history turned down? These are the three essential questions that each member of the flag committee should answer during this debate.

Perhaps I am doing the Liberal flag committee members an injustice when I suggest that they intend to remain silent. Perhaps each one is going to speak. I am sure the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) will find it difficult to refrain from baring his innermost thoughts. He finds it so easy to make revelations to the press. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra—and I think I am in order in bringing this out—received 41.7 per cent of the total vote in his constituency.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sure the hon. member must have some doubt whether this is relevant. At this stage of the debate, or I suggest at any time, he cannot refer in such a personal way to another member of the house.

Mr. Pascoe: I was just trying to bring out the point that none of the members of the flag committee were speaking for the majority of the people, which is why I think there should be a plebiscite.

In answer to my challenge to all members to speak and make a sort of report to their constituents, I want to make my own stand clear. I have already spoken in favour of the Canadian red ensign and I see no reason at all why it should be scrapped. It is a beautiful flag steeped in 100 years of tradition. However, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of national acceptance some modification of the red ensign is proposed, and I would agree with this. My stand is that some symbols of our past history must remain, because a country which does not honour its past has a very uncertain future. What is wrong with preserving our past history as an example for future generations? In a speech reported in *Hansard* at page 4651 of June 24, the Prime Minister said:

> Attachment to tradition is an important element in a country that wishes to progress.

These words have a direct bearing on our effort to have a plebiscite on the flag issue.

The Newfoundland member for St. John's West (Mr. Cashin) is reported in *Hansard* of June 30, page 4912 as saying that we should "retain those things of our past for which we have so much genuine affection and loyalty". I certainly agree with that statement. If the flag debate continues perhaps he will stand up and repeat this laudable statement. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) speaking in French in the house last week called for British justice. This is a tradition of Canada and it is symbolized by the union jack

in our flag. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) in the course of a recent television interview referred to our form of British government. This is also part of our tradition represented by the union jack in our flag. I mention these comments in order to emphasize our contention that the people of Canada should be consulted by means of a plebiscite before their present flag is taken from them.

To put it directly on record I will read again in part the amendment we propose to the report of the flag committee:

> However, as the final vote of the committee did not reveal a sufficient degree of unanimity for the proposed design for a national flag for Canada, your committee therefore recommends that the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to conduct a plebiscite to be held at the next general election in order that the Canadian people may be given their rightful opportunity to declare their choice concerning a national flag.

I think that clearly outlines the situation before us.

In an earlier speech I referred to the hundreds of letters I have received from constituents in support of the Canadian red ensign. At that time I listed the many references in them to the need for deciding the flag issue by means of a plebiscite. I will not repeat those statements now. I will merely say that many of the letters I receive continue to support the stand taken by my party on this flag issue. This is in direct contradiction to press reports which seek to indicate that public concern over the flag has declined. I have received letters recently from towns in my constituency supporting our stand on this issue. I received three today, from one of which I quote the following:

> As my representative at Ottawa, please insist on the inclusion of the union jack in any proposed flag. In the interests of Canadian unity we should have one flag only.

Members on the government side who have expressed opposition to a plebiscite claim they can speak for their constituents. I agree that under our democratic system of government we were elected to vote as parliamentary representatives on behalf of our ridings with respect to all political and economic matters, with regard to which decisions can be altered later, if necessary. But voting to substitute a single maple leaf flag for the red ensign is something very different. This is a very emotional issue. It is an issue which calls for a majority decision by the Canadian people. As our amendment suggests, this could be sought at the next election, which will probably come by or before next June. Canadians will be better prepared to accept the result of a plebiscite than they are to accept the result of a vote on party lines in parliament. I would think the Prime Minister would welcome this means of solving a difficult problem.

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Pascoe: I agree with the speeches made by the hon. member for Kent (Ont.) (Mr. Danforth) and the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) who pointed out very cogently how the Canadian people would be affected if the flag were changed.

May I call it ten o'clock?

Mr. J. E. Walker (York Centre): May I have the leave of the house to revert to motions?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member have leave of this house to revert to motions?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

At ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, December 4, 1964

The house met at 11 a.m.

CANADIAN FLAG

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SIXTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Thursday, December 3, consideration of the motion of Mr. Batten that the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, be now concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Monteith.

Mr. J. E. Pascoe (Moose Jaw-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, when the house adjourned last night I was presenting submissions in support of the amendment to the flag committee report. This amendment calls for a plebiscite which would give to the Canadian people an opportunity of making their own decision on the flag issue. The proposal is to hold a plebiscite during the next federal election, which I said was likely to be held by or before next June.

I commented on the wall of silence on the government side during this flag debate, and especially on our call for a plebiscite. There certainly has been a wall of silence over there, except for the jeers and heckling as we speak out for the millions of Canadians who resent the attempt to scrap the Canadian red ensign. I stated that it is the obligation of each one of us to state very clearly for the *Hansard* record his or her position on the flag issue, and especially on the call for a plebiscite.

I point out that if the Prime Minister continues to insist that the red and white maple leaf flag have priority over more important government business, such as the labour code and the railway problem, this debate will carry on until Christmas. This will give each member of parliament plenty of time to explain why he or she is for or against the flag plebiscite. I am sure the Canadian people are waiting to hear from the Liberal members why it is so necessary to rush the flag vote, and why they are opposed to a plebiscite. Perhaps they are not completely opposed, but they certainly have not stood up in their places and spoken one way or the other.

We on the opposition side are making our stand in favour of a plebiscite very clear. Government members, not only the 47 Liberals from Quebec but those from the English speaking area of Canada as well, should do the same. They certainly owe it to their constituents to make their position clear. If they are opposed to letting the Canadian people decide the flag issue for themselves, then surely they are expected to explain to their constituents why they are taking this stand.

Emotions have been arised across the country. What each member is doing in regard to the flag question is being watched very closely. Statements have been made that a plebiscite on the flag would cause ill feelings and would create divisions. I believe a clear appraisal of the situation would reveal that any change in our flag, without holding a plebiscite, would be much more divisive. Some hon. members may not accept that statement but I repeat, and ask them to consider carefully, that greater divisions will be created if a flag is imposed on Canadians without a plebiscite to allow them to make the choice for themselves.

We realize that plebiscites or referendums are not the usual procedure under democratic government, but they do have a place in issues affecting the people in a particular manner. The changing of a flag is just such an issue, and that is why we are stressing the need for a plebiscite. Plebiscites have been held on other occasions to settle emotional questions of great concern to the people. The 1942 plebiscite on conscription was held to allow the Mackenzie King government break an earlier commitment not to call up men for overseas service.

If I may be permitted to refer to local matters, I would point out that in the coming Ottawa civic election a referendum will be held on fluoridation and Sunday sports to let voters decide these issues themselves. It has been argued that we are in parliament to make decisions but Ottawa has a mayor, a board of control and a council, yet they are referring these matters directly to the people because of their significance to each individual voter. In my own constituency there was a referendum in the municipal election on the question of building a new hospital. The

people there have a mayor and reeve who could have decided the matter, but they put it up to the people to decide and I am happy to report that the people decided in favour of the hospital.

Press reports claim that public interest in the flag issue has dropped off. This is not the situation in my constituency, and I am sure it is not in a great many other constituencies. I admit we are not receiving as many letters on the flag issue as we did just after the Prime Minister unveiled his three maple leaf design, but most of the correspondence I receive from my constituents still carries a note in support of our stand. As I stated last night, I am receiving letters every day asking us to continue out stand on the flag issue. I have one here that I received yesterday and I want to put it on the record again. It reads:

> Dear Sir,
> As my representative at Ottawa, please insist on the inclusion of the union jack in any proposed flag. In the interests of Canadian unity we should have one flag only.

I am sure government members have received letters from the Canadian Corps Association, and that they will agree with me its interest and concern in the flag issue are not dropping.

Our members have made reference to the stand taken by the Canadian Corps Association. I should like to place on record in order of the dates on which they were received a number of letters from this association to show that the demand for a plebiscite is continuing; indeed, I believe it is increasing. On April 20 the Canadian Corps Association said in a letter that the government's course of action in this matter should be determined only by a plebiscite. On June 8 the association wrote:

> With such divided opinion throughout Canada on the flag question we cannot understand why Mr. Pearson will not allow the people of Canada an opportunity to choose between the Canadian red ensign and his new suggested maple leaf choice.

At that time it was three maple leaves. Then on August 5—interest in the need for a plebiscite was still continuing and growing—a letter from the corps stated:

> The Canadian Corps Association dominion command again emphatically requests the Prime Minister of Canada and parliament as a whole to place this subject before the people at the next regular general election. Let the voters of Canada finalize this matter.

That is exactly what we are asking. Then on November 27, only a short time ago, another letter came from the corps as follows:

[Mr. Pascoe.]

> The Canadian Corps Association dominion command at this time reiterates that no change in Canada's present national flag should be made unless the government is so instructed by the citizens of Canada by means of a plebiscite vote conducted in conjunction with the next general election.

I have read those four letters and referred to the dates on which they were written to show that the demand for a plebiscite is continuing. The Canadian corps represents a very large body of opinion.

In conclusion I express the hope that supporters of the government will express their views on the subject of a plebiscite in the course of this debate. As has been said many times, we all realize that the scrapping of a flag is a very emotional issue. I have spoken on this matter before, but I feel compelled to speak again on this amendment to express my views. I hope all members across the way will take the opportunity to express their views. The Canadian people think they should be allowed to decide for or against a new flag. We also believe this. In all sincerity I say that a decision on the flag by means of a plebiscite would be much more widely accepted than the compulsory imposition of a flag selected by a divided vote in parliament.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Winkler).

Mr. Byrne: Things must be getting tough.

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate those remarks from the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne). They are typical of what he might interject into any debate, particularly when I am involved. I would like to say once again that I would certainly appreciate hearing his views from the floor, and not from his seat. First of all I would like to refer to *Hansard* for December 3, 1964, page 10,803, the right hand column, where Your Honour, in correcting the speaker who had the floor, used these words:

> It seems to me that he is away off the point of a plebiscite, how it should be held, where it should be held, when it should be held and if it should be held.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, you feel those are the points which are relevant in this particular debate. I agree with those points and would like to add one more, with Your Honour's concurrence; that is, why it should be held. On that premise, and in connection with the amendment that is before us, I would like to make a few remarks.

I believe that we as members of the opposition are fulfilling a very useful purpose in

this debate. We are fulfilling a very useful purpose today, as we have during all this session thus far. It is obvious that the government and some members of other parties do not agree with the holding of such a plebiscite in our fair country. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I also am not too imbued with the idea of a plebiscite.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Winkler: I believe I made that very clear in my speech in this chamber on August 12, which was one of the earlier speeches in the debate after it had been resumed. On that occasion I pressed the government and pleaded with the Prime Minister to send the question to a committee. After that date I had the pleasure of attending an international conference and was away from the house for a considerable period of time; and of course when I returned on September 8 the house was still seized with the resolution presented by the government.

I believe that today the opposition has no other course to follow. The government has put the opposition in such a narrow position, without endeavouring to display any degree of co-operation, that we have no alternative but to take this course on behalf of the people of Canada, and I believe the majority of the people of Canada; the figure of 60 per cent was quoted in a recent poll, but I believe it is 64 per cent. I believe we have the right to speak for these people, and if it is their wish that we have a plebiscite, I am willing to accept their judgment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Winkler: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that had the government moved in the proper direction and at the proper time in sending this question to a committee, it would have been resolved.

I had not intended to use these words at this juncture of my remarks, but I am forced to do so. The manner in which the subject was presented to this house by the Minister of Transport indicates to me that the old philosophy of the days of Mackenzie King has been adopted. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the ghost of Mackenzie King is now treading the corridors of the House of Commons, because one can determine that the presentation of this subject, which will have divisive results in our country, is an endeavour to put on the opposition the blame for any crisis that occurs. They seem to be following the course of allowing the crisis to become imminent and then stepping in and solving it as the benefactors of the electorate. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that the Minister of Transport has indeed been in communication with the previous prime minister and maybe even received some direction, because the plan is working quite well thus far and he has the opposition, as I said, in a very narrow corner.

Mr. Greene: Has the opposition ever been anywhere else?

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I think the humiliating defeat the hon. member for Renfrew South suffered in Toronto should be enough to keep his mouth shut for a few days, unless he wishes to rise in his place and make a speech. He is another one of those professional hecklers we could well do without.

I ask that hon. member and this house, Mr. Speaker, whether the flag debate of today is of such consequence to this country that we can afford to ignore every major daily newspaper. It may be that the government members are now considering a referendum, even though it may be undesirable to them. Because of my great respect for individuals outside this house and for the officers of this house, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to name any minister or bring the Prime Minister into this, but in view of the picture presented to us today by various newspapers in this country I believe there should be some change of heart. I have here the front page of the Montreal *Star*, the front page of the Montreal *Gazette*, the front page of the Toronto *Globe and Mail*, the front page of last night's Toronto *Telegram* and the front page of last night's Toronto *Star*, all of which seem to put the government in a pretty sorry mess. Where is the great zeal on the part of members on that side for the people of this country? Where is the great feeling they have for the pension plan? Where is the great feeling of those members in regard to medicare? What has happened to the government's attitude in regard to the labour legislation for which we are all waiting? What has happened to the government's attitude in respect of many of the other things about which we have heard so much? Because of the obvious situation presented by the newspapers of this country perhaps the government will change its mind and give serious consideration to the amendment respecting a plebiscite which is now before us.

Mr. McIlraith: Why do you filibuster the way you do?

Canadian Flag

Mr. Winkler: The President of the Privy Council has used the word "filibuster". Let me remind that hon. gentleman, whom I consider as a friend, that while I have not taken a daily count, at the last count I took of the measures dealt with by this house the number was something over 60. If my memory serves me correctly that is well beyond the number of legislative measures dealt with during any session by any parliament.

Mr. McIlraith: That is good government.

Mr. Winkler: You cannot have obstruction on the one hand and good government on the other hand. Had it not been for the opposition, where would these measures now be? In this regard I will give as much credit to my friends on our left as we take ourselves. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, let us have no more remarks from the President of the Privy Council about a filibuster.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to read to you and to the house from an article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of Monday, November 23 having regard to a speech made by the Prime Minister. I do not think the government or its supporters will deny these words by the right hon. Prime Minister, who said, as reported in that article:

> "We have spent 23 days in the House of Commons debating the flag—which I think is too long —but those 23 days were at a time when normally we should have been having a holiday so while we may have spent a long time we have not sacrificed parliamentary business in doing it," he said.

Does that smack of obstructionism, Mr. Speaker? I now turn to the transcript of an interview of the Minister of Agriculture. It is perhaps a good thing we are having the flag debate at this time because that minister can stay away from the house now without his absence being too conspicuous.

Mr. Moreau: Where is Mr. Balcer?

Mr. Winkler: I may remind the hon. member for York-Scarborough that as I read of the situation in the newspapers these days, if it were not for certain events things would be a little different there as well.

The Minister of Agriculture had this to say on November 25 during an interview on the national broadcasting system:

> —and I don't think that there has really been as much obstruction lately as we had during the summer recess—or when we should have had a summer recess.

The Minister of Agriculture says that during the summer months there was obstruction, yet the Prime Minister says the business of parliament was not sacrificed during the summer months.

Mr. Hahn: Mr. Speaker, we are not dealing with the obstruction of parliament, we are dealing with an amendment. If the hon. member is going to use the rules of this house to filibuster, he should filibuster by the rules.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I am making these remarks in an endeavour to convince this house that we should have a plebiscite. The hon. member for Broadview, like many other members on that side, should make some contribution to this debate instead of remaining in his seat interrupting. If he signifies that he will do so I am prepared to resume my seat and listen to him. The hon. members can continue this program of interference but they will not bother me, because I know their minds are closed on this issue.

Let me say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of this house that I have one more reason for advocating a plebiscite. We now have one flag design before us, of a basically red colour. Such a design has no appeal whatever in many parts of the country. I have the privilege of returning to my constituency each week end, and since this design has been presented to the house I have observed a tremendous amount of displeasure on the part of my constituents.

Miss LaMarsh: Then vote against it.

Mr. Winkler: I believe the people of Canada are beyond this now. Although they dislike it and find it is not desirable, I think they are beyond it. But the government does not seem to be interested in the lunch pail men of this country. I believe that the people who carry lunch pails in the province of Quebec are a little different from the people who carry lunch pails in the province of Ontario, but regardless of their province, their aims and objectives in life are very similar. This matter is of little significance to them. What is of significance to them is a brighter and better future for their families, and if they were called upon to make this decision it would be a very simple one for them to make. I believe the government would be very surprised to find that the red ensign would receive a tremendous amount of support from all these people.

To remove every vestige of our history from the design we are going to have to accept if we do not have a plebiscite to determine what the people desire is in my estimation a retrograde step. It is well known in the history of

the world that those who forget their past may well have greater difficulties in the future. I do not know whether all hon. members have had the time to read the column by Bruce West in this morning's *Globe and Mail*, but I believe they will find that it expresses the thinking of most people. Let us not deny, Mr. Speaker, let not one member of the house deny, that there will be a tremendous number of members on the government side of the house who will vote for this particular design knowing full well—

Miss Jewett: That the committee recommended it.

Mr. Winkler: —that they are voting against the desires of their people. I will tell the hon. member for Northumberland—

Miss Jewett: That the committee recommended it.

Mr. Winkler: —that the Liberals on the committee, in a final act of desperation, found themselves in the position of not being able to accept anything else.

Miss Jewett: What about the 14 to 0 vote?

Mr. Winkler: If you want to make a contribution, madam, rise in your place and make your own speech. Don't bother me.

Miss Jewett: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Winkler: I will accept questions when I am finished.

Miss Jewett: I just want to ask about the 14 to 0 vote.

Mr. Winkler: I would be glad to accept that question.

Miss Jewett: Fine. I have already asked it. What about the 14 to 0 vote?

Mr. Winkler: I should like to comment on the 14 to 0 vote. It is a very simple thing.

Miss Jewett: Good.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Don't use big words, because she can't understand them.

Mr. Winkler: It was a Liberal trick within the committee.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Winkler: I do not care what the reaction to that remark is; I tell you that is what it was. If you are faced with a decision involving an apple which is perfect and another apple which is imperfect, which one are you going to choose?

An hon. Member: The perfect one.

Mr. Winkler: Absolutely; and if you make this decision preferring pears and there are no pears, then you have no alternative. That is the truth. You know it and every member of the committee knows it. Let us be truthful about this matter. Members on the other side of the house do not like this thing and do not want it, but they are forced to take it. I am not going to ridicule it because I might find myself standing up before it some day. I am that honourable, as I think every member on this side of the house is. Nevertheless, when we are faced with something that is second rate, for goodness sake let us give the people of the country, 64 per cent of whom have now stated they want a poll, the opportunity to vote in a plebiscite, or let the government say they will put something on this flag representing our past. This design is bland. It has no crown, not a single point of association with our past.

Mr. Munro: You are ridiculing it.

Mr. Winkler: Maybe that will be all right for you, but there will be a few members from Toronto who will rue the day they supported this flag. Make no mistake about that. As I approach the end of my remarks I should like to refer to this article by Bruce West which I feel is an honest and sincere effort to set the situation straight, as it should be. I say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. West in his article this morning reconciles the situation that exists between our two great provinces, and I think he does it very well. He indicates that the flag debate is becoming very wearisome to him.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Winkler: He goes on to say:

> Believe me, I do not enter into this argument in this space merely to fill up some blank paper.

Do not believe either that the opposition is acting from any such motive.

> The words which have already been written and spoken on this matter would, if compiled in book form, probably provide enough volumes to build a modern great wall of China along the entire length of the Quebec-Ontario border. However, in spite of my best intentions, I often find it difficult to just sit here saying nothing while the battle ebbs and flows. I consider it to be not only my right to comment on it but my obligation. For one thing, I believe that the wishes of a great and extremely important segment of our people on this matter are not only being ignored but disdainfully and even contemptuously ignored. This, I think, is a shameful thing, and if I can help express their side of the argument I intend to do so. One particular puzzling aspect of the long flag debate, both in parliament and on the streets, is

the fact that somehow we who favour the retention of our century old banner are now being singled out as the villians in the piece. We are accused of helping to sow disunity in this country by refusing to go along with the proposal for a new Canadian flag.

This is true. This is part of the trick to which I referred earlier, and one of the reasons I would be prepared to put the question to a plebiscite and stand on what the people had to say. Mr. West goes on to reconcile the whole matter. I have before me a speech that was delivered in Toronto in regard to the problem as some people try to portray it; but Mr. Robarts, the premier of Ontario, has approached it from the point of view of trying to unite the country. I am afraid those on the other side of the house do not have as full an appreciation of what they are doing to Canada. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and all members of the house, was there a problem before the Liberal party came into power in this country? Was there a problem between Quebec and the rest of Canada? No, there was no problem. Why should there be a problem now, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Hales: Divide and rule.

Mr. Winkler: It is a very sad and sorry thing that this sort of thing takes place for political purposes, and I am afraid that is the case. That is all the more reason why a plebiscite should be held. As I said earlier, I am not too much imbued with the idea, but when the government comes along in this way and uses these tactics I can only say that this must be their motive.

I also have here the text of a speech delivered in Toronto at a similar sort of meeting by one Mr. Fernand Guindon, a French Canadian from eastern Ontario. He expresses his thoughts on the question very well. I believe more attention should be paid to the sensible attitudes that people put forward rather than trying to pick on the small things which cause trouble. I should like to read an excerpt from this speech. As I say, it was made by a French Canadian who lives in eastern Ontario. He said in part:

We French Canadians in Ontario have not only received fair treatment for our own particular problems. We have also shared with all Ontario citizens the benefits of progressive policies which have developed this province and made it prosperous.

The same doors are open to every citizen of Canada. Do you hear the province of Ontario squealing because of a recent announcement that it pays more taxes than any other part of this country? I think not. Should they not, then, have the opportunity of saying what kind of flag they want? Would a plebiscite not achieve this purpose? Then let all the people across the country accept the result.

Mr. Moreau: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Winkler: Yes.

Mr. Moreau: Is he suggesting now that we should have a weighted vote, depending on the amount of taxes we pay?

Mr. Winkler: No, I did not say that. This is another typical Liberal trick that the hon. member is using. I will admit that the hon. member is in attendance quite often, but he has not said much lately. I believe the people of Scarborough would like to hear his views on this issue.

Mr. Moreau: I should like to express my views by a vote.

Mr. Winkler: We know how they will be expressed.

Miss LaMarsh: You have not told us which apple you like.

Mr. Winkler: If the minister would mind her own apples she would get along better around here.

Mr. Regan: I was attempting to follow the hon. member closely, and with interest. I understand he made a complaint that the people of Ontario pay more taxes than any other area. I ask the hon. member if he would not agree that this is because of the fact that the rest of Canada has to bear the tariffs to protect Ontario's industries and provide a captive market for the products of Ontario?

Mr. Winkler: The other night, Mr. Speaker, I believe I referred to the hon. member but one word was missed in *Hansard,* so I will repeat the reference today. I referred to him as the brash and junior member for Halifax. If he looked after the problems of his own constituency and voted properly on this question, he might have a chance of coming back. In addition, I do not like the way he takes my words out of context.

I meant to ask, do you find any of the arguments that arise in Canada today coming from the province of Ontario? You do not. No one hears that voice. I make this statement precisely for the benefit of the hon. member for York-Scarborough. You do not hear any of these arguments coming from

the province of Ontario. I do not criticize anyone else because it may be that if we were to raise these points we could get closer together. I believe, too, we should let the people on both sides, whether they are revolutionary or whether they are not, whether they are vocal or whether they are quiet, decide the issue by means of a plebiscite, and perhaps then we could achieve some unity in this country. Perhaps some day the Minister of National Health and Welfare will find I am hammering my desk for her, although I do not know.

I should like to say to the house that I believe there are three alternatives open to the government today. We have one before us right now in the form of an amendment providing for a plebiscite. The government, of course, could accept the amendment and we could go forward with a plebiscite. The second alternative is that the Prime Minister and the cabinet could decide to drop the whole issue and maintain the status quo until a more opportune time. The third alternative would be the application of closure. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what has been discussed with government members. We have the amendment, and I wonder which of these alternatives the Prime Minister has informed government supporters he is going to follow. Whichever one it is, I should like to remind him that we refuse to change our position.

Miss LaMarsh: Let us vote.

Mr. G. D. Clancy (Yorkton): Some weeks ago I spoke in this house and said I was opposed to a plebiscite. I gave my reasons. I said I did not want to see bitterness engendered; I did not want to see a wedge driven too deeply between the various groups in our country.

I have changed my position, and I want to put it on the record. I am going to vote for a plebiscite. Let me tell you why. As I look across the house I find there is not one member in this house who represents an area west of Toronto. Oh, I apologize; there is one. I have changed my position and I am going to give you the reasons for that change.

Mr. Groos: Would the hon. member also change his position and admit that there is at least one other member from the west sitting in the house today?

Mr. Clancy: Once again I apologize. I have been around here so long that when the new boys walk in I do not always recognize them.

Now, I am going to make my position clear. I am voting for the plebiscite. I am not bilingual, Mr. Speaker, but I want to draw attention to one fact. I believe the French word for rabbit is "lapin". I suppose the plural would be "les lapins". Well, watch those on my far left vote; watch them bolt for the curtain.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Ralph Cowan (York-Humber): Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this house has voted to continue the debate on this plesbiscite question, I am happy to take some part in the discussion because I am fully in favour of allowing the population of Canada to rule on this very emotional question of a flag for this country.

We have a distinctive Canadian national flag now. As I pointed out in speaking on the original motion on August 24 last, orders in council passed in 1924 and 1945 bear that out. It is referred to five times as a distinct or distinguished flag which certainly cannot be confused with that of any other nation. If there are some minds which cannot distinguish the Canadian red ensign from other flags, I see no reason why the entire nation must be brought down to the mental level of those who cannot tell the red ensign from any other flag. We do not have to descend to the lowest common denominator.

The Prime Minister, when speaking before the Royal Canadian Legion in Winnipeg on Sunday, May 17, in the second paragraph of his remarks stated that there was too little of the emotion of patriotism to be found in Canadians. I sincerely hope that I will not be carried away by my emotional approach to the flag. I hold it in the highest respect, in the highest regard, and I always will, despite what action may be taken by this parliament in a vote that may come before Christmas, although I sincerely hope not. The things for which the flag stands were created by the experiences of a great people. Everything for which it stands was written by their lives. The flag is the embodiment not of sentiment but of history. It represents the experiences made by men and women, the experiences of those who lived and those who died under the flag. It is not something to be laughed at. Last night I expressed my convictions and I expressed the opinions of the majority of the voters in the riding of York-Humber, as fine a constituency as there is in the city of Toronto. I hope you, Mr. Speaker, did not hear the laughter behind my back by people I did not wish to identify and therefore did not turn around.

Canadian Flag

The Prime Minister, speaking in the House of Commons on June 15 last, said "This is a serious, a solemn and historic occasion . . ." You can tell from the chatter behind the curtains how serious and important they consider the event. This is a serious, a solemn and historic occasion, as the Prime Minister said. Might I have order, Mr. Speaker? It is just a small request.

Mr. Speaker: I must say I think you have very good order and rapt attention, certainly better than a great many others.

Mr. Cowan: The Prime Minister said:

—this is a serious, a solemn and historic occasion and I venture to hope, as I also mentioned a moment ago, that the debate will be worthy of the occasion.

I would like to congratulate the Speaker on the ruling he made—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have not got the authority with me, but many years ago Mr. Speaker Glen said it was not hardly proper to even smile at the Speaker let alone comment on anything he has done or said. Of course if you are dissatisfied with his decision you can always move a motion, but please leave the Speaker out of this debate.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, I was well aware of the rule, but I am on *Hansard* as having expressed the wish to congratulate you. I have been cut off in my wish, but you can take it as read.

I would like to remind the members of this Canadian House of Commons that charity covers a multitude of sins, and flags can be used to cover a great deal of inaction and indecision. They are trotted out at times of stress and strain and thus serve as a divertissement from other questions that should be before the house.

I sat in opposition after being elected in June, 1962 until the house was dissolved in February; I suppose you can say from June to February but I prefer to say from September to February. I sat on the other side of the house in the fall of 1962, and at that time I was very interested in the remarks by the then leader of the opposition on December 19, 1962. I quote those remarks from *Hansard*:

It is a traditional and fundamental right of parliament to vote taxes before they are collected and to approve expenditures before they are made. When these rights are ignored, when they are violated, parliament itself is being violated and we are taking a step toward its destruction. No matter how wide a circulation we give and no matter in what form, to the bill of rights, and no matter how much we talk about Magna Carta and the bill of rights, no matter how emotionally we may wrap ourselves up in parliamentary or national flags, both these rights I have mentioned are being deliberately and systematically violated by the present government.

I am wondering if this party has been committed, as we are told by some people, to bringing before parliament a distinctive national flag within two years from April 1963. I am wondering why we are wrapped up emotionally in national and parliamentary flags rather than in questions that should be occupying our attention at this time. I have looked over the speech from the throne in 1963 and the speech from the throne in 1964. The speech from the throne read on May 16, 1963 stated:

The greater Canada that is in our power to make will be built not on uniformity but on continuing diversity . . .

"Unity in diversity" is quite a phrase. I do not use it. The words contradict each other. However, the speech from the throne in May, 1963 stated:

The greater Canada that is in our power to make will be built not on uniformity but on continuing diversity . . .

They tell us the present flag is causing offences in certain parts of the country and that therefore we need a new flag that will not cause the offence which some people claim it occasions them. I say if there is some objection to the union jack in the Canadian red ensign then let us follow the fine, high sounding words in the speech from the throne on May 16, 1963:

The greater Canada that is in our power to make will be built . . . on continuing diversity . . .

In that speech from the throne we were promised that the parliament of 1963 would establish a Canadian development corporation. Where is it? We were told there would be a new department of agriculture act to be placed before us—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret having to interrupt the hon. member, but I do hope he is approaching the question of the plebiscite and that this is all preliminary to moving in that direction. I hope these preliminary remarks will be relatively short because the question before the house is the amendment, and the amendment deals with the plebiscite.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, I have said before and I repeat that I am 100 per cent behind holding the plebiscite, but I am wondering why we need to hold a plebiscite on a question that was never even mentioned in the speech from the throne. I am wondering why we should be spending our time dis-

cussing a matter that was never mentioned in the speech from the throne in 1963 or in the speech from the throne in 1964. There were many references to pieces of legislation to be passed by the parliament of 1963 and the parliament of 1964, but those pieces of legislation are shoved aside and suddenly we are presented with the proposition that the government has promised somewhere, somehow, sometime that it would produce a distinctive Canadian flag.

If you, Mr. Speaker, feel I should not mention the lengthy number of items referred to in the two speeches from the throne in 1963 and 1964, items that have not been implemented, then I will lay aside that portion of my remarks. But I am certain all hon. members of the house know very well the questions that have been pushed aside because of the government's action in bringing in the flag question at this time.

Dealing with a plebiscite, personally I would rather see the government withdraw the flag committee report completely and just let it die on the order paper, let it die at the time of the Christmas recess. But if it will not follow that sensible course of action, which was the course followed in 1945 and 1946—and I have had lengthy discussions on the matter with the chairman of the flag committee of 1945 and 1946, and with one of the members of that committee who is sitting in the house today, God bless him—I wish it would pay attention to the fine example set under the leadership of Mackenzie King, who used to be held in high respect by the Liberal party when living. But of course Mackenzie King dead is Mackenzie King dead, and today we have smarter men than that great man who held the office of prime minister longer than any other Canadian. He let the flag committee report go to the wall in 1946, and I suggest the same treatment be given to the flag committee report of 1964.

Among the items mentioned in the 1963 speech from the throne—and I apologize to the Speaker for referring back to it—was a promise that the committee on privileges and elections would review the Canada Elections Act. I asked if any action had been taken on that, but the government's answer is that that committee met in 1963 but the session ended before the committee could report. If the committee discussing the Canada Elections Act in 1963 was allowed to die at the time that the session ended in 1963, then I would point out that is a very good precedent. It ranks with the flag committee report of 1945 and 1946, and I think we should follow the same practice in 1964 and just let the committee report go to the wall when we adjourn for the Christmas recess.

The government's present intention of giving priority to the report of the flag committee is putting this parliament in a strait-jacket. Not only is it putting the opposition in a strait-jacket; it is putting the government into one as well. They would like to take some necessary action to bring the trustees of the S.I.U. before a parliamentary committee, but since we are allowed to discuss only this flag question we may not be able to take the action required to bring these trustees here. We have to stay with the report of this flag committee, we are told, until a decision has been reached. I sincerely suggest that the entire report be withdrawn and that we proceed to government business which requires the attention of the House of Commons and which should be on the order paper at the present time.

I have admired those speakers who are defending the red ensign, and I regret that it should be necessary to defend the red ensign in this dominion which has been built up under the wing of, and with the help of, the British empire. I have admired those people who have pointed out that our discussion of the flag question has brought changes in the position taken by the government with regard to the matter, and I sincerely hope the discussion we are now pursuing—and it will continue until the Christmas recess, I assure you, Mr. Speaker—will result in further action by the government which will be of benefit not only to Canada as a whole but to the government party as well.

There have been quite a few retreats. I regret to use that word but, being a Liberal, I hear it so often it just comes naturally to me. There have been quite a few improvements—I will use that word this time—in the government's actions in connection with this matter. Hon. members will recall that on May 19 it was to have been a government bill, absolutely a government bill. I could read from *Hansard* of May 19, 1964 if it is legitimate to refer to previous debates in the current session, and draw attention to an exchange between the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings and the Prime Minister.

Mr. Nowlan: Let us not evade the question any longer. We are now told that the government is going to put a design before parliament. Does the government accept responsibility for it?

Canadian Flag

Mr. Pearson: The government will indeed take responsibility for the design which is submitted to the House of Commons.

That design later turned out to be the three leaf design. On May 19 we did not know what it was. But the Prime Minister said the government would accept responsibility for the design. The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam then asked a question and the Prime Minister replied:

The members have had an election pointed at their heads like a gun in respect of every decision that has been made in this house on policy matters since we took over the government. I have pointed out, and I think I should make it quite clear, that when the government submits to parliament a matter of policy—and this is certainly a matter of policy—the government must stand or fall on the result of the decision of the house.

Then the right hon. gentleman went on to say he did not intend to hold it against any member of the Liberal party who voted against the design. But this was certainly a matter of government policy. Where is that three leaf flag today, Mr. Speaker?

Then we retreated again—I am sorry; we withdrew. We withdrew to a free vote on August 21.

An hon. Member: It was not a retreat?

Mr. Cowan: I said we withdrew, and the statement then made by the leader of the government was:

There has been criticism that the government was attempting to influence a decision in its favour by the threat of an election if it were defeated on the issue. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I stated at yesterday's meeting and I am glad to repeat it to the house today that in our view votes on the resolutions and on amendments to them will be entirely free. That is, an election will not be at stake on such votes.

That is a most interesting statement, because I have another statement here by the Secretary of State. Speaking in Toronto on June 13 the Secretary of State told a press conference that the flag was "nevertheless a government proposal and that a defeat on the question could cause an election". I ask you, Mr. Speaker, where is the three leaf flag of June 13? I have quoted the Secretary of State himself.

We were told that this question would never go to a committee, that it was a matter to be decided by the full parliament of Canada in all its majesty and with all its capabilities. Well, we improved our position by withdrawing to previously prepared positions and putting the question into the hands of a committee. This was as a result of the discussions we had on the flag during the summer months.

[Mr. Cowan.]

Out went the three leaf flag. We now have a one leaf flag. I maintain we should hold a plebiscite among the people of this country from Vancouver island to Newfoundland to find out what they want on a single transferable vote basis with a few suggestions put before them including the Canadian red ensign. I know what will command the majority vote in this country and that is why I say "Put the red ensign on the transferable ballot".

Speaking about our improvements and withdrawals, we were to have a new flag on July 1. It was going to look terrific. Well, the same flag is still flying that was flying when this country was built up, and it will continue to fly from that same flagstaff. Then we were to have a new flag so the Queen could come over here and lower the jack in the red ensign and run up the three dying leaves of the new flag in October. But October, too, has come and gone. Now we are told we will have a new flag by Christmas. Mr. Speaker, we are going to have a flag by Christmas; it will be the red ensign with the jack in the hoist.

Mr. Winkler: Where are all the hecklers now?

Mr. Cowan: I understand from a ruling made by the Chair last night while the hon. member for Moose-Jaw-Lake Centre was speaking that it is not in order to quote from a newspaper editorial written during a current debate. I cannot figure out in my mind whether an editorial which appeared in *Le Devoir* on August 22 was written during the current debate or not. At that time the debate was on the three leaf flag. We are now in the course of a debate on a plebiscite in connection with a one leaf flag, and if there is a ballot I should like to see the red ensign on the ballot. May I quote from an editorial written in August?

Mr. Speaker: With the greatest of interest and the greatest of sympathy for the hon. member, may I say that the question before the house is not a general discussion on the flag; it is whether or not we should have a plebiscite. The hon. gentleman, I know, was just warming up to deal with this question of the plebiscite. I do not know how long it takes. Perhaps he could confine the remainder of his speech to the question of a plebiscite. The subject of the flag and all the movement surrounding it is one which can be discussed on the main flag motion, but now

we are dealing with the amendment, which concerns a plebiscite.

Mr. Cowan: I was hoping that some comments I was about to make would provide information to those who will be voting on this question of a plebiscite. As to relevancy, I thought we had wide latitude. I was here the other day and heard the way an admitted draft dodger referred to men who had lost a leg in the first world war, or an arm in the second world war as "resembling Canadians." That apparently was relevant; he was not called to order. Yesterday or the day before I heard a cabinet minister tell an hon. member of this house to sit down and shut up. So I know the latitude accorded to us in this debate is very wide.

On this question of the plebiscite I should like to point out that this editorial of August 22 last says we now have a government led by a man who, one day in May, claims he is discussing a national policy of the utmost importance; yet in the month of August he says it is a free vote and everybody can do as he likes. With a plebiscite it would be a free vote and 19 million Canadians would have an opportunity of telling us what they think.

I have already drawn the attention of the house to the fact that the party in the seats of government does not hold a majority of votes from the electors who put us here. I am the member for York-Humber, with 20,000 votes behind me; I had 24,000 votes cast against me. I hope and pray that I represent a majority of the people in York-Humber. I know I do on the red ensign question, but on other questions of the day I hope and pray that I represent always the majority opinion of the people of York-Humber and not solely the opinion of the minority who put me into parliament with 20,000 votes in a 44,000 vote election.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cowan: I say we have not a clear mandate to put a flag before the nation on a single vote of parliament; this party does not have 50 per cent of the votes. Two by-elections were held quite recently. It is a sore subject in some quarters and perhaps I do not need to name where they were held, but I would point out that in regard to the vote in those two by-elections—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Churchill: Go ahead.

Mr. Cowan: —the party in power did not receive a majority of the votes; yet we have a spokesman for the Liberal party going down into New Brunswick and announcing that 90 per cent of the people are in favour of the proposed flag. This statement was made within two weeks of the two by-elections in which the party in power did not obtain 50 per cent of the votes. Boy, if that isn't inflation I never did see it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cowan: They obtained 47 per cent of the vote on November 9, yet it is said that 90 per cent of the people are in favour of the one leaf flag. The same spokesman who was in New Brunswick stating that 90 per cent of the people were in favour of this flag was in Victoria, B.C., in August. As reported by the Victoria *Times* we learn that the question of the flag is settled; everybody is in favour of the three leaf flag. The Victoria *Times* of August 14 says:

> There is definitely no chance of a federal election this year and prospects are unlikely in 1965, transport minister J. W. Pickersgill said here today.
>
> The federal cabinet minister pooh-poohed any question that the issue of Canada's new flag could precipitate a vote.
>
> "The public has decided the flag question. It is settled", he said emphatically.

This is the Victoria *Times*. This is the three leaf flag that the member for Leeds loves so much. If the question was settled on August 14, why are we debating the matter in December of 1964, except to force a plebiscite of the people? Let us get the opinions of those people who are the backbone of and who are this country in the last analysis, and let us not have the decisions of people sitting in these seats and sitting here, in a great many cases, with a minority of the votes behind them.

I certainly believe that in a plebiscite, if three or four suggested pennants were before the public, the red ensign would carry an overwhelming majority of the vote; because with a transferable vote only a majority vote can win the day, which is not the case when you put eight or nine flags up for grabs and one gets, say, 31 per cent of the vote and you say therefore that everybody will go for it. If there were a transferable vote of the nation on this question of a pennant you would find that the red ensign would top any such plebiscite that was held.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that statements have been made that this is going to be a free vote. A free vote is one where the government does not fall if the vote goes

against it. I would like to comment on some facets of this. We are going to have a free vote on this question of the amendment and a plebiscite. The question of the amendment and the plebiscite will be decided by people who, as I mentioned when speaking on August 24, have sincere hopes of senatorships, or diplomatic appointments, or who would like to be judges.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cowan: It is a free vote, however, and those who would like to go to Kuala Lumpur, Scotland, Copenhagen or Russia, are also free to vote as they like, just as it was free for them to make these trips around the world. They do not make any reports to the government at all; they just come and go. They are here at times of stress and strain to vote, and they are away on other occasions. I think the government should have a board in the outer lobby setting out these members who so willingly sacrifice their time and are absent from home to go to Copenhagen, north Russia, south Siberia and the far end of China. The names of these members should be shown, because the country does not realize the sacrifices that many of these people make and are going to make on their behalf in connection with this free vote. They draw learned conclusion in their own minds and consciences, but there is no report made to parliament as a whole; there is no written statement as to what they picked up for the guidance of members of parliament. Just those who participate in travel at government expense know what they have learned; and frequently they are defeated in the following election, so the vast store of knowledge they have acquired is lost to the nation as a whole, more's the pity.

Mr. Churchill: Along with their bumper stickers.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize this to point out that there cannot be a free vote in this Canadian House of Commons. I was not in the house when it was suggested that the sessional indemnity should be increased to $18,000 a year. I left for Toronto on a Friday afternoon train and was not in the house on the Monday when it was voted on. I was in the Gravenhurst-Orillia district talking on a matter that was of interest to the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources and the Department of Transport in connection with a suggested canal from lake Muskoka to join the Severn river.

I was there when this increase was voted, but I will state that if I had been in the house I would have voted for it, because I think the $18,000 a year indemnity is necessary to the great majority of members of the House of Commons. But I would like to present some figures regarding salaries of $18,000 or more a year.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: They don't want to hear it.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the hon. member will not mind my interrupting. I think the record should be kept straight. Parliamentary committees, associations, or members going on those various trips to C.P.A., I.P.U., NATO and Canada-United States meetings are the subject of subsequent reports to parliament in each case. I think the hon. member will find that in each case those reports are recorded in *Hansard*. Certainly I know of at least three such reports, and I know of two reports which will come to the house in due course. I am sure the hon. member did not wish to imply that hon. members who are representing their country in foreign countries are not carrying out their duties in the proper manner, because I wish to assure the hon. member that they are. I have seen the reports, and those reports are then filed with the house. I am sure the hon. member meant something else.

With regard to the $18,000 indemnity, I do not see how this has a bearing on the question before the house, which is the matter of a plebiscite on the flag question. Would the hon. member try to confine his remarks to the question of a plebiscite, whether it should be held, where it should be held, how it should be held.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have your statement that you know three or four such reports have been received. I know of 30 trips that have been taken.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cowan: With regard to the matter at issue, I simply point out that we are all the product of our experiences. We are all the product of our education, and our decisions are guided by our past experiences, by our present status in life and by our hopes for the future. We do have hopes for the future for ourselves, for our families, for our loved ones and for the country as a whole. The fact that

some of us have a French background dictates a manner of thinking and voting. Those who like myself have an Anglo-Saxon background have a different approach to the questions of the day.

A study of history is of great value to us. I cannot help but repeat my request that this committee report be allowed to drop. We have all heard of the great victory of the king of Epirus over the Romans in Italy. King Pyrrhus then said, "One more victory such as this and the war is lost." When thinking of that great victory of the Greeks over the Romans do not forget that he is the one man in history regarded as having been able to prevent the growth of the Roman empire, had he wished to do so. For some reason, probably because Greek cities did not give him the military support necessary, he turned back from his approach to Rome and ravaged southern Italy and Sicily. He is known particularly for his epigram, "One more victory such as this and the war is lost".

King Pyrrhus had a greater claim to fame than his military victories in southern Italy and Sicily, which were indeed tremendous. Another epigram has been and will be associated throughout history with King Pyrrhus. After ravaging Sicily for three years, he is the man who has been described as introducing the phalanx to Italy. His outriders were mounted on elephants brought in from Egypt. After leaving Sicily he decided to go back to Greece and—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Cowan: Those voices come from the serious, honest and high minded members who have handled this whole question in the way it has been handled. That is the group that continually shouts "Shut up and sit down".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cowan: I was pointing out that as King Pyrrhus left Italy for Greece he said to the hosts assembled around him, "What a battlefield I leave here for Carthage and Rome".

I suggest that the flag issue should be dropped. Our hopes will govern the votes of many of us, and at $18,000 per year or $1,500 per month, with 40 months from now until the end of the life of this parliament, this is a $60,000 question. I ask you to vote in favour of the plebiscite, and vote for it wholeheartedly, so as to let the country decide this question.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I should like to know whether an hon. member has the right to impute motives to others for the way they vote?

[*Text*]

Mr. Lawrence E. Kindt (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, before I commence my speech on the flag question I should like to compliment the hon. member for York-Humber for his splendid address.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Kindt: May I also suggest that if every member of the Liberal party was honest and studied that speech I am convinced they could not find anything wrong with it, and I challenge all those Liberal members to stand in their places and voice their opinions on this subject. There is not one among you who has made a speech, so we can rightfully accept the attitude expressed by the member for York-Humber as the official attitude of the Liberal party, and it should be presented as such. We all know that as trained seals you have not the fortitude to depart from the position which has been taught you and speak your minds with intellectual honesty, as has been done by the hon. member for York-Humber.

The hon. member for York-Humber has stated categorically that the committee report should be dropped and that we should go ahead with the other important business of the house. How many times has that suggestion been made in this chamber during the past several days? Almost every member who has spoken during this debate has made that suggestion, but it has fallen on the deaf ears of the members on the Liberal benches.

As that hon. member suggested, there is no clear mandate for adopting the flag which has been recommended by the committee as the national flag. Let us consider the red flag which has been recommended by the committee. It represents a complete change from the three maple leaf design originally presented to the house.

The right flag for this nation, if a change is to be made from the red ensign, has not yet been discovered or presented to the Canadian people. One cannot discover the right flag by appointing a committee, setting time limits and holding guns to their heads. That cannot be done. If the Liberal members would just stop and think about what they are doing they would realize that in order to produce the kind of flag of which we can all be proud it

must be discovered, just as discoveries are made in the physical sciences.

Let us consider, for example, the discovery of Salk vaccine for the control of poliomyelitis, or the discovery and production of insulin by Banting and Best. Another example might be the discovery and development of the Bell telephone. Those were all discoveries.

Discoveries are also made in the social sciences. Consider for example the lady who sat in Boston with needle and thread and sewed together the flag of the United States. She carried out her work from the heart. She made a discovery with which everyone agreed, and it became the official flag of that great nation the United States of America.

I do not believe, by the very nature of the job they were assigned to do, a committee can go to work in camera, supposedly, and produce a flag satisfactory and suitable to this nation. That cannot be done. Instead of appointing a flag committee, as we did, it would have been much better to assign the task to the Canada council. I think we have a group of people there who could have taken much more time to consider this matter and given it much greater consideration. I am certain they could not have done a worse job than the committee did.

Mind you, it is not the fault of the members of the committee. They are all good men and I think they worked hard, but the task assigned to them was an impossible one. What we have got now was fully predicted by certain members of the press and by certain members of the house who said before the committee was appointed that it would not produce anything that would be acceptable to the people. Anyone who knows how matters of this kind are dealt with knows that the committee was charged with an impossible task.

I see the Minister of National Health and Welfare in her seat. Having charge of health matters, she would know that discoveries in the field of health must be worked on not just tomorrow or the next day but often for years before a remedy is ready to be made available to the public. When something is discovered it is often by accident. Someone imbued with the spirit of research goes ahead and works out the problem. The same thing has to be done in the field of social science with regard to the production of a flag. What I am trying to say is that the committee was placed in an impossible position.

One thing about which I am somewhat fearful in regard to a plebiscite is that we still have not a basic flag on which the people could vote. One flag that was suggested was a modification of the red ensign. I am certain that no one on this side of the house has objected to a compromise. No one has said that the red ensign must be accepted lock, stock and barrel. In fact it has been said that the two founding races should be represented on the flag, and that there are many compromises and changes that should be made. But to deviate 100 per cent from the red ensign and throw it out completely will not satisfy the people of Canada. Now, Mr. Caouette—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member knows he has to refer to hon. members by the constituency they represent and not by name.

Mr. Kindt: Well, it was in the newspapers. I have reference to the front page of the Toronto *Daily Star* for December 3, 1964. In an address in Toronto the hon. member for Villeneuve made the following statement:

> "English Canadians" are not to blame. Reaching agreement in parliament on the choice of a flag will not achieve national unity.

In other words if the recommendation of the committee for a single maple leaf design is accepted this will not bring about national unity, according to the hon. member for Villeneuve who has spoken so vociferously in favour of blindly supporting this particular design as the national flag of Canada.

In reviewing the matter I sometimes think the Liberal party has chosen this time to bring forward a discussion on the flag in order to make it serve as a red herring and draw attention away from other problems facing the government. There is no doubt there are important matters that should be discussed, and it would be far better to get on with the discussion of them.

When the Liberal party brought forward their estimates, the house leaders got together and there was no trouble in getting the estimates through. When any other legislation has been brought forward which has been in the best interests of the people of Canada we on this side have always co-operated. But as the official opposition we have a right to point out those things that we feel are not in the best interests of Canada.

I say "in the best interests of Canada" because in my opinion the Liberal members are no more in favour of the recommendation of the flag committee than are the Conservative members of the house. But the fact is that we in the official opposition are being blamed throughout the country for talking on

the flag in order to hold up other business. The effort is being made to have the people of the country believe that we are to blame because we wish to debate the flag issue. It might be that the best thing to do would be to dump the whole matter into the lap of the Liberal government and let them fight about it. The Liberal members are already divided on the question. They are already voting like seals—

An hon. Member: Flattery will get you nowhere.

Mr. Kindt: —but when they go back to their constituencies they will see what their people have to say about the matter.

There are one or two other matters that have come to my attention. I come from Alberta where maple trees do not grow so there is nothing in the maple leaf design that thrills me one bit. I would vote against it on the ground that it contains the maple leaf. I want something on the flag that depicts my province. I do not believe the people of eastern Canada should force this particular design down the throats of other people in Canada, particularly in those parts of the country where maple trees do not grow.

There is no urgency about the flag. We have had the union jack for 100 years. I should like to tell you a story about what a French waiter in the dining car said to me the last time I came east.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I wonder whether the story the hon. member is about to relate refers to a plebiscite.

Mr. Kindt: It is 100 per cent related to the plebiscite that we are proposing in the amendment. He knew I was a member of parliament and he asked me what I thought of the flag. He said that he thought the people should have a vote on the flag. He went on to say that we have had the union jack for 100 years and that he was not too much interested in whether we had another flag or whether we had the union jack. He said "What difference is it going to make to me? What I want is security." In other words, what he wanted was a pension. He was thinking about a pension and those other things which would give him security, and he went on to talk about them.

So if you go out and talk to the man on the street you will find he is not worked up about this flag issue. There is no urgency, therefore, and the taking of a plebiscite to decide a flag might just as well be deferred for the time being. Let us get on with other matters that are more important and are needed to a greater extent by the people of this dominion.

As the hon. member for York-Humber has said, we have a flag. I look out my apartment window at about five minutes to eight in the morning and see the red ensign being unfurled above the peace tower. It is a great thrill to see that flag go up and unfurl; the wind catches it and then it floats in the breeze. It is now floating above the peace tower, and it is there every day. Let us keep it flying. The people of my riding are saying, what is wrong with the flag we now have? Give us a chance to vote on it and get on with the business of the country, but do not let that fellow Pearson take away our red ensign. This is the mandate I have; it is what my people are saying.

The other day I attended a meeting put on by the Legion at Barons, in Alberta; about 400 or 500 people were there. They talked in a jocular way about everything in connection with the flag issue and the question of a plebiscite. They were all in favour of a plebiscite. I have come to the conclusion, for my own part, that the only method by which unity in Canada can be maintained is to have this flag question decided by a plebiscite. The people you approach in your constituency know just about as much about the flag of a nation and have as much ability to decide what position to take with regard to a flag as any member of parliament. In other words there are some issues that come before the House of Commons that lend themselves to a decision by the voters. They should be given an opportunity to vote on this issue before we adopt an official flag for Canada.

A vote in this house based on a political report and a political flag will never preserve the unity of this nation. I feel just as the hon. member for York-Humber felt, that unless there is a plebiscite this assembly is not in the position to take a vote on this particular flag and thrust it down the throats of the people.

I have letters referring to such matters as the fact that this is a red flag. I do not say this is something that was taken into consideration by the committee, but people say that red is the Liberal colour. Blue is the Conservative colour. I know that every party has a particular colour. Here are the Liberals coming in with a 100 per cent red flag. According to the letters I receive, people from one end of the country to the other are drawing attention to this.

Mr. Matheson: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question at this point?

Mr. Kindt: Yes.

Mr. Matheson: I ask the hon. member, in fairness, if he is aware of the fact that it was a Conservative government that recommended to King George V that our national colours be argent and gules, that is white and red?

Mr. Churchill: It is not right.

Mr. Matheson: Is he aware of that fact, that the national colours are white and red?

Mr. Churchill: That is not right.

Mr. Kindt: I will say this, that if I were appointing a committee to decide on a flag I would never put anybody on it who knew anything about heraldry. I would pick some sensible, ordinary citizens who knew what the problem was and let them go to work to decide on a flag. Do you mean to say that the lady who, with her needle and thread, sewed together the flag of the United States at Boston knew anything about heraldry? She knew nothing. It is these people who think they know something about heraldry and know nothing who sit on these committees and produce the type of thing we have here.

Mr. Matheson: Does the hon. member know that Betsy Ross did receive technical advice from experts in heraldry before she sewed this flag?

Mr. Kindt: You are absolutely wrong when you say she had technical people advising her at the beginning. Be that as it may, we are not talking about technical people. I see that the time is now one o'clock.

Mr. Cowan: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member has called the attention of the Chair to the fact that it is one o'clock.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2.30 p.m.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, you may remember that when time ran out at one o'clock I wished to ask a question of the hon. member. I wish to ask the hon. member for Macleod, who was being interrupted by the hon. member for Leeds, if he does not agree with me that this is the time when "Hark, the heraldry angels sing"?

Mr. Kindt: I agree with you very much.

In concluding my remarks I wish to say the government has no mandate to decide the flag issue and therefore that issue should be placed before the people in a plebiscite.

The government made mention of the flag in the dying days of the last election, saying that if returned to office it would try to provide a new flag, but that was not something which made it mandatory on the government to act. What was meant by that was that if it received a majority, and continued in office for four or five years, the subject of a flag could be introduced and it would do what it could do to arrive at something which would bring greater unity to Canadians and preserve the degree of unity we have now. However, as a result of the people's vote in that election we must deduct that the government is not in a position that it has a mandate to change the red ensign.

Mr. Olson: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Kindt: Furthermore, they are being kept in office by a group that wishes to retain their $18,000 a year.

Mr. Olson: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Kindt: They are—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the hon. member kindly resume his seat. The suggestion which he is making now is entirely out of order and I would ask him to confine his remarks to the matter which is supposed to be discussed and considered, the necessity and advisability of holding a plebiscite.

Mr. Kindt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The next point I wish to make is that there is no urgency to the flag issue and hence, as the hon. Liberal member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) said, it should be withdrawn and more important and urgent business placed before the house. How can any reasonable person blame the opposition for being opposed to the proposed flag?

I say we should place the flag issue before the people in a plebiscite, and keep the red ensign flying from the peace tower, all across Canada and throughout the world until something more acceptable is found than the political monstrosity concocted by the political flag committee.

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Speaker, on rising to support the amendment I should like to start by reading part of it:

> However, as the final vote of the committee did not reveal a sufficient degree of unanimity for the proposed design for a national flag for Canada, your committee therefore recommends that the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to conduct a plebiscite to be held at the next general election—

Mention has been made of the fact that there was a vote in the flag committee of 10 to 4 in favour of the one maple leaf design, and the question was asked, "What is the significance of four votes against the proposal"?

Mr. Winch: Against ten votes.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Yes, against ten; but I would like to point out that each vote in that committee represented about 1,250,000 Canadians, which means that about 5,500,000 Canadians do not favour the design recommended by the majority of the committee.

Mr. Winch: How about the 14 million who do support it?

Mr. MacLean (Queens): This is the point I am getting at, that in the interests of national unity some process must be found whereby we can arrive at a flag of which all Canadians can be proud. It has been said that the one maple leaf design is one that does not stir the imagination, and that there are millions of Canadians who do not feel strongly one way or the other. In my judgment a flag that does not raise some emotion, some feeling of patriotism and some enthusiasm in the hearts of Canadians is not worth having. A flag of that sort would be of little use to any country.

Flags are intended to represent the things, the principles and the traditions we hold dear. If the committee had come up with a unanimous or a virtually unanimous recommendation I would have supported it, but a unanimous recommendation is not possible unless recognition is given to the various large groups and traditional factors which make up Canada's total population. But it failed to do this and as a result failed to produce a design which was unanimously acceptable to the committee.

A little over a week ago I happened to turn on the television and I saw the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) being interviewed. He was at his benign, gracious best, the soul of reasonableness, and he was explaining to the Canadian people how this government was one which governed by consent, as all governments govern by consent. He was the soul of reasonableness. In practice, however, we are finding that this government is one which is trying to govern by coercion and pressures of various kinds. First we were to have a free vote on the flag question. Then it was said the result of the vote would determine the life of the government, and government supporters were pressured into line. This is why it is important that the Canadian people should be allowed to decide this issue. The Minister of Transport makes a reasonable statement that Canadians should be governed by consent. I agree with that. But if the minister does indeed hold these views they are not evidenced in practice today. I have the highest respect for the Minister of Transport and I do not believe he is a callous hypocrite who would intentionally try to mislead the Canadian people by telling them something he does not practise or believe in. All I can conclude, therefore, is that his influence in this cabinet is virtually nil, because if it intended to carry out his proposition the government would welcome the opportunity to ascertain the wishes of the Canadian people with respect to a flag.

I hesitate to digress, because it is not my intention to be out of order, but as time goes by and especially since he took up his present portfolio, the Minister of Transport—and I do not intend to be offensive to him in any way—reminds me more and more of some phrases in a musical which was popular about a hundred years ago.

Mr. Byrne: Order.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I will desist. The hon. member across the way does not want to hear it so I will leave it for some other time.

Mr. Byrne: Sing a carol.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Well, if I were to mention this musical the Minister of Transport would be honoured because it is about a very famous person. The lines go something like this:

> He has made with the aid
> At least of a geist
> Two books in the native vernacular,
> And the trips of his ships
> In a host on the coast
> Is something really spectacular.

But that is only in passing. I want to get back to my theme. I have a lot that I wish to say. We believe that the government should listen to reason. It is not too late. We believe the government should recognize the desires of the Canadian people and not continue to

pursue a program which cannot be anything but divisive. After all, at the present time it has become clear that the purpose of the government is not to construct and evolve a flag which would have a unifying effect. It has become clear from the work of the committee that from the government's point of view one thing is absolutely necessary, namely to banish the union jack and any other symbols of one of the great races of Canada from our present flag. The purpose of the government at the present time is not to create, but to tear down and banish forever those symbols which millions of Canadians hold dear. The government has never committed itself publicly to doing this. In the election compaign the Liberal party never took the people into its confidence in this regard and therefore by no stretch of the imagination have they a mandate to do this.

It is therefore essential that the Canadian people should have an opportunity to vote on a plebiscite at the next election to express their views on this subject. None of us know with any certainty what the majority of Canadians or what large groups of Canadians think on this subject. There are of course opinion polls, but only a fair amount of accuracy attaches to them. One thing is clear: Canadians are divided on this issue and the longer we pursue it and are forced to pursue it the greater the division will be. To impose such a decision upon Canadians without giving them adequate opportunity to express their views would be the most divisive action of all. If the government really believes that the introduction of a new flag would have a unifying effect and that Canadians would accept it, hon. gentlemen opposite should welcome the opportunity to allow our citizens to express their views in a plebiscite.

Some contend it is only those who are old enough to have served in one of the great wars who have any interest in the symbols of those things for which this nation stands. It is said that people of younger ages are all in favour of doing away with them. I find no evidence to support this view, although I quickly admit there is very little evidence to the contrary, either. But I did read recently that a boys' magazine took a poll among 2,000 of its readers between the ages of 8 and 18 and that the returns were split almost evenly between those who wanted the union jack and those who favoured a flag without any trace of the union jack. This indicates that even the young people of the country are divided on the issue. As I have said, for some reason which it is difficult for me and for the average Canadian to understand the government is bent on eliminating these symbols from our flag. It wishes to get to the point of no return as quickly as possible so that nothing can be done about it.

We counsel mature consideration. We say this is a matter which could be desperately divisive as far as Canada is concerned, should a flag be imposed on the Canadian people which a large group is loath to accept and which another large group would detest. This is not the way to go about obtaining Canadian unity. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the question that naturally arises in our mind is, what is the motivation of the government? What pressure are they under? Why do they persist in this course? One explanation, of course, would be—and I am not suggesting it is the correct one—that somebody, perhaps the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), has a sort of mania about this and his mind is blocked to anything else.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I think I am dead wrong on that; I am not suggesting that is so —but that eliminates a possibility. It may be based on a distorted reasoning, namely that by eliminating the symbols that the various groups of Canadians hold dear you will arrive at a kind of neutral situation where these divisive elements will disappear. In my judgment that is entirely wrong. There was a similar situation in the island of Cyprus when they tried to get a flag for that small country. The Greek majority thought that it should be one thing; the Turkish minority wanted their colours and their symbols in the flag. They could not arrive at any agreement and they would not agree to accept both suggestions. Each side wanted the right to veto what the other believed in. So they arrived at a nondescript thing which I believe is a map of Cyprus, and so on—I think there is an olive leaf in it somewhere—that is something comparable to the recommendation of the flag committee of this House of Commons. It cannot be said by any stretch of the imagination that this has brought national unity to the island of Cyprus.

Mr. More: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the members to the extreme left are not interested in the debate, I would like the opportunity to hear what the speaker is saying, and hear it clearly. I wonder whether Your Honour would ask them to desist from the half dozen loud conversations that are going on at that end of the chamber.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): The question is, where is this pressure coming from? I would be very surprised if it is coming from the province of Newfoundland, for example. I see no great body of public opinion there that is intent on banishing the union jack, for example, or the red ensign. I am sure this pressure does not come from Nova Scotia, from Prince Edward Island or from British Columbia; nor does it come from Alberta or Saskatchewan. There is not one member in this House of Commons—if we are the ones to decide—from the province of Saskatchewan that favours doing away with the union jack as one of our historic symbols. The pressure does not come from Manitoba, and I am sure it does not come in any great measure from the province of Ontario. I am logically forced to conclude—

An hon. Member: That it comes from Quebec.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): —that it certainly does not come from the province of Quebec. I will explain why.

Mr. Ricard: That disappoints you over there.

An hon. Member: All that are left now are the Yukon and Northwest Territories.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I say that, Mr. Speaker, because the only argument I have heard the government or any spokesman for it advance as to why these symbols should be eradicated from our national flag is that they are archaic vestiges of a long dead, long past, colonialism. If that is the reason, it does not jibe with the reasoning of the province of Quebec—at least the province as a province—because as I recall it, their provincial flag, which I presume has the affection of all citizens of that province, consists of a white cross and four fleur-de-lis on a blue background, the symbols of old France. I think that is a very attractive flag and I respect the viewpoint and the good taste of the people of the province of Quebec who hold this flag in high esteem. I know that even if they did not do this, and felt that these symbols were an anachronism, they would surely not expect Canadians generally to eliminate from the national flag the symbols they love, before they had put their own house in order and eliminated from their own flag these equally archaic symbols of dead colonialism. I know Quebec people; many of them are among my closest friends, and I know they would not advance such a preposterous suggestion as that.

Where does this leave us? There is still some group that is pressuring the government to eliminate these symbols from our flag. I do not know who they are; but the government is obviously committed to this program and are embarrassed by the fact that they were not able to do it quickly. I suppose they took a straw vote of the membership of the house and found there were more people, collectively, in the other parties that would vote for them than there were in their own party that would vote against such a proposition, and they snatched at it to cause embarrassment and division in all parties in this house. Here was an opportunity to shove something through parliament quickly, and they were pressured in this way. As a result of that course of action, they have been saying ever since, with various degrees of politeness, "Stop talking. Bring this matter to a vote".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): They say, "Sit down and vote". The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) puts it in slightly different terminology. I believe she said to an hon. member, "Shut up, sit down and vote". But anyway, Mr. Speaker, this is what they advance. There is a reason why this course is not acceptable at the present time, and I will come to this point in a moment. In making this point they have practised the ruse that is as old as time itself. I am rather amused by the fact that one or two gentlemen of the fourth estate, the press gallery—and these men look upon themselves as people who are objective, incisive, shrewd and worldly-wise; and they are, with perhaps one or two exceptions—have fallen for the ruse the government has used, which was old when Ali Baba and the 40 thieves were around. One or two of the gentlemen of the press have been taken in by this ruse. It is an old trick of pickpockets, from time immemorial, that when their victims begin to get suspicious, they point at some innocent bystander down the way and scream "Thief", and everybody goes after him and the pickpocket disappears up the alley. This is what the government has been doing all summer; they have been saying, "The terrible opposition are preventing parliament from getting on with the country's business". I want to point out that it is not the opposition that is holding up government business. The opposition has no choice as to the program of business which is laid before parliament. This is the 27th day the government has taken

the view that the elimination of the symbols which millions of Canadians hold dear is the most important problem facing the government of Canada. I know of no other government in the world that is so confused it believes its most urgent task is the abolition of its national flag.

The government can stop this waste of parliament's time immediately, if it is a waste. They can stop it in various ways. The most obvious way of stopping it would be to accept this amendment and take this divisive subject out of parliament, allowing the Canadian people to make a decision. They could stop this waste of parliament's time, if that is what it is, almost as easily by calling other government business on the next sitting day. The government could have done that 25 days ago. What has happened to the labour code? Why has the government not brought that on? What has happened to the C.N.R. financing legislation and the Canadian pension plan?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the hon. member for Queens will agree with the Chair, that he is straying from the motion that is before the house at the present time.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I am pointing out that by agreeing with this amendment to refer this question to a plebiscite the government will immediately clear the decks of parliament for other business. I am also saying that that is not the only way this could be done. The third way it could be done, if there is no other government business ready at this time, is to accept this amendment and adjourn parliament for the Christmas recess.

Mr. Dupuis: Let us vote and see what happens.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): If the minister will get up and state on behalf of the government that they accept this amendment, then I will—

Mr. Dupuis: This is to be a free vote. I cannot say that for them.

Mr. Herridge: We heard all about the free vote just before lunch.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): The most important point I want to make with regard to all of this, and this is the point that seems to have missed the grasp of the government entirely, is that this is no ordinary piece of legislation. If it were a financial bill, or any kind of legislation which could be corrected, repealed or amended by another parliament, I would gladly have someone state the position on behalf of myself and others and let the issue come to a vote. I would be glad to let the government stew in its own juice as a result of its errors.

However, this is a more serious situation than that. There is an old tradition that no parliament can bind a future parliament. However, if we do what the government proposes we will in effect be binding future parliaments, because the flag is something that should be permanent. If this report was concerned only with a flag to fly over Canada during the life of this government I would let it go through immediately, but I have my country's future in mind and at heart, and I think it is shameful if parliament allows this nefarious piece of legislation to be carried out, perpetrating on Canada a permanent flag that millions of Canadians will not accept. A flag is something that cannot practically be changed. Although there may not be anything in the constitution which would prevent a future parliament from changing the flag again, surely we do not want the flag changed every parliament. This government acts as though it were going to be in power forever. There is no telling what the next parliament will be like. It may be entirely different from this one.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I hear an hon. member from one of the splinter parties, and I agree with the view that he has expressed. I am not suggesting the party to which I belong will necessarily form the next government, because I think the next parliament will probably be more fragmented than this one. One of the reasons for this belief is that the present government has condemned the official opposition with a vitriolic flood of abusive propaganda, but have also condemned themselves by their own acts.

Mr. Herridge: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I am not surprised that one of the hon. members of the N.D.P. applauds.

I should like to illustrate what I am going to say with a very homely illustration, Mr. Speaker. My contention is that if the government wanted to get on with the other business of the nation now, all it has to do is agree with this amendment. They refuse to do so. They refuse to bring on other government business. They refuse to do what Mackenzie King did in 1946 or 1947—let the

report die on the order paper and prorogue the house.

Mr. Choquette: This is 1964.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I know this is 1964.

Mr. Choquette: Come back to the present.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Whatever we allow to happen now on this issue will be permanent. We have an obligation to do a good job, and to do something that will be constructive and bring Canadians together. Therefore I feel that a plebiscite is one of the ways by which this can be done. If we find out what the Canadian people want in the way of symbolisms on their national flag we could then perhaps adopt a flag which would be acceptable. Perhaps the best way of doing this would not be by allowing them to make a choice from a number of completed flag designs, but by giving them a choice of symbols they would like included on the flag. I am sure that if that choice were given to the people the maple leaf would be one of the symbols chosen. I am also sure that the union jack would be one of the symbols chosen. I am not sure that the Canadian coat of arms, the fleur-de-lis or some other things, would be among the choices.

If the Canadian people were asked to choose three or four symbols from among a number, parliament would then know their feelings and a panel of experts could then design a flag incorporating the chosen symbols, and parliament could then adopt it.

Mr. Speaker, as one hon. member has already said, this is not something in respect of which there should be winners or losers, regardless of who they may be. This is a circumstance in which all Canadians should act in unity in order to have something of which each and every one can be justly proud, perhaps not for the same reason, but something that means something to each one.

I think it is divisive to try to insist that certain symbols, which millions of Canadians hold dear and cherish, should be eliminated from their flag. You cannot achieve unity by any one group pretending that if they do not recognize the other group it will disappear and go away, as it were. It is a fact that we are made up of two founding races and an intermixture of many other races. This is a fact. It would be folly for me as a Canadian of Scottish extraction over several generations to make myself believe or to do anything that would lead me to believe that all Canadians were of the same background as I am. Therefore I am willing to allow Canadians of every origin to be represented in the flag; but I want the same privilege for myself.

This is a time for the government to reassess the situation. I would implore them to consider supporting the amendment.

An hon. Member: Let us vote and you will see.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I would suggest there are other ways in which this very contentious matter could be removed from parliament. I started to say a while ago that I wanted to illustrate the situation by a very homely analogy. When I was a teen-ager and a young man back on the farm, we always threshed in the fall of the year in a fairly wet climate and when some member of the threshing crew wanted to have a rest and did not want to carry on with productive activity he just made sure that a couple of really soggy sheaves went into the machine, whereupon the machine was fouled up and had to be shut off to be cleaned out. This is what the government is doing and has been doing all summer. Every day, day after day, it throws into the mill of parliament this very contentious question of the flag and how it should be designed. The result is that it will not go through the mill itself and it prevents other important business from being done.

I think my time has just about expired, Mr. Speaker, but there is a crucial point I want to reiterate. A government, especially a minority government, has no right to impose legislation which, in a practical sense in any case, cannot be repealed by a future parliament. Therefore unless this action can be taken with the unanimous consent of every party and every faction in the house, and unless it has almost 100 per cent support from all language groups and all racial backgrounds from every part of Canada, it should not be in a partisan manner in this way. It should not be done because the implication is that when the government goes out of office, as it will, the succeeding government would normally be bound to change the flag, and this no Canadian would want. The flag should be at least as permanent as the constitution, and at least as difficult to amend as the constitution, and in most countries amendments of the constitution requires a two thirds majority vote, or something of that sort, over and above the normal requirement for legislation.

If this flag is going to be imposed upon us there are large segments of the country that will not accept it with grace. There are millions of people who will resent it and to whom it will be an affront. Therefore if it is going to be imposed on them in this way, the least the government can do, this government which has discovered this theory of which it is so proud, the principle of opting out—and this may seem a bit ridiculous but the opting out principle can apply—is to allow the provinces that do not want this flag to opt out and not have it fly over those provinces.

I believe my time is up and I will continue my remarks on the main motion.

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks I wish to refer to page 10701 of *Hansard* for November 30 last where the following remarks of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) are recorded.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Webb: I quote:

With respect to the visit of the grade 10 children from the Peterborough school, it is true that at the request of certain members of the house, and I include among those the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Honey), the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Stenson), and the hon. member for Hastings-Frontenac (Mr. Webb)—

These remarks resulted from the chastising or taking to task of the hon. member for Leeds by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith) because of the action and conduct of the hon. member for Leeds when he was a member of the flag committee. I say to the house that this quotation is untrue. It is a downright lie.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Smallwood: Oh, sit down.

Mr. Webb: I say to you that I had no knowledge—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have done my best to follow the hon. member's argument but I cannot see the relation to the question of a plebiscite.

Mr. Churchill: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Furthermore, the use of the word "lie" is far too strong and I am sure the hon. member realizes that. Shall we say "misunderstanding" or some other equivalent word?

Mr. Webb: I was trying to put the matter in its true context but I will gladly withdraw the word "lie". I did not know of this visit to the flag committee room until I was invited on the day that the group was here by Mr. Howard, the students' teacher. The hon. member for Peterborough has also denied this charge.

Since for many reasons the number of those members who are in a position to put forward their independent views is very limited and since I speak for people outside the House of Commons I have again taken advantage of my right to have my say in the hope that by raising certain points and problems the government will reconsider their announced course on the flag question.

Some hon. Members: No.

An hon. Member: Read on.

Mr. Grégoire: We want a vote.

Mr. Webb: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says "read on". I want to assure him that we in this party have no paid script writers. My speech was written by me last night and the night before after the house closed. I say to these hon. members that if they were less interested in their beauty sleep and more interested in putting forward the views of their constituents on the floor of the house, we would have a better parliament.

Some hon. Members: Order.

An hon. Member: Listen to the parrots over there.

Mr. Webb: I have lots of time.

Mr. Grégoire: Filibuster.

Mr. Webb: It is far from my purpose to indulge in destructive criticism alone. It is sufficient to say that the course of action upon which the government has decided would be disastrous to the unity of Canada. It is certainly better to consider now whether we are right or wrong, especially when we can do something about it. Such action as is contemplated by the government would be very serious for this Canada of ours.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. We should note something unusual which is happening in this house. This is the third speech being pronounced by the hon. member for Hastings-Frontenac (Mr. Webb) on the flag issue.

In hockey when a player scores three goals, we say that he did the hat trick. I will be glad to send him a hat on the occasion, because three speeches in the house can well be compared to three goals in hockey. My

congratulations to the hon. member for this brilliant feat.

[*Text*]

Mr. Webb: I want to thank the hon. member for those congratulations and I shall look forward to hearing his speech on the flag.

Mr. Grégoire: I will vote on it.

Mr. Webb: Such action as is contemplated by the government would be very serious to this Canada of ours, to its history and geography, its economic and trading position, its status as a world power, its people, culture and way of life as well as its traditions. Up to the time this government came into power the Anglo-French heritage was one of the most important distinguishing features of our country. The two cultures existing side by side—

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Webb: —each maintaining—

Mr. Speaker: Order; I am sure the hon. member realizes that the two cultures are very interesting, especially to me. Nevertheless, "plebiscite" can be translated into either English or French, and the same principle applies either in English or in French. Let us speak about the plebiscite.

Mr. Webb: I am not quite clear on your ruling, Mr. Speaker. The two cultures existed side by side, at all times believing in a plebiscite, and each maintaining a distinct identity and each complementing and contributing to the other. The other ethnic groups have made and are making increasing contributions of their own. Areas in Ontario have been settled by the Germans and Dutch. There are large Ukrainian communities in the western provinces.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have already indicated to the hon. member that, while this is extremely interesting, it is not on the subject. Surely, after a mild suggestion like that the hon. member will confine his remarks to the plebiscite.

Mr. Webb: I believe, Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of latitude granted to the many speakers who have preceded me.

While Canada is physically part of the new world it has never cut its ties with the old world. Through thick and thin Canadians have maintained their democratic way of life. Democracy and equality go hand in hand.

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Webb: You cannot believe in one without believing in the other. At this time, what is more democratic than deciding on a major issue in this country. When you are denying the Canadian people a vote, Mr. Speaker, there is neither democracy nor equality.

There are many other fine qualities in a democracy, such as ideals, honour, loyalty, which are precious and must be protected with great care. This is what the Progressive Conservative party is trying to do today. If these qualities are not protected they will be broken as a result of careless handling, such as is the case in this flag debate. It is a matter of regret that a truly secret ballot could not be taken in this house. I am certain that if this were done the outcome would be different. It is no secret that this issue is tearing at the very heartstrings of many hon. members opposite. Those members, as well as some cabinet ministers, are suffering a great deal; their own consciences tells them they should support the plebiscite, and yet they are faced with party loyalty. It is difficult to understand why the government cannot agree to have a plebiscite at the next general election. The House of Commons, and especially the government, would win praise from many people who at this moment have lost complete confidence in their administration.

Perhaps at this time it would be well to put on the record some remarks made by someone outside our country. Sometimes we are put to shame by the recognition which other nations give to their appreciation of the heritage they have received from Britain. A few years ago Richard Nixon, then vice president of the United States, said this:

> No people in history owe more of their heritage to another than the American people to the British.

He cited the English language, the common law and parliament, freedom of speech, assembly, press and religion, as Britain's proud legacy to the nations of the world. He went further and stressed how his country had benefited by British capital investment when the United States was an undeveloped country.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Surely, the hon. member will endeavour to stick to the amendment to the motion which deals with a plebiscite.

Mr. Webb: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the whole of the debate, and as I said before a great deal of latitude was allowed

previous speakers and many editorials were read into the record. I fail to understand the restriction at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Order; I think I should answer that. A few days ago it was indicated that considerable latitude had been given at the time the main motion was before the house. An amendment has been moved to that motion and under our rules, as it was announced at the time, the Chair should endeavour to keep the house strictly to the amendment. Surely we can count on the co-operation of the hon. member. Ample latitude has been given for days and days during well over 185 speeches, and I think we are entitled now to stick to the amendment.

Mr. Webb: And yet—

Mr. Ricard: Before the hon. member resumes I would like to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that we have been hearing interruptions ever since he started his remarks. I would point out that those making the interruptions are French speaking members who are so tender about their rights in the House of Commons. Being myself a French Canadian I feel ashamed to have those of my own blood making all these interruptions, and I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to enforce the rules on them so that decorum may be re-established in the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Standing order 34 (2) clearly provides that when an hon. member persists in irrelevance—and Your Honour has already called him to order four times; so, if that does not indicate irrelevance, then I do not know what does—Mr. Speaker may direct him to take his seat. I believe, therefore, that the rules should be applied, since you referred to strict relevancy, and that you should be adamant and order the hon. member to discontinue his speech.

I think we should all abide by the rules. Incidentally, I should like to point out, if I may, that the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard) knows absolutely nothing about procedure.

I understand that the burden of treason is heavy on his shoulders because of the way he voted yesterday.

Mr. Grégoire: He speaks in English.

Mr. Choquette: I would like the rules to be observed and that you should ignore the member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot, since he is an ignoramus.

[Mr. Webb.]

Mr. Ricard: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of all the members on this side of the house, I asked that the rules be observed. I understand that the hon. member felt that those remarks were addressed to him personally, since he is one of those who always interrupts and since he took it upon himself to stand up and try to discredit me.

Mr. Choquette: Poor you.

Mr. Ricard: I do not feel any twinge of conscience for the way I voted yesterday and as far as my constituents are concerned.

What I asked the Chair is to apply the rules in the case of the hon. member who just rose and who continually interrupts.

In asking you to call the hon. member to order, I should like to point out that the hon. member for Lapointe is also one of those constantly making interjections.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. For once I support the statements made by the hon. member for Lotbinière. I say that we are ashamed of the attitude and of the treason of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot.

I should like to refer to standing order 34 (2) since the Conservative member who has the floor made reference to freedom of speech. I refer to the standing order which provides that when a member persists in repeating things which have already been said—I would like to point out that according to statistics compiled at eleven o'clock this morning, the word "plebiscite" has been said 3,743 times exactly. Consequently, the hon. member has no reason to claim that he has not had full freedom of speech.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you then to enforce standing orders and to prevent the repetition of things which have already been said 3,743 times. In my opinion, that is sufficient evidence of the freedom of speech granted to members of the house, even for those who are repetitious.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The Chair wishes to thank hon. members for the spate of advice, good and bad, tendered it. However, the Chair feels that the hon. member for Hastings-Frontenac (Mr. Webb) is doing his best and I am sure he will follow the suggestions made by the Chair.

Mr. Webb: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Why not a plebiscite?

Mr. Grégoire: Three thousand, seven hundred and forty four.

Mr. Webb: The disturbing elements in favour of a new flag stem from a conspiracy of non-Canadians who have set themselves to wreck Canada and the whole commonwealth. I have heard many times lately from some of my friends that they do not fear communism and are not afraid of the dangers of war caused by aggression. I do not agree with them. I fear war; I fear communism and the results of aggression.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I must tell the hon. member, I hope for the last time, that he must stick to the matter under discussion. He knows perfectly well the subject under discussion is the plebiscite. Will he please discuss it?

Mr. Webb: I have here a letter dated October 17—

An hon. Member: Another.

Mr. Webb: I think if the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) were in his office licking those three leaf bumper stickers he would be kept busy.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have the right to call to order a member whose remarks are not in compliance with the rules. Moreover, if the hon. member wants a sticker, I think it would be a good thing to stick one on his mouth.

[*Text*]

Mr. Webb: I imagine the price has gone down, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Dupuis: You are going down.

Mr. Webb: I have a letter here from Martha J. Shangraw of Verona, Ontario—

Mr. Grégoire: If you read it you will have to table it.

Mr. Webb: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that for the small sum of $50 the people of Lapointe could buy a parrot and send it here where it would do a more effective job than the hon. member. This letter is signed by Mrs. Martha J. Shangraw, a lady who had 41 relatives in the two world wars and who lost four sons.

I have another letter here asking for a plebiscite—

Mr. Grégoire: Three thousand, seven hundred and forty five.

Mr. Webb: The lady who wrote this letter said the red ensign is a beautiful flag and she sees nothing wrong with it. She points out that her father was not born in this country but came here from Denmark.

I have another letter here asking for a plebiscite—

Mr. Grégoire: Three thousand seven hundred and forty six.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, you have given a certain amount of latitude to the hon. member for Hastings-Frontenac (Mr. Webb) but it seems to me that hon. members opposite and those to my left are taking a great deal more latitude than is proper under parliamentary procedure.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I very much regret these interruptions but surely the Chair does not have to act as a schoolmaster continually. I have made a few suggestions to hon. members and I hope they will follow them.

Mr. Webb: They do not disturb me in the least, Mr. Speaker. I am just hopeful these hon. members will some day grow up. I have another letter here asking about a plebiscite. It is from a Mr. James Cummings. He says that it is pretty late in the day and that we must all be sick of the flag debate, but the great mass of non-vocal Canadians cannot understand why parliament must be pushed around by a minority government and why this issue cannot be decided by a plebiscite. I have one or two other messages here, Mr. Speaker, but you might rule them out of order. I have here, too, a copy of the order in council which was passed in 1945 declaring that it will be proper to fly the Canadian red ensign within or without Canada whenever the place or occasion—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Langlois: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not have anything against the hon. member for Hastings-Frontenac (Mr. Webb) especially, but I believe he has been out of order for some time. He is now reading to us an order passed in 1945 concerning the red ensign. I agree that if we confine ourselves entirely to what is said in Beauchesne's fourth edition it is difficult to define relevancy. As the author says, a wrong comprehension might have a serious effect on the freedom of speech and in borderline cases members should be given the benefit of the doubt. However, if we turn to May's sixteenth edition we find at page 451 the following:

A member must direct his speech to the question then under discussion...debate must not stray from

the question before the house or anticipate a matter appointed for the consideration of the house.

What we are considering today is an amendment put forward in the name of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith). The main motion is something which will come before us in the future in certain circumstances, that is to say, if this amendment should be defeated. We would then be speaking on the main motion and have an opportunity to deal with the subject in general terms. Furthermore, the hon. member is continually reading either from letters or from notes, a practice which is not in accord with our rules.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, once and for all to make the hon. member stick to the subject under consideration, that is, the question of a plebiscite. If the rules were enforced I think it would shorten many of the speeches being made in this house.

Mr. Webb: I want to thank the hon. member for his consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my time has just about expired. I assure you that if I have not been relevant to the motion before us, on the next occasion I will try to be more relevant. Today we are living in a world of turmoil and our only hope is our faith in God and the simple fruits of His teaching, together with the history and tradition of our past. More and more we hear about patriotism and I suggest in closing that real patriotism is when we understand that Canada is a nation, not a denomination.

Mr. D. V. Pugh (Okanagan Boundary): May I say at the outset that I am in favour of the amendment and in favour of the proposal that a plebiscite should be held.

I take this view because, among other things, the people of Canada are only now beginning to find out the truth behind what went on in the flag committee. In the second place, I am in favour of the amendment because I do not think the government ever had a mandate to introduce a new flag. I will return to this subject later. My third reason for supporting the amendment is the confusion and indecision of the government previously with regard to its proposed flag, the Pearson three maple leaf flag, which has been withdrawn and dumped into the ash can. My fourth reason is the lack of unanimity within the flag committee.

Before proceeding further I should like to pay a tribute to the chairman of the flag committee, the hon. member for Humber-St. George's (Mr. Batten). He ruled that committee with a very firm hand. He was fair in the extreme—a lot more fair than many of the Liberals who are sitting in the house at the present time and who apparently do not want to hear anything at all about the flag. The hon. member for Humber-St. George's saw that the business before the committee was carried out properly and in an orderly fashion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

I should like to point out that this is the third speech made by the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Pugh) on the matter of the flag. Since he has made the hat trick during this debate, it gives me pleasure to send him a hat with a red maple leaf.

[*Text*]

Mr. Pugh: Can I have a ruling, Mr. Speaker, on the question of privilege?

Mr. Speaker: There was no question of privilege. I understand you were making some preliminary remarks and that you were about to deal with the subject under discussion.

Mr. Pugh: I suppose it is difficult for some hon. members to realize that remarks appreciative of another member who has carried out a most difficult task as chairman of one of our committees should be well received. As far as privilege is concerned, the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) is a great authority on privilege, and what he said comes in at one ear and goes out the other. That is all the attention his remarks deserve; nothing more and nothing less.

Today we are considering an amendment to the motion for concurrence in the report of the flag committee, an amendment which would require a plebiscite to be held at the time of the next election giving the people the right to declare their choice with regard to a national flag. The amendment is based on the fact that the committee did not reach its decision with sufficient unanimity. As was stated earlier, some 72 per cent of the members were in favour of it. I would point out that the last time a flag committee reported, 95 per cent of its membership expressed approval of the flag chosen on that occasion. But for some reason or other that flag was never brought before the house. I do not need to remind Your Honour who the prime minister of the day was but I must commend him on at least one thing—his common sense in not bringing forward an issue so divisive for Canada.

I think it is essential that everybody in Canada should be given a chance to express their views on the Canadian flag. I believe the designs put to the people might well be the three designs which the committee finally considered. The Canadian public is only now becoming aware of those designs. In passing, I wonder why more curiosity was not displayed on the part of the press in this regard. I wonder why pictures of those three designs were not published widely throughout Canada. The first was the Pearson flag, three maple leaves on a white background with blue edges. The second, the one chosen, was the one maple leaf, on a white background, bordered with red. The third flag was exactly the same as the flag finally chosen except that it bore the symbols of our past superimposed upon it, in other words, the union jack and the royal flag of France showing the fleur-de-lis. These three designs were not arrived at indiscriminately. In other words, the committee decided in its own right that they would group the flags in three set groups. Then we had a finalist in each one. In other words, the committee gradually cut down the number of flags in each group so that we had a final flag. It is this final flag in each group which I believe, if this amendment is agreed to and the whole matter is referred back to the committee, could form the basis of a plebiscite for the people of Canada. I do feel, however—and I will refer to the question of mandate later—that the majority of people in Canada would answer in the negative if they were given the opportunity of a plebiscite and asked whether they wished to change the flag we have at the present time. I feel absolutely positive about this, Mr. Speaker.

Now I will say a few words about the mandate, because it is to this mandate that my constituents have referred when they have said to me, "You must demand a plebiscite so we can say exactly what we wish". There is no qualification in that whatsoever. I have only to go back to the last election campaign, when there was some news received in British Columbia that there would possibly be a new flag, and candidates—

Mr. Smallwood: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and with all due respect to you —and you have my complete sympathy— could Your Honour possibly convince people over there that they should show some dignity in parliament, and would Your Honour ask the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) to resume his seat and act like a parliamentarian, instead of—well, I will not describe the way he has been acting. I would like a little dignity to be maintained in this house.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point on this question. This is the fourth time today when the speaker who had the floor was not being interrupted or interfered with in any way, but members of the opposition have risen and stated there was interference with the hon. member. That being the case, I think it is up to the Chair to indicate whether or not there is interference with the hon. member having the floor, rather than letting these remarks appear in *Hansard*, as has been the case, regrettably, today, when there was not interference.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, and so that the remarks on *Hansard* may be accurate and complete, members on the other side of the house, and the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) in particular, have been infringing the rule which I will give Your Honour; I refer to rule 12(1) dealing with order and decorum in the house. It is quite proper for us to call the attention of the Chair to this interference with the progress of debate in the chamber. Order and decorum should be maintained, under that rule, and if people are constantly interrupting or, as the hon. member for Lapointe was doing, standing up on the other side of the chamber and talking to the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) loud enough for us to hear on this side, that is surely interrupting the member who has the floor and who is endeavouring to present his case in the debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Plourde: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege.

Since only a small group of Conservatives are making speeches, which are mostly prepared speeches, could we suggest that they hand them over to the Clerk of the house in order that we may vote immediately on this important flag issue?

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Since the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) has accused certain hon. members of taking no account of the decorum in this house, I respectfully submit that the useless debate going on today is deliberate filibustering and that Conservatives are destroying the whole decorum the House of Commons was enjoying—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Grégoire: —by constant repetitions, by saying one ridiculous thing after another and by attempting to throw a monkey wrench in the works.

If the Canadian people has no confidence in parliament, the responsibility rests with the Conservatives and the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

Mr. Plourde: That is right.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Grégoire: To satisfy their own pride and ambition, the Conservatives are holding up the business of the country, and I strongly protest against such an attitude. They will bear the responsibility and the consequences of this state of affairs.

[*Text*]

Mr. Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, the point I drew to your attention was that the hon. member for Lapointe was standing on the other side of the house with his back to Your Honour, and he has been doing that continuously. That is what I was drawing to Your Honour's attention, regardless of what the house leader had to say.

Mr. Speaker: I am glad to say that it is almost four o'clock and I am sure we can start a new regime immediately. I should add that the point raised is reasonable and well taken. Standing order 12 (1) says:

> Mr. Speaker shall preserve order and decorum, and shall decide questions of order, subject to an appeal to the house without debate.

The house is nice and quiet at the moment, and I do hope we can continue in that vein.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all hon. gentlemen who have contributed to my speech. I am sure that when I send the one copy home it will be read with very great interest.

As I was saying, one of the reasons for my believing there should be a plebiscite is that there was no proper mandate, certainly not from my constituency. As I said, news finally sifted down to the province of British Columbia that there might be some question of a flag raised in the last election, and it was a question put to all four candidates when they were attending four-party meetings. Those four candidates represented the Conservatives, the New Democratic party, the Liberal party and the Social Credit party. When the question was put to them as to what they would do about changing our Canadian flag, their answer in each case was specific and without qualification: "We will not change the present Canadian flag. It is our flag, and we will fight for it". I say this, Mr. Speaker, because it has been leaked all over the place exactly how the voting went in the committee. There is no question about it, the Liberals, the members of the New Democratic party, the Creditistes and the Social Crediters all voted against our Canadian flag, the red ensign. This has been leaked out by the press. I will not mention any names, but that was the result of the vote. It was leaked out, incidentally, by a Liberal.

Mr. Bell: Mr. "Leakman".

Mr. Pugh: In any event, to go back to the question of mandate, no one wishing to come to Ottawa and represent Okanagan Boundary heard anything about this, nor did they receive a request that the flag should be changed in any way, shape or form. This was the voice of the people. They elected me, but they also voted for the other candidates all down the line. I am wondering whether this did not happen in a great many more constituencies. I know that it certainly happened in the province of British Columbia. Therefore I wonder, just as the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) did this morning—another Liberal—what mandate we do have. The member for York-Humber made no bones about it; he pointed out that numerically he was here after having received a minority of the votes cast. He pointed out that numerically many, many of those members sitting on the government side of the chamber and in other parties, including our party, were here without receiving 50 per cent of the votes of their constituents. In fact very, very few members of parliament are here today with a majority vote from their constituencies. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, one asks, has there been a mandate? Then one asks, is there not a great deal of truth in that which the member for York-Humber brought forward this morning? It is true that people are sent here from everywhere in Canada, but it is an extraordinary thing that only one Liberal feels the government did not have a mandate. This is an extraordinary thing. Were the Liberals elected as Liberal members, or were they elected to come down here and throw Canada's flag into the ash can, and that is about what their action amounts to?

I do not think there is any clear mandate which can be relied upon. There has been a small amount of party literature circulated. I was very careful to watch for literature of

other parties in my constituency, but I do not remember anything—

Mr. O'Keefe: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Pugh: —about a proposed change in the flag of—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. O'Keefe: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Pugh: —Canada which would indicate to the people—

Mr. O'Keefe: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have recognized the hon. member for St. John's East.

Mr. O'Keefe: Mr. Speaker, I am a little tired about being told—

Mr. Pugh: Why do you not sit down?

Mr. O'Keefe: —that we are throwing Canada's flag in the ash can. Perhaps the hon. member opposite would read order No. 44(B) where he will see that the Prime Minister's motion—

Mr. Churchill: What is your point of order?

Mr. O'Keefe: —is to the effect that the union jack may be continued to be flown as a symbol of Canadian membership in the commonwealth of nations and of Canada's allegiance to the crown. Surely that is not throwing Canada's flag in the ash can.

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Speaker, I have yet to be convinced that the United Kingdom flag, or the royal union flag is Canada's flag. I recognize and appreciate the tone of the hon. member's voice. He is obviously from Newfoundland, and I can understand his concern, as I understand the concern of the chairman of the committee, about the actions of the government in this regard. If he will ask the members of that committee, and no doubt that information has already leaked out, he may find out what changes were made in that resolution at the last meeting of the committee, and then perhaps he will be satisfied that what I am saying is correct. Perhaps the hon. member will study again the original resolution which was brought forward by the government. What did that resolution suggest? It referred to the red ensign, not to the Canadian red ensign, whereas now you are referring to the union jack. The union jack is certainly not the red ensign and is not Canada's flag. Please do not try to confuse the issue. The hon. member from Newfoundland should be concerned because of the way this proposed flag was brought forward, and the second rate position into which the royal union flag has been placed, for certain obvious purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I did use the word "ash can". I will not use that word. The Canadian red ensign was turned down by the committee. I have explained this fact to the people of my riding, and that is one reason they demand a plebiscite. They feel they are now getting the real story of what took place at the committee meetings, and are beginning to understand that the report of that committee as it appears on the order paper does not give a clear picture of what took place.

The reason I recommend that three flags be presented to the people of Canada for a choice is that the people wish to have a say in which flag should be Canada's national flag. If the red ensign is turned down as the first choice, then the people will have made that choice. Had the efforts of the committee in arriving at its conclusion been represented accurately—

An hon. Member: Carried.

Mr. Pugh: If what we are presently discussing is carried, that will be marvellous.

After the red ensign was turned down in the committee by all members other than Conservative members, the Conservative members did their level best, as the members of that committee will testify, to produce a flag which would incorporate something symbolic of our past, such as the union jack and the fleur-de-lis. I do not agree with certain statements made by committee members who said that the fleur-de-lis could not form a part of a Canadian national flag because no French Canadian owed allegiance to royal France.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe that the member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Pugh) is entirely out of order. I would like to point out to the Chair that the Conservatives, who claim that this debate is important, at this moment only number 10 out of 95; and among those 10, one voted against the plebiscite, namely, the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer). When they claim that this debate is important and when only 10 are present in the house, it is evident that there is something wrong somewhere. Furthermore, they are always talking about something else than

the matter under discussion. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to be stricter and to call them to order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Tardif): Order. The fact that only 10 Conservative members are present does not mean that the rules are violated.

However, I may add that the hon. member who has the floor is out of order because he is not talking about the matter before us at this moment.

[*Text*]

I will repeat that in English, if I may. The fact that there are only ten members of the Conservative party in the house does not make the hon. member in order or out of order. The fact that the hon. member is not speaking to the question before the house for consideration does, however, make him out of order. The amendment having to do with a plebiscite is the subject now before this house for study.

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker, on this point of order, I should like to point out that the attendance of the Conservative members in this house this afternoon has been as good as, if not better than that of the members of any other party.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Tardif): Order, please.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Balcer: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Tardif): Order, order. I do not think the question raised by the hon. member as to members' attendance in this house has any relation to the subject now under study. The hon. member who made reference to attendance was himself out of order. The hon. member for Okanagan Boundary has the floor.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Balcer: Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to point out to the Chair that 10 Conservative members are worth at least 150 members of the other parties.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I must point out to the Chair that the hon. member for Three Rivers is not at the present time in his seat and that he should not be recognized.

Mr. Grégoire: Yes, it is true that the hon. member for Three Rivers is not in his seat.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Tardif): Order, please. The hon. member for Okanagan Boundary has the floor.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I should like to point out to the Chair that the hon. member for Three Rivers was not in his seat when he spoke.

There are six members of our party in the house now, that is 50 per cent, and they are worth at least 95 Conservatives.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Tardif): Order. The fact that the hon. member for Three Rivers was not speaking from his seat was taken into consideration by the Chair. Now we will listen to the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary.

[*Text*]

Mr. Skoreyko: I should like to speak to the question of privilege, or on the point of order, raised by the hon. member for Lapointe, Mr. Speaker, and his reference to the number of Conservative members in the House of Commons. I want to put on record the fact that the Conservative party has never abdicated its role in this house on the flag debate, as has the Creditiste party on a number of occasions when none of their members were in their seats.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Tardif): Order, please. I think the Chair has received sufficient advice as to which members are in their seats and which are not in their seats, and as to how many members are in the house, and as to how many are absent. Perhaps now we can have a little order so that we can listen to the rest of the hon. member's words of wisdom that are going to be placed on record.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles: The Speaker is not supposed to comment on the debate.

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Speaker, apparently I have been ruled out of order because I have not been referring to the plebiscite. I suggest with the greatest respect that about every 15th word I have used has been the word "plebiscite".

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the substitution in the Speaker's chair will make no difference with regard to any remarks that have been

made or any remarks I am about to make. As I have said, I feel there are a number of reasons for a plebiscite, and I am referring to those reasons and nothing else. I mentioned that the people of Canada are only now finding out about the decision of the flag committee. I mentioned the fact that I did not believe there was a mandate. I mentioned the fact that there was confusion and indecision arising out of the government's proposal, namely, the Pearson flag, and I said finally that to my mind there was not sufficient unanimity in the decision of the flag committee for us to accept it. The main motion was for concurrence in the sixth report of the flag committee, but I have had the opportunity—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: There are only nine Conservatives in the house now, because another one has just left.

[*Text*]

Mr. Herridge: Don't take any notice of that.

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether it would not be better to use the word "duck" in reference to that hon. member, than the word that has been used.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Pugh: I have put forward these four points and, when I was so rudely interrupted again, I was about to say that since the committee made its report on the flag I have had the opportunity of visiting my constituency. What I am putting forward today represents the very things that have been said to me and impressed upon me by my constituents. They tell me that for the reasons I have been putting forward and which I intend to keep on putting forward they feel they have a right to have the final vote themselves on the flag question by way of a plebiscite. I am not quite sure whether they want a plebiscite at the present time or at the next general election but it would save expense if it were held at the next general election and that might well be the time to have it.

Because of the interruptions, Mr. Speaker, I hope you will not mind while I pause for station announcements and to look over my notes. I said that confusion had come out of the flag committee and I mean just that. A great deal of the confusion was caused by the good public relations story written by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) which was blatantly published right across Canada prior to the committee report being presented to the house.

Mr. Grégoire: Now there are eight Conservatives here.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Could we have order, please.

Mr. Grégoire: That is terrible.

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Speaker, do we have to listen to that? I ask you to put that man out of the chamber so that I may continue my speech uninterrupted by him every five seconds. You must do it and I am asking you to do it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I can assure the hon. member that the Chair is listening with great interest to what he is saying. I am sure he will realize it is impossible for the Chair to make sure there is 100 per cent attention to everything that is said at all times. I assure the hon. member that I will protect him and protect his right to speak without interruption, if in the opinion of the Chair there is a disturbance that prevents hon. members who want to listen to him from having the opportunity and the advantage of hearing what he has to say.

Mr. Pugh: May I ask one more thing, Mr. Speaker. I have been watching the clock fairly carefully, but in view of the numerous interruptions and the speeches which have been interpolated into mine, I wonder whether you would advise me by what time my speech has to be concluded.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: This is not a proper question to the Chair. The hon. member has 40 minutes to speak and he will be allowed 40 minutes.

Mr. Pugh: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was referring to the confusion which has arisen over this matter and I mean just that. A great deal of that confusion has been generated by the pre-leaking or pre-publication of a story by a member of the committee which was grossly unfair and aroused quite a bit of indignation.

When I was in my constituency I was questioned about the laughter that went on in the committee. The people of Canada are worried about the flag that has been produced by this committee, a flag with laughter attached to it, a flag with a tactical advantage attached to it. I have only to refer to newspaper reports at the time. "Strategy is Big Blunder", says one Liberal member of the flag committee. Another one says, "Tac-

tics Fell Through", or something like that. It does not really matter. The point is that people asked me about this.

One member went on to say that there was a tremendous amount of laughter, that the Tories in the committee were completely baffled, that they were apparently taken off base and so on. When I discussed the matter with my constituents they told me in no uncertain terms that for this very reason they would like to have a vote on the flag. They want a vote and they should get it. If there was any laughter in that committee or any amazement on Tory faces it was due to one thing, that when the Pearson flag with three maple leaves and blue borders was being considered not one Liberal voted for it. Every Liberal voted against it. To me this means one thing, and it means one thing to the people of my constituency and to many more in British Columbia and elsewhere. It is why they are asking for a plebiscite. They are asking for a very good reason. They do not want a laughingstock flag. They do not want a tactical advantage flag. They do not want a strategic retreat flag or anything like that. They want to be able to look at the flags and decide for themselves.

I could quote the rather blatant language that the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra used. If the laughter meant anything to the Tory members of the committee it meant just three things. The Liberal members were laughing at their leader and their cabinet. They had said they were going to stand or fall on the three maple leaf flag and they made it a matter of confidence. They bedevilled parliament with it all the way through. The second reason why they were laughing was that they had kept all of us here throughout the spring and all during the summer and fall by shooting the flag at us, instead of dealing with important business. They tried to make out it was an important issue. The third thing they were laughing at was the people of Canada themselves. That laughter was hollow. Let us not produce a hollow flag as a result of it. That laughter was based on those three things, and by producing this flag at this time they have kept everybody in the country in an uproar and a state of unrest.

The Liberals have said to the people all across Canada that we are not getting along with the business of the house. What utter balderdash. That is not true. I think we have made a fair go at things in this session of parliament and it is time the people knew it. If we have spent 23 days on the flag the people should realize that we have been here for nearly 10 months. The people should realize that we were here all summer and that 23 days does not add up to much compared with ten months.

My people are annoyed about this matter. They say they have been bamboozled on the flag question from the beginning. We know the truth now and they jolly well should know the truth. I am not going to say any more now, although I have quite a bit more additional material. The people are annoyed at various things that have appeared in newspaper articles, one of which, as I say, was published prior to the committee presenting its report to the house. This was a most disgraceful thing. There was no reason for it whatsoever. The time of publication might have been an error on the part of that hon. member, but as the chairman of the committee knows I objected strongly to him at the time. I wonder how he feels? I wonder why he has not made a speech condemning this man, not because he allowed the article to be published prior to the presentation of the report but because of the misinformation he tried to feed the people of Canada. My people are annoyed about this and this is one of the reasons why they want to have a voice in the choosing of their own flag. They want to have a plebiscite. They want to be able to talk and make a decision outside of this flag committee. I was proud of this flag committee up until the very last morning. I was proud of it because I thought the members made an honest effort to get together. Certainly many of the members had fixed opinions at the start. There was no question about it. The Liberal members had a flag, and perhaps they bent over backwards when they voted for another flag. I think the other parties tried to be considerate.

When you look at the background of some of these members who were on that committee, you could not expect anything else. They were fixed in their determination to bring in a flag. I do not believe, for instance, that all members of the New Democratic party would agree with what their member finally decided. They have expressed this view in the House of Commons. In fact, the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge) said that a plebiscite is necessary. I agree with him 100 per cent. I only heard part of the speech delivered this morning by the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan). When I left I thought rather deeply about this speech and I asked myself, in demanding a plebiscite is this man a radical? I asked myself, is he a

person who is not a Liberal who somehow got in there? Then, I thought, no, I can look around the Liberal benches and realize, since I have friends over there, that a good proportion of them believe a plebiscite would be a good thing.

Mr. Grégoire: Ready for the question?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; the hon. member who has the floor has the right to continue his remarks without being interrupted.

Mr. Pugh: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Winkler: Before the hon. member proceeds, and since there was a break at this point, I wonder if he would clarify one point for me? It is the first time I have heard it raised in this house so far as I recall. I have listened with interest to his remarks, and would he reaffirm the statement that the Liberal members on the committee, in fact, did vote against the design that was proposed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson)?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; this point raised by the hon. member may be very interesting. Certainly, it seems to me that the point was made previously by the hon. member who has the floor. However, it does appear to the Chair to be a little remote from the amendment which is under consideration.

Mr. Pugh: I rather think the hon. member who posed the question has run into the same thing in his riding as I have and, no doubt, as a lot of Liberal members have as well. It is this: How was it that 14 members in the committee could have voted for a flag if they did not want it? The answer is very simple. There was no vote for that flag. There was a preference vote between the three maple leaf flag and the one maple leaf flag. These were the only two flags left before the committee. We were asked for our preference. We Conservatives could not vote for the three maple leaf design. Were the Liberals going to vote for the three maple leaf design? Well, after sweating it out here during the summer and most of the fall, you would have thought that possibly the Liberals would have voted for a flag which had been put to us on a take it or leave it basis. You would have thought that. I am glad the hon. gentleman did pose the question because a lot of people do not understand there was a preference. However, everyone voted against that Pearson flag; no one voted for it, not even one teeny, weeny, little Liberal.

Now, to me, it is a shocking thing—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; in the remaining minutes the hon. member has at his disposal, I wonder if he would limit his remarks to the subject matter of the debate?

Mr. Pugh: Well, yes, Mr. Speaker; if I had another 20 minutes, I would go on—

Mr. Grégoire: No, no; spare us.

Mr. Pugh: If I had another 20 minutes, I would go on extolling the virtues of the hon. member for York-Humber, the one Liberal who spoke this morning. I would recommend to the people all over Canada that they read his speech. I would recommend that they take his speech to heart. I would recommend that Liberal members should take it to heart. I hope that when you open your mail and when you read your newspapers or listen to other news media throughout Canada tomorrow, you will really take these remarks to heart because, in my opinion, they present the crux of the whole situation. As I say, Mr. Speaker, if I had 20 minutes I would take portions of that speech and put them forward.

However, may I content myself by saying, in conclusion, that there is merit, not only merit but absolute necessity, in the idea of holding a plebiscite at the present time. My reason for saying this is that the people of Canada have before them something that goes deeper than a little piece of legislation which is brought before the house. It goes to the very depth of our being, our historical background, and all of those things which count. This is not something that can be settled as easily as some legislative matters.

However, there is a far more important factor in my opinion, and that is that parliament is not the place to settle the flag question. This flag issue should be removed from parliament now so, as some hon. members suggest, we can get on with other more important business. I have another reason which I feel is cogent and irrefutable, and that is that so far as the public are concerned the flag question has become political in the extreme. I feel that if there is any choice made in this House of Commons, people all over Canada are going to remain divided on this issue. There is not going to be any settlement of it by a vote of this House of Commons. There will always be a substantial number of people who will feel the flag has been railroaded through. Later on, it will be felt that the flag has been railroaded through by a minority or, as the hon. member for York-Humber has said, by a

minority of minorities, because most members who sit in this house are here on minority votes.

As I said before, I do not want a flag that is the laughingstock of the country, or one that was brought about by tactics. I want a flag that I can look at, just as I look at our Canadian flag today, a flag that has my respect, a flag which I know has the respect of the nations around the world.

Mr. F. J. W. Fane (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped I would not have found it necessary to make a second speech on the flag issue and make it today. I say that I had hoped I would not have been called upon to make a speech at this time because it was my hope, my vain hope, that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) would have smartened up to some extent by this time and would have seen the handwriting on the wall or listened to the voice of the people of Canada demanding that the flag issue be settled by a plebiscite. Either that, or it should be dropped entirely because we want to continue with the flag that has been Canada's for so many years, at least until it becomes possible to choose a flag that will represent the wishes of the vast majority of the people of Canada.

It is amazing that in their wisdom the Prime Minister and the government have not seen fit to call this debate off. It is not the opposition that is continuing the debate; it is the government. The majority of the people of Canada wish to have a chance to say what flag shall be Canada's for all time to come. This is not a today, tomorrow or next year deal. When the flag is chosen it will be forever.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. There are conversations going on across the aisle, something which is highly reprehensible and which makes it difficult for the Chair to follow the speech being made. If hon. members wish to continue their conversations I invite them to do so outside the chamber.

Mr. Fane: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, although I must say it does not worry me because I have been interrupted many times from the people on my left. As I was saying, the vast majority of the people of Canada—

Mr. Grégoire: Only six now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fane: As I remarked, Mr. Speaker, the leader of "la canaille à gauche", that is the rabble to the left does not worry me a bit, but I can tell you that whenever he carries on in this way he is degrading the house.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. May I invite the hon. member to return to the subject of his speech. I realize the hon. member was interrupted and I have tried to co-operate with him, but I would ask him to co-operate with the Chair and deal with the subject matter of the debate.

Mr. Fane: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, the people of Canada should have a chance to say whether they favour a new flag or not. They should have a chance to choose a flag which they can respect and, if necessary, fight for. It should be a flag worth that. The choice of a flag is for keeps and the majority of the people realize this.

The action of the Prime Minister makes me wonder who is blackmailing him and why he must pass on this blackmailing to parliament and the people of Canada. We are being presented with a flag that the majority of the people do not want pushed down their throats. I do not need to tell you where I stand, Mr. Speaker, because I am sure everybody in the country knows that the hon. member for Vegreville, Alberta, stands for a plebiscite on the flag issue. I also stand for the continuation of the Canadian red ensign as the flag of Canada, at least until we get something else that is worth standing for, looking up to and fighting for, and we sure have not got anything like that brought before us yet.

It has been suggested that the flag was the subject of an election promise in the 1962 and 1963 elections, but I can assure you it was not an issue in my constituency. I have told you previously that whenever I was asked about the flag I made it perfectly clear what flag I stood for, and why. In fact I got a standing ovation at each one of my meetings where I was asked about the flag. There were six candidates in my constituency and none of them mentioned the flag at any of the 12 joint meetings we had, and in addition to those meetings I had 45 meetings of my own. I believe 86 per cent of the eligible voters in my constituency voted and I got approximately 70 per cent of their votes. For that reason I believe I have a mandate to continue the attitude I have towards a plebiscite and a flag for Canada.

I know that the flag committee worked assiduously. It held 45 meetings in six weeks. Its members were chosen from all parties in the house and I know they were most fortunate in having such an estimable member

as the hon. member for Humber-St. George's (Mr. Batten) as their chairman. Nobody can point a finger at anything wrong in what he did or said during the time he was chairman of that committee.

I am not qualified to say anything about how the committee did its work because I was not a member of it. I was perhaps a little too set in my ways on the Conservative side because, in the light of what has happened, I would not have given up one little bit of my support for the Canadian red ensign. However, I must say I was very shocked at the result of the committee's deliberations in bringing forward a flag that is not distinctive in any way. It certainly has got a red maple leaf, a dead maple leaf on it, but its background is exactly the same as the flag of Peru. How can that be considered a distinctive Canadian flag? The maple leaf alone is not adequate to make it distinctive. Though I hold the maple leaf in high regard it is not distinctive of Canada, except as an emblem used during war and on Canadian exports. In the part of Canada from which I come a great many of the people do not know what this is all about because they have never seen a maple leaf.

Before I get into trouble I intend to read the amendment which is before the house because I have to have something to follow and if I read this I will be speaking within the narrow lines of what I may speak about; I do not want to get off the track because I do not like to be called to order. The amendment moved by my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Monteith) is as follows:

> That the sixth report of the special committee be not now adopted but that it be referred back to the committee with instructions to strike out paragraph 7 of the said report and substitute therefor the following:
>
> "However, as the final vote of the committee did not reveal a sufficient degree of unanimity for the proposed design for a national flag for Canada your committee therefore recommends that the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to conduct a plebiscite to be held at the next general election in order that the Canadian people may be given heir rightful opportunity to declare their choice concerning a national flag".
>
> And that the committee for such purpose be revived.

That is what I have to talk about for the rest of the time allotted to me.

I am amazed that so far only three of the members of the flag committee from the government side have seen fit to stand up and make their reports to the House of Commons and to the people of Canada. The five members from the Conservative party have made their reports. As to the members from the smaller parties, I believe none has so far made his report.

An hon. Member: There is one; the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott).

Mr. Fane: I am sorry. I am reminded that the hon. member for Danforth, of the New Democratic party, has made his report. I regret I omitted him. But the situation on the other side of the house is a very strange one. One wonders what is happening in the Liberal party. Have these people been told they must not speak? Are they afraid to speak? Surely they are not just zombies, now, unable to make up their minds about anything. One member has said his piece. He said it very well today and he is worthy of respect throughout Canada. As to the other two members who spoke from the government benches, the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Cadieux) made a good and sensible speech while the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) was his usual self. We will leave it at that.

This is only part of what we fail to understand. We wonder why during the last election spokesmen for the government said nothing about this intention to introduce a new flag. I suggest there was one good reason for this silence. Had the Liberal party come out and shown the people of Canada the flag they proposed to foist on them there would be 75 fewer Liberals in this house today. The people of Canada would not have accepted such a proposal no matter what they might have felt otherwise. I believe this to be a fact.

Speaking of the plebiscite, if the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and the government are so sure they are right and that the people are behind them in their wish to have a new flag for Canada, why are they so afraid of letting the people express their views at the time of the next election? The cost would not be very great. In any case considerations as to cost would not deter the present government because they spend money like water, like a drunken sailor does, or is alleged to do. The amount of money it would cost to conduct a plebiscite on the flag issue at the time of the next election would be very small compared to the cost of the election itself. Indeed, about the only extra cost would be the extra ballot papers required and the transportation of those ballots to a central place for evaluation. Presumably less division would be created in Canada if the ballots were all brought to Ottawa and counted here. This flag

issue is one which has divided Canada and set one part against another. And all this has happened for no good reason at all, because this issue is nothing but a phony issue; it is not a real issue in this country.

The people of Canada have a flag which they have looked up to and for which they have fought. Many thousands of Canadians have died under it. Though we did not carry it along with our advancing columns during the war, it was behind us. It was there. So we can say we lived under that flag, we fought for it, and many died for it.

In case anyone here has forgotten the constituency that I represent, let me remind him it is a constituency comprised of some 45,000 people. There are people of 40 different national origins there. There are 6,100 Anglo-Saxons. There are 30,000 whose origin is in some part of central Europe and 1,300 people of French Canadian origin. In addition there are 1,300 of our original citizens—the people we call North American Indians. Also living in this constituency are 3,000 people of German extraction, besides many of Norwegian, Swedish, Danish and Finnish origin, as well as representatives of almost every other nationality one cares to mention. I would say that 90 per cent of these people want a plebiscite. They want a voice in choosing the flag which will fly over them, a flag they will be able to respect. That is what they say. I think that if the plebiscite were held there would be an almost 100 per cent turnout of electors because, as I have said, in the last election I believe 86 per cent of the electors of my constituency turned out to vote.

I have had many, many letters from and many, many interviews with various people in my constituency. I said in my last address that only three people had told me they stood for the three maple leaf flag. I have had one letter supporting this new flag with one red maple leaf on a white background, with red borders at each end of the flag. This man wrote to me, "Let's stop talking about it and get on with the business of Canada".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fane: That is one man out of 45,000, which is not a very big percentage.

Mr. Brewin: One wise man.

Mr. Fane: I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that the N.D.P. did not do too well in my constituency, and they are not likely to do well in the future either. I am just stating facts which have nothing to do with me, but just with them. Thousands of people have told me, "Let's have a plebiscite and let's say what flag we want". That is my mandate, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I can stand up today in this house, or on any other day that I am allowed to do so, and say these things; and what I have said I will say anywhere, because I am willing to stand behind anything I have said.

Mr. Leduc: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit one question?

Mr. Fane: I certainly will permit one question from my hon. friend.

Mr. Leduc: The hon. member has mentioned that he stands behind every word he has said. Would he stand behind his word when he said that the people in his riding did not know what a maple leaf was?

Mr. Fane: I said that the vast majority of my people had never seen a maple leaf, and that is quite different. They know what a maple leaf is supposed to look like, but they have never seen one, because they do not grow in my part of the country.

Mr. Dupuis: You don't have any money there? You can't travel and see them?

An hon. Member: Not from selling bumper stickers.

Mr. Fane: Oh, I could not take a trip to Asia and all over the world, as did the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis). I do not have the government behind me at the moment.

Mr. Dinsdale: He was selling stickers.

An hon. Member: Haven't your people seen pictures of a maple leaf?

Mr. Fane: You can see a replica or depiction of something almost anywhere, but until you come to this part of the country you probably do not see maple leaves in real life.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Fane: How profound, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Dupuis: Question.

Mr. Fane: I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that after all these interruptions members of the various parties who have been yelling for the question to be put think I am going to sit down and let it happen. How wrong they are, because I am just not that type. I wish to say again that it amazes me that all the Liberal members do not rise in their seats

and say where they stand on this flag issue. Are they scared? Are they brainwashed? Are they just following orders, like the trained seals they are emulating? They will not get up and speak; they only speak from their seats. They will not get up and identify themselves. Are they sitting on the fence in the hope that they will get some reflected glory because they did not say anything? They are plenty vocal at other times, so why do they not get up and speak in this debate? Why can they not get up and state where they stand, in some way other than just sitting in their seats and interrupting those who hope they have something to say in which their people will be interested? That also goes for the other parties, the lesser groups in this house. They are not carrying their weight in this debate; they sit around and yell "filibuster" and let it go at that. That is their contribution. What a contribution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It being five o'clock the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely public bills and private bills.

REPRESENTATION ACT

AMENDMENT TO CHANGE NAME OF LAPOINTE CONSTITUENCY

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-66, to amend the Representation Act.

He said:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, it will only take me two minutes to explain this bill. Its purpose is to change the name of the electoral district of "Lapointe" to that of "Jonquière".

I should remind the house that such was the promise made by Liberal candidates during the last election.

As a matter of fact, I wish to point out that this promise was made by the former Liberal member for Lapointe, Mr. Augustin Brassard, at a public meeting attended by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), who applauded and said the promise would be kept.

The promise was also made by the Liberal candidate during the 1963 election campaign.

It was also taken up by the Tory candidates during the 1962 and 1963 elections.

It was also promised by the N.D.P. candidate in 1963; that party had no candidate in my riding, in 1962.

In fact, I was the only one not to promise that. I felt that it should not be part of my platform, but it was promised by the Liberal candidate and former member, for the riding, before the present Prime Minister, who was then leader of the opposition. That promise was made with the approval of the present Prime Minister, and in his presence. Since the Prime Minister now seeks to keep his promise concerning the adoption of a national flag within two years, I am sure he will want his party to keep the promise made by its candidate in the riding of Lapointe, just as he is making praiseworthy efforts to keep his pledge with respect to the adoption of a distinctive flag.

Mr. Speaker, I did not make that promise during the election campaign, but afterwards, I received many such requests from chambers of commerce, service clubs and the municipalities of Jonquière, Kénogami and Arvida. I even received some from tourist associations, etc., because all feel that by substituting the name of Jonquière for that of Lapointe, it would be easier to locate the riding in the interest of the tourist industry and others.

Mr. Speaker, the constituency of Lapointe has been named after Jean Lapointe, the first farmer in that area. The name of Msgr. Lapointe, the first bishop of the diocese, is also mentioned.

Mr. Choquette: And Ernest Lapointe.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lotbinière has just mentioned the name of Mr. Ernest Lapointe. But in the opinion of all, the riding was so named in honour of the first farmer of the district, Mr. Jean Lapointe.

Under the circumstances, there are no political implications involved. As a matter of fact, the provincial riding bears the name of Jonquière, and since the largest city of the county is called Jonquière, there is every indication that this name would be more appropriate and, at the same time, more suitable for the people.

Representatives of all political parties have submitted requests to me and the Liberal member for Jonquière in the Quebec legislature told me himself that he approved this change of designation. It must be remembered that he also represents a large number of electors.

Therefore, I submit that this bill deals with a change of name only and does not involve any government policy. It is only a matter of granting the wishes of the electors of that riding.

It has been said also that consideration of that bill could be postponed until redistribution has been completed because the limits of some ridings will change.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make it clear that the limits of the riding of Lapointe will not change because our region is rather remote, a national park a hundred miles long cuts through it and there is not a house, post office or resident near it. Therefore, nothing will be added to it.

In the area itself, the four constituencies are extremely well divided, proportionately, according to new standards adopted in the legislation concerning redistribution.

No changes are expected in our area.

Mr. Speaker, before ending my remarks, I would like to say that if the house welcomes this change of name, it will be an all-party agreement. One group will not be allowed to take credit for it more than another because it is a matter where there is no room for politics. I am not asking this change for a personal advantage but for that of my constituents.

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. Grégoire: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Dupuis: Could the hon. member tell the house whether the constituency of Lapointe also includes the municipalities of Arvida and Kénogami? If so, does he not think that he should include the names of Kénogami and Arvida and change the present designation of his constituency to that of Kénogami-Jonquière-Arvida?

Does he not feel that, should changes be made a few months from now, following the redistribution—and time only will tell—should the municipalities of Arvida and Kénogami be removed from the riding of Lapointe, it would be wiser to wait until the establishment of the new redistribution since everything could then be settled in a more useful and permanent way?

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Minister without Portfolio has asked that question, and I wish to tell him that I have had representations from the Jonquière, Kénogami and Arvida chambers of commerce, as well as from social clubs in Kénogami and Arvida. All these organizations requested, almost unanimously, that the name of the electoral district be changed to Jonquière only, and not to Jonquière-Kénogami-Arvida.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Representatives from the various service clubs in the towns of Arvida and Kénogami made representations with a view to changing the name of the electoral district to Jonquière, and that opinion was unanimous throughout the district.

The representatives of owners' leagues in Jonquière and Arvida also requested that it be named only Jonquière, and not Jonquière-Kénogami-Arvida.

Moreover, it is not always advantageous to represent a riding with a compound or long name like St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville. In fact, I remember hearing the Minister without Portfolio say that the name of his constituency is rather long. I can even recall that two years ago he said that St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville was a rather long name for an electoral district, and I think he was right at the time.

Mr. Speaker, since the representatives of the four parties of the riding of Lapointe as well as the Liberal member for Jonquière at the legislative assembly unanimously agree that the constituency of Lapointe should bear the name of Jonquière, I feel that we should pass this bill. It would then be a move made by the four political parties, not only by one. We would thus meet the wishes of my constituents, in general those who live in the riding of Lapointe, and I would be happy if the promise made officially by the Liberal candidate, in 1962, in the presence of the present Prime Minister, were kept. All the voters in the riding of Lapointe would then be satisfied.

[*Text*]

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question? He is probably aware that in English we sometimes say that a rose by any other name would smell as sweet. I am sure there is a comparable expression in French. I am wondering whether we would feel the same about the hon. member, whom we have got to know and love as the member for Lapointe, if his name were changed. Would he smell the same with a different name?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) may rest assured that, within a month, he will have heard the name of the constituency Jonquière often enough so that this name will become as favourably known as it was in the past.

Mr. G. C. Lachance (Lafontaine): Mr. Speaker, we heard the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) mention the promises made by the former member for Lapointe, by the former candidates and by the provincial members.

But apart from the statements which were made in this house by the hon. member for Lapointe, I have no personal knowledge of any representations which would have been made—

Mr. Grégoire: In Montreal.

Mr. Lachance: —either by the electors of this riding or by the various organizations, chambers of commerce, municipalities, etc. Mr. Speaker, changing the name of a riding is just as serious as changing the name of an individual, and the hon. member for Lapointe must have very serious and interesting reasons to put forward this request, but the house must study this question as seriously as it would for any other riding.

He spoke of the representations made to him.

As I just said, I personally did not get any. I never heard about that. It may be that I did not happen to read certain newspapers of that area which might have dealt with the question, but I never heard about it in my riding, in Montreal or in Ottawa.

Mr. Grégoire: No wonder.

Mr. Lachance: Have representations been made also to other authorities, to this government or to the chief electoral officer?

I could not say but I never heard about it.

Now, as the hon. member for Lapointe said, the name of the riding would be changed as a result of representations made by candidates or members. It could be a good reason for discussing the matter. That is what we are doing today.

But I do not feel it is sufficient reason to pass the bill as hastily as all that, without giving it very serious consideration.

A moment ago the hon. member for Lapointe referred to the forthcoming redistribution. Perhaps the boundaries of this constituency will not be changed but, there again, the hon. member can give us no assurance.

Indeed, the hon. member for St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville (Mr. Dupuis) told us that other cities and towns might be interested.

If an inquiry were made, perhaps we would find that both Arvida and Kenogami are interested in having their name given to the constituency now called Lapointe.

There are other municipalities in the constituency of Lapointe. I am sure that the hon. member for Lapointe knows them very well because he has surely visited them. There are, in addition to Jonquière, the municipalities of Larouche, Bourget, Taché —great names—

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I would point out to the hon. member for Lafontaine that there are no municipalities of Bourget and Taché, but that there are the townships of Bourget and Taché.

As this hon. member seems to have absolutely no information about my constituency, I am not surprised to see that he was not aware of any representations—

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The hon. member may disagree with what is being said by the hon. member for Lafontaine. The point he is raising now is refutation. It is not a point of order. The hon. member for Lafontaine.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of course, of the store of knowledge of the hon. member for Lapointe, but I think he must know whether township municipalities exist. When one mentions a township or a municipality, it is for the purpose of an enumeration and I note that after the towns of Larouche, Bourget and Taché we also find Labrie and Bégin, for example—

Mr. Choquette: Would the hon. member allow me a question?

Does the municipality owe its name to Hon. Joseph D. Bégin, a great friend of the hon. member for Lapointe?

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I cannot—

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, there is in fact a municipality of Bégin. The name has existed for a long time; it is a parish where respectable persons are living and I could not perhaps say as much about the hon. member for Lotbinière.

Mr. Lachance: I should like to add that the constituency of Lapointe was established following the 1941 census. It was created in 1947 under a new legislation, and it was first represented by Mr. Jules Gauthier.

Mr. Grégoire: A notary from Jonquière.

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Speaker, I did some research in order to find the origin of the name of this constituency.

The hon. member for Lapointe referred to a certain Jean Lapointe, a farmer of that district.

People I met told me that there might be some relationship between the designation of that riding and the name of a great Canadian, Hon. Ernest Lapointe, as well as that of Bishop Lapointe, at one time teacher at the Chicoutimi seminary and also vicar general of the Chicoutimi diocese, who died in 1947.

It should also be noted that the hon. member for Lapointe did mention it a few moments ago.

If we refer to a speech which is probably the first made by the first member of parliament for Lapointe in this house, we can read this, among other things, as reported in *Hansard* for April 4, 1950, page 1559:

> The county of Lapointe the name of which recalls both Mgr. Eugène Lapointe and his namesake the former minister of justice, owes to him—at least to a great extent—its existence as a distinct unit.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the first hon. member for Lapointe is apparently recalling—and this was in 1950, shortly after the setting up of the county—that that name has some connection with those of Mgr. Eugène Lapointe and the Hon. Ernest Lapointe. However, he did not mention the name of Mr. Jean Lapointe who was no doubt an honourable gentleman but only referred to Mr. Ernest Lapointe and Mgr. Lapointe.

Now, it could be that that name was chosen to commemorate the name of Mr. Jean Lapointe, but, personally, I think that if the house is of the opinion that Hon. Mr. Ernest Lapointe was a great statesman and if the name of Lapointe should be changed today, I would be very sorry to see that name disappear when it commemorates such important men as the former minister of justice, that great French Canadian statesman.

I also noticed several other things. The citizens of the city of Jonquière would certainly be very pleased to see the name of the riding changed to Jonquière. The hon. member for Lapointe told us that some people in Arvida and Kénogami were also in agreement.

I said that personally I had never heard of it. I would think that the people of Jonquière would not want to be accused of selfishness with regard to the other two large cities of that riding by having the name of the riding changed.

I congratulate the hon. member on the love he feels for his riding. But I do not think he should let his love strangle and kill it by wanting to give it a new entity through a new name, for instance.

There is no doubt that this matter of redistribution, which is to be carried out soon, is extremely important at this stage. I do not think the house has given adequate consideration to this problem to be able to take a decision today. There is a committee which has been established through legislation passed by the house to study the problem of redistribution. I believe, and the hon. member for Lapointe is quite aware of it, that representations could be made to the commissioners and other people whose function it is to study the problems of the new redistribution.

That is all I have to say. I know that the hon. member for Lapointe is interested in this matter. I commend him for it. But we are interested too in having more details. I should appreciate it very much if the hon. member for Lapointe would send us copies of those resolutions from municipalities or organizations, if any. We must admit that within a municipality or an association, there could be one group in favour of a certain project while the other would not be. I do not know whether the majority of associations within his riding wish the name to be changed. I do not know whether there is a majority of municipalities or cities in favour of that change.

The hon. member for Lapointe said he made no promises. I congratulate him for this. He did not promise to change the name. I suggest he must feel very comfortable, whether a change is made or not. Therefore, if the hon. member for Lapointe made no promises in this regard his electors should not hold anything against him in the event of the name of the Lapointe constituency remaining as it is.

Mr. Grégoire: It is impossible, Mr. Speaker, because my constituents, far from holding a grudge against me, are satisfied with me.

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Speaker, I submit that before the house decides to change the name of a constituency, particularly when it is a constituency bearing the name of great men whose names went down in history, the matter has to be considered very seriously. Moreover, all those of this riding who are represented by associations or groups of the various political parties, and even those who are not interested in politics, must be heard. Otherwise, it would

remove famous names from the electoral map, thus creating a most important precedent.

Mr. Grégoire: Would the hon. member allow a question?

Mr. Lachance: Certainly.

Mr. Grégoire: After hearing the hon. member for Lafontaine, I feel he would probably be in favour of holding a plebiscite in his electoral district, in this connection. Is that what he means when he says that everyone would like to be heard? Is that what he is suggesting, that a plebiscite be held in the district of Lapointe?

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Speaker, I am in a good position to answer this question, for I have not spoken of a plebiscite but only of the resolutions put forward by various public organizations. The hon. member for Lapointe introduced the subject himself, saying he had received representations from various municipal councils, public organizations, chambers of commerce and others.

I have not seen as yet the resolution by those public bodies or those municipalities.

I do not know if the hon. member for Lapointe has resolutions from those public bodies. This is not a question of a plebiscite. I did not say that the voters of the constituency should cast their votes to decide if it must change its name, if it must be called the constituency of Lapointe or if it should changed to the constituency of Jonquière or, as suggested or mentioned by the hon. member for St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville (Mr. Dupuis), to the name of Kenogami-Jonquière-Arvida.

We are prepared to accept the word of the hon. member for Lapointe when he says that representations were made to him. Only we did not see those representations, and we would be interested in questioning those people through some committee which might be interested in hearing them. Changing the name of a riding is a very serious matter.

Those were the remarks I intended to make on that issue. I am not against the change, but I would like this matter to be considered more closely by a special committee or by the privileges and elections committee.

Mr. Grégoire: How many members would sit on the committee? Would this matter be referred to a parliamentary committee?

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a committee which could examine the case quite properly, the privileges and elections committee.

However, Mr. Speaker, I was talking more particularly about the committee which is looking after redistribution at present. That was the agency I was referring to when I mentioned that a committee or a public body could be appointed to examine this question.

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I commend the hon. member for Lafontaine (Mr. Lachance) for his speech on the bill before us. I agree with his views and on the way he looks upon the situation.

First of all, I think the constituency of Lapointe, as was clearly pointed out by the hon. member for Lafontaine, was named after great public men, two great French Canadians: Monseigneur Lapointe and Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe.

As French Canadians we are proud that the name of one of our great Canadians who distinguished himself in public life be preserved forever in our memory through the designation of a county, an electoral constituency in the province of Quebec.

Here may I recall a souvenir going back to the first days of the war. It seems that I can still hear Hon. Ernest Lapointe, one fall evening, speak for Canada in bidding godspeed to those of us who were about to go and defend our liberties outside the country.

It was most edifying to hear Hon. Ernest Lapointe, and I am convinced that it was especially so across French Canada where the people were particularly proud to see the fate of Canada in the hands of such a great man.

There are also many other reasons, as mentioned by the hon. member for Lafontaine, why we should keep the name of Lapointe for the county represented in the house by the sponsor of this bill. I think the hon. member for Lafontaine made a strong case when he suggested that the whole question be fully considered before a decision is reached. There is also the matter of redistribution and I am afraid the county of Lapointe will not be spared.

There again, changes will be made and, for all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the hon. member for Lafontaine is perfectly right.

I cannot but wonder in seeing that the present member for Lapointe who usually attaches so much importance to Canadian names and who calls for special attention concerning anything of interest to French Canadians, has thought of suggesting a new name for his riding. He may not have done

so deliberately, but if we agreed to the change, we would be responsible to a certain degree towards our fellow citizens for insinuations to the effect that we do not show enough regard and respect for the memory of a man who has played such an important role in Canadian politics, Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe. But, personally, I think that changing the name of a riding, as was so well said by the hon. member for Lafontaine, is somewhat like changing the name of an individual. It must be done only if the reasons for such a change are sufficient.

I am sorry to tell the hon. member for Lapointe that I think the reasons he put forward are not important. I like to see the whole people of a riding pay homage to one of our compatriots who gave the best of his life, in saying that they live in the riding named after one of our great Canadians, namely Ernest Lapointe.

Mr. Speaker, I have other reasons to oppose the change of name—reasons that I would rather keep to myself—and I believe that as a representative in this house, I do not have to grant any consideration to the hon. member requesting such a change. For all those reasons, I shall oppose the adoption of this bill.

[*Text*]

Mr. John Mullally (Kings): Mr. Speaker, the bill sponsored by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) reads in part:

> Paragraph 25 of that part of the schedule to the Representation Act, dealing with the description of the electoral districts in the province of Quebec, which describes the electoral district of Lapointe, is amended by substituting for the word: "Lapointe", the word: "Jonquière" at the beginning of the said description.

In essence its purpose is to change the name of the riding. Like the other two hon. members who preceded me I regret I have to oppose this request by our good friend from Lapointe.

I should start out by saying that the constituency of Lapointe arose out of a report by a committee that was appointed following the census of 1941 to change the representation of the various constituencies. That committee reported in 1947, and the substance of the report can be summarised in these few words: "The committee recommends a new constituency, known as Lapointe, to be created out of the western half of Chicoutimi."

When the report of that committee was incorporated in the Representation Act of 1952, which the hon. member seeks to amend, it said, speaking of Lapointe:

> The Representation Act, 1947, chapter 71, 11 George VI, states:
>
> Lapointe, consisting of the city of Arvida and the towns of Kénogami and Jonquière, together with that part of the county of Chicoutimi situated west of the western limits of the townships of Gagné, Tremblay, Chicoutimi, Laterrière, the western part of the townships of Lartigue and Lapointe situated west of the Boisvert river (Cyriac) together with the whole territory situated north of the townships of Falardeau, Bégin, Labrecque, and west of a meridian line passing through the northeast angle of the township of Falardeau.

That is the description of the hon. member's riding.

It might be interesting for the house to know—and this relates to an observation made a few moments ago by the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis)—that this is not the first effort to have the name of the hon. member's riding changed.

On January 15, 1957 the then hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Girard), who was an independent member, introduced Bill C-11 for the purpose of changing the name of the electoral district of Lapointe to that of Jonquière-Kénogami-Arvida. The bill was read for the first time and did not come up for debate subsequently that session. I believe, Mr. Speaker, this indicates that the suggestion made by the Minister without Portfolio has some merit because, as I understand it, the three largest localities or cities in the hon. member's riding, according to the 1961 census, are Jonquière, with a population of 28,000 odd, Arvida, with a population of 14,000 odd and Kénogami with a population of 11,000 odd.

I would like very briefly to relate the history of various efforts made during the past 12 years, since the Representation Act of 1952, by members representing different constituencies to have the names of their constituencies changed. From the very quick bit of research I did I find there were 20 bills introduced during those 12 years to have the names of constituencies changed. This is probably not a correct figure because in some instances they were repetitions of previous efforts that were unsuccessful, or which did not come up for debate in the house.

Of these 20 attempts that were made only five were successful. I shall review them quickly and indicate which were successful, but in most cases it will be found that rather than changing the name of a constituency there was merely added another word to make

the name more meaningful, and representative of all the area covered by the riding.

The first effort to have a name changed was in the 1952-53 session when Mr. Studer attempted to have the riding Swift Current changed to Swift Current-Maple Creek. That was not successful but in the following session a successful attempt was made by Mr. Harrison to have the name changed to Swift Current-Maple Creek.

In 1955 the present hon. member for the riding of Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. McWilliam) was successful in having the name Miramichi added to the riding of Northumberland in New Brunswick. In 1957 Mr. Girard, in the instance I have just mentioned, attempted to have the name Lapointe changed to Jonquière-Chicoutimi. This did not come up for debate and, of course, no change was made. In 1959, Mr. Fréchette attempted to have the name Témiscouata changed to Rivière-du-Loup-Témiscouata. The bill lapsed. In the same session the hon. member now representing Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) attempted to have the name of the territory of Keewatin-Franklin changed to Northwest Territories. He made a number of attempts before he was finally successful. In 1960 there was an effort by the hon. member for the constituency then known as Humboldt-Melfort (Mr. Rapp) to add the word "Tisdale" to the name of the constituency, and the hon. member was unsuccessful. Again in the same session the hon. member for Yukon was unsuccessful in having the name Keewatin-Franklin changed to its present title.

In the session 1960-61 there were at least four attempts to have the names of ridings changed. This time the hon. member for the constituency then known as Humboldt-Melfort was successful in having the name "Tisdale" added to the other two names of his riding. An attempt was made by Mr. Asselin to have the name Montmorency added to Charlevoix. It was unsuccessful. Mr. Valade sought to have the name of his riding, St. Mary's, changed to Camilien Houde. He was unsuccessful.

In 1962, the hon. member for Yukon was successful at last in having the name of the riding of Keewatin-Franklin changed to the Northwest Territories as it is now, and the representative for the constituency then known as Nanaimo, Mr. Matthews, was successful in having the name of that riding changed to Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands. The then hon. member representing Inverness-Richmond, Mr. MacLellan, attempted to have the name of that riding changed to Inverness-Richmond-Cape Breton West. He was unsuccessful. The then hon. member for Halifax, Mr. Morris, sought to have the name of that riding changed to Halifax, Dartmouth and County, but he was unsuccessful.

In the more recent sessions of 1962-63 and 1963 the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Bélanger) attempted to have the name Montmorency added to that of his riding but he was not successful. Now in 1964 we have before us the bill brought up by the hon. member for Lapointe asking the house that the name of the constituency of Lapointe be changed to Jonquière.

My hon. friend from Lafontaine (Mr. Lachance) supported by an hon. member opposite gave proper reasons, in my view, why the name of Lapointe should be retained. Despite what the sponsor of the bill had to say, I believe this riding was named after a great Canadian statesman, the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe. The hon. member in introducing this bill told us, as far as I can gather, that the main reason for seeking a change was that all the other candidates and party leaders except himself had promised the name would be changed. In view of what happened in that riding during the election I would imagine that the hon. member, who of course was successful, would be superstitious enough to be reluctant to have the name altered in any way.

I am opposing a change in name for three reasons. First, as I said, I believe this riding was named for a great French Canadian, Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, a statesman who made an outstanding contribution to the public life of this country. I am sure this view will be shared by those of my colleagues, and others, who come from the province of Quebec and who would, I am sure, be unhappy to see the name of this gentleman taken from its present place. I could speak at length about the contribution made to Canadian public life by Mr. Lapointe but I do not think this is the occasion on which to do so. But I think it would be wrong for us to make any effort to change the name of a riding which was, I am sure, called after this great French Canadian statesman.

My second reason for opposing this bill is the fact that we recently set up a redistribution commission to bring about necessary changes in the constituencies of this country. In these circumstances I think it would be premature to make any effort to change even the name of a constituency. I do not think there is any good reason for the request contained in this bill. From rumours most of us have heard it seems every riding in the

country will undergo at least minor changes and it is almost inconceivable that the riding of Lapointe will be an exception.

My third reason for opposing any change is this: I believe that before we can accept a proposal of this kind, logical reasons must be advanced in its favour. I do not think such reasons have been advanced on this occasion. The hon. member said this change had been promised, but advanced very little by way of further justification. I would point out that any change of this kind is bound to result in some confusion. Difficulties are bound to arise when anything of this nature is done. For these reasons I have to oppose this measure.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with sustained interest to the arguments put forward by one side and the other, in the discussion of the bill now before the house, to have the name of the Lapointe constituency changed to that of Jonquière.

I have listened to the arguments offered by the hon. member who is the mover of the bill, and in support of his bill, he referred to the numerous representations from various public bodies in favour of the proposed change.

It is quite possible that the people in Lapointe riding are as anxious to have the name of their constituency changed as they are to have their member of parliament replaced. But I do not think too much attention can be given to his suggestions.

The name of Lapointe is of course a short name easy to remember. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well to strongly advocate simplification, clarity and concision in riding names, so that they may be more easily understood by the people than complicated and endless names like those of Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie, St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville, Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière, Winnipeg South Centre, Winnipeg North Centre, Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm.

Mr. Speaker, if you ask the man in the street, the layman, in what riding he lives, in what riding he must vote, when the riding is called Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale, Okanagan-Revelstoke, surely there are people who may be very much confused with such complicated designations. That is why I am strongly in favour of a simplification of the names of those ridings, because, after all, those ridings are represented by members and must be well known by the people because they are in the final analysis in the public interest.

The simpler, the clearer and the easier to understand things are, the more people have a chance to understand them—

Mr. Matheson: Yes.

Mr. Choquette: —as is pointed out by my hon. and distinguished friend from Leeds. Indeed, Leeds is a name which is easy to remember, all the more so because its member is one of the most admirable and most distinguished citizens, and his contribution to the House of Commons is always exceptional.

Mr. Speaker, no doubt the hon. member for Lapointe had serious reasons for submitting his bill. It would, indeed, have added to his personal prestige to be credited with a change of name.

Still, I am surprised to see him insist so much, with such gusto on electoral promises which may have been made by former members of parliament or Liberal candidates for the district of Lapointe.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that so far as electoral promises are concerned, we are doing splendidly. The new redistribution bill has, after all, been passed during the present session and the speakers who have preceded me think highly of it. Redistribution will make possible the geographical adjustments and divisions which are needed; it will make it possible also to change names where it seems imperative to do so.

In my opinion, the bill submitted by the hon. member for Lapointe is only precipitating events because the commissions which will have to hold public hearings and people who will have complaints to make about the limits of the ridings where they vote or which they represent will have an opportunity to state their views fully at those public meetings.

It seems to me, therefore, that trying to precipitate changes is simply going too fast. Of course, it is a characteristic of the Ralliement Créditiste always to go farther than necessary—

Mr. Bélanger: Forward.

Mr. Choquette: They ask that family allowances be doubled, that old age pensions be increased, that retirement age be reduced to 65 years of age, that income tax be decreased and that even students be granted salaries. One must not be surprised then when those people make such absurd remarks—

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the bill before the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member for Lotbinière allow me a question?

I do not know if I misunderstood him. It was not his intention perhaps, but in reading over *Hansard,* he will realize no doubt that his words did not reflect his thoughts.

Did he mean to say it was impossible to increase family allowances or to reduce the retirement age?

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. This question does not deal with the problem before the house at the moment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, to return to the subject, we are certainly in favour of family allowances—

Some hon. Members: This is not the subject.

Mr. Choquette: We are in favour of increasing family allowances, but to return to the subject, Mr. Speaker, as a member favouring an increase in family allowances, I will continue to discuss the bill now before us.

Mr. Speaker, the name of Lapointe has great lustre, as the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Mullally) pointed out a few moments ago. This is a name that can also have some semantic value and can be analysed. And when one reads the explanations given in Larousse on these words, one sees that the word "pointe" cannot better describe the member representing the constituency of Lapointe.

For instance, the word "pointe" means—

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order, I would recall that a while ago you called the hon. member for Lotbinière to order.

At this moment, does he wish to speak about Ernest Lapointe or about the member for Lapointe?

If he is talking about the present member, he is out of order. If he attributes this definition to Ernest Lapointe, he should say so. However, Mr. Speaker, when one does not know what to say, one should consult the dictionary.

I would like to point out to the hon. member for Lotbinière that it is six o'clock.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, the word "pointe" also means a very small quantity. That gives a very good description of the hon. member for Lapointe: a very small quantity. It also means—

Mr. Grégoire: Small, yes, but it penetrates everywhere. Just like the point of a needle, which seems to be the effect I have had on the hon. member for Lotbinière.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Venom also penetrates.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. Would the hon. gentleman resume his seat, please. The hour for the consideration of private members' business has expired.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could put a question to the acting house leader with respect to the business of the house for next week. If by any chance the current debate on the flag is not concluded in the early part of the week, could there be consultations as to the possibility of setting aside a day to deal with the Canada labour code?

Miss LaMarsh: I will be glad to bring this to the attention of the house leader, Mr. Speaker.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, December 7, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Seventh and eighth reports of standing committee on public accounts—Mr. Baldwin.

CANADIAN FLAG

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SIXTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Friday, December 4, consideration of the motion of Mr. Batten that the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, be now concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Monteith.

Mr. F. J. W. Fane (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, when I had to stop speaking on Friday afternoon because of the advent of five o'clock and the private members' hour, I had reached a point in my address where I was saying that I hoped the Prime Minister would either listen to the pleas of 64 per cent of the people of Canada who have called for a plebiscite or withdraw his motion to introduce a new flag at this time. Since then I have had that request reinforced by the knowledge that people are not now saying "Let us stop talking about the flag issue", but they are saying "Let it come before a plebiscite so it can be taken out of politics and the people of Canada can decide what they want to do about a new flag, the flag that is going to be their flag forever". This will be their flag not just until another parliament and government are elected. This time the flag is for keeps. There will not be any backing up on it after it is approved, whether the people like it or not.

I inquired of the government what was the great compulsion to have this issue settled now. Who is blackmailing the Prime Minister? Why must he pass this blackmail on to the rest of Canada? Why must he pass it on to parliament and demand that we decide an issue that is so divisive? Nothing could be more divisive than to have the flag decided by the members of parliament because, on the whole, they were not given a mandate to decide it.

I also wondered what had happened to the great Liberal party which forms the government. Its members were very vocal, especially when in opposition. Why can't they get up now and make their personal feelings known to their constituents and to Canada as a whole? They just sit back like a bunch of zombies. A few of them are always—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think I can appreciate the hon. member's line of argument, but the point at issue is the plebiscite.

Mr. Fane: Yes, sir, the point at issue is the plebiscite, and I am asking why they do not get up and talk on that point at issue. They act as if their brains have been picked. They act just like bodies moving around not of their own volition. Three of them have spoken already, but where are the rest? I would like to mention names but I shall not. Surely these silent members have decided views. Surely the people they represent have decided views. Why are these members so silent, except when they interrupt from their seats and try to hinder others who do wish to speak on this issue?

Mr. Grégoire: Question.

Mr. Fane: The little turkey gobblers are at it again.

Mr. Caouette: Speak about something you know.

Mr. Fane: The hon. member says to speak about something I know. I was a farmer and kept turkeys on my farm. Listening to the party on my far left makes me thing that this is killing time for turkeys on the farm.

Mr. Grégoire: You are more interesting when you speak about the farm.

Mr. Fane: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Lapointe would only talk about what he knows he would be forever silent.

Mr. Grégoire: I know something about a filibuster.

Mr. Fane: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that the people of Canada want to be consulted, and they should be consulted. The Prime Minister and his government should either withdraw this motion or agree to hold a plebiscite at the time of the next general

election. The people of Canada could then decide what they wish to do about the flag, whether to keep the present one or accept the one which was chosen by the committee.

By the way, that latter flag is not distinctive. The only distinctive thing about it is the red maple leaf. Why could they not have chosen a green maple leaf or something like that? If they wanted to have a maple leaf, why could it not have been green so as to show the surging life of Canada? Canada has a great future. In time to come Canada will probably be the leader of the nations of the world. Why have a dead maple leaf on our flag? Why not a green one to show the nation's surging life? With that thought I will close my remarks.

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): On rising to take part in this debate one cannot but be conscious of the time which has passed in discussion of this matter. One is conscious also of the time which has elapsed by reason of continual delays on the part of the government itself with regard to this whole question.

One of the things which impresses me greatly in this regard is the priority which the Prime Minister has given to this issue during the last several months.

An hon. Member: Order.

Mr. Nasserden: By his interruption the hon. member opposite reinforces my argument that the government feels there is some great urgency attached to this particular measure. I am very conscious of what has taken place. The Prime Minister eloquently drew our attention to what he called the urgency of this question when it was first introduced, and this sense of urgency on the part of the government and its supporters has not decreased.

We need only look at what has happened during the past few months to realize, however, that the sense of urgency spoken of by the Prime Minister was something he had pulled out of his head with regard to this measure. All the opposition groups in parliament have asked that this issue be given a lesser priority than certain other measures which should be brought before parliament in order that something might be done directly for the benefit of Canadians.

In the last few days the third, fourth and fifth parties have shown—and this is an interesting development—that they are willing to barter away the urgency of the other priorities in order that this particular measure may be disposed of as quickly and as carelessly as possible. The Prime Minister as the chief executive officer of the House of Commons has been the architect of a variety of measures of closure with respect to the business of the House of Commons, but no single action has held up the work of the House of Commons to such an extent as his rugged insistence that this measure should be disposed of before others are brought forward.

We can think of the report of the committee itself, which was not altogether the report that I imagine the Prime Minister himself expected but nevertheless a report that brought in a recommendation that rejected the first and foremost premise upon which the Prime Minister presented the new flag design to parliament. I refer, of course, to that often stated objective of his, that we should have here in Canada a flag not to be mistaken for the flag of any other country. In fact, I believe that by this action he has reinforced the reputation he has gained as a rejecter of much that has been brought forward by his own cabinet colleagues throughout the debates this session. I want to refer to them very briefly in order to remind the house of what happened. There was the presentation of the first Gordon budget, the variety of pension plans that were presented to parliament—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Nasserden: —what took place on the division of the powers of the Minister of Agriculture, and now this latest—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. When the motion was before the house considerable leniency was allowed, as all hon. members know; but we are now on the amendment, and the amendment deals with a plebiscite. It does not seem to me to be in order to deal with matters which may or may not have been dealt with before. It seems to me that hon. members should confine their remarks to the plebiscite, how it should be held, if it should be held, where it should be held and why it should be held.

Mr. Nasserden: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am very happy to say that I was just getting along to that part of my remarks. It is not only members of the House of Commons who believe that a plebiscite should be held on this particular question; great numbers of Canadians believe that a plebiscite is the only fair and the only just way in which question can be decided.

This does not only apply to Canadians in the higher age group, but also to young Cana-

dians. Many of these people believe that if they have a part in the choice of a Canadian flag, whatever the final decision of the majority of Canadians they could accept that decision and bring that flag into their hearts and minds and daily living much more closely than any flag imposed by parliament. An article which appeared in the Moose Jaw *Times-Herald* referred to the fact that teenagers, as other Canadians, deplore the waste of time in parliament on this particular measure.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nasserden: I see the hon. member opposite and one or two others applauding that statement. It was their leader, the Prime Minister of this country, who chose the priorities. He has put this issue above all other issues for consideration by the parliament of Canada. He has done this in the face of an opposition that has said it does not want to pass this measure; and he has chosen this course despite the fact that there is a wide ranging view across this country that denies that this measure should be given the substance and the priority that the Prime Minister of this country has chosen for it at this particular time. Let the hon. member opposite and those others who applauded applaud again, and get up on their feet and tell us why we should pass this measure. The hon. gentleman opposite is one of those who has refused the plea of his Prime Minister to get up and defend this resolution.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Nasserden. He has refused, as have 95 per cent of the members opposite.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Tardif): Order, please. I would ask the hon. member to keep to the matter before the house, which is the question of a plebiscite.

Mr. Nasserden: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I hear hon. gentlemen opposite applauding, as does the hon. member for Lotbinière, who has not contributed anything to this debate. All I can say is that time and time again by these interjections they show their disregard for parliament and for the right of the minority, however small that minority might be, to state its views in the House of Commons.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Tardif): Order. I think the hon. member is giving me the practice I need. May I again ask him to keep to the subject which is before the house at this time.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, I was only going where those on the other side of the house led me. I was speaking about the plebiscite at the time they led me along this course, and I have no apologies to make to anyone for that. I was recounting when I was interrupted by hon. gentlemen opposite what the teen-agers in Moose Jaw think on the flag question. One of them said:

> I feel that a plebiscite should be held to get the opinion of the majority of the Canadian people.

That opinion was expressed by a 17 year old student in grade 12. Another one said:

> It would be simpler and much more effective to let the Canadian people themselves vote for the flag they want to represent their country.

Another one said:

> It is my opinion that the government conduct a national poll and from this they would be able to obtain a national conviction on the topic.

Another one said:

> I think the opinions of the whole of Canada should be considered in the form of a plebiscite in the next general election.

We cannot help but ask ourselves this question. Why has the Prime Minister gambled so frivolously with the time of parliament and with the will of the Canadian people by taking the time that has been asked of parliament for the consideration of a measure for which there is widespread lack of support throughout the country? I have not heard a single person say that he is in favour of the new design submitted to parliament by the committee which was set up by the House of Commons. Search out the newspapers. How few or non-existent are the expressions of the Canadian people endorsing this design which has been brought forward by the members of the committee. Search out the problems which face the people in all parts of the country today and ask yourselves whether the priority placed on the measure is a priority which is justified in view of these problems, which are before the Canadian people.

Therefore for those reasons, while this debate has its deplorable aspects, nevertheless in the face of the tactics employed by the Prime Minister the official opposition has no other course than to take the action we are taking at the present time. The Prime Minister and hon. gentlemen opposite cannot afford to think they can hide behind the rules of parliament even in this debate or in any other debate in the House of Commons. What the government is asking is for the careless acceptance of this proposal, not for a

day, not for a year, but for many years and perhaps for all time.

I say to you, sir, and to the members of this house that the Prime Minister must assume the guilt for this travesty he is making of the time of parliament. He has committed his party and the government of Canada to this thoughtless gesture, this careless venture. When we say "Let the people decide", we cannot help but wonder why hon. gentlemen opposite have not taken part in this debate if this matter is as urgent and as justifiable as they say. Surely someone among the members on the other side of the house has some argument to bring forward which could change the minds of those who sit on this side of the house if the case presented is the case the government say it is. And if it is not the kind of case they say it is, then why give it the priority in this house that it has been given?

Mr. Moreau: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Nasserden: As soon as I have concluded my remarks. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman this question. Why has he failed to come to the aid of his Prime Minister in this debate?

An hon. Member: He doesn't need it.

Mr. Nasserden: Why has he failed to place upon the record his reasons for taking the course he will undoubtedly take when the vote eventually comes?

Mr. Moreau: Would you like an answer?

Mr. Nasserden: Just as soon as I have completed my remarks we will be glad to hear from the hon. member for York-Scarborough. With regard to the holding of a plebiscite on a new flag, I make no secret of the fact that I am not one of those who think a plebiscite is the last word in the deciding of this particular issue. But when one considers how the matter was brought before parliament initially, what other course could a responsible opposition employ to bring before parliament the wishes of vast numbers of Canadians? What other course is open to parliament, not only to the opposition but to the government itself, to obtain a true expression of what Canadians want in regard to the choice of a national flag?

The Prime Minister said at the beginning of the debate that one of the reasons for the priority given this matter was what was taking place in the province of Quebec. He brought in the whole picture of national unity.

[Mr. Nasserden.]

An hon. Member: He did not say that.

Mr. Nasserden: He referred to the whole question of national unity and what this measure might do to meet the urgency of that particular problem. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there are other things the government could do not only in that old province of Quebec but in other areas of Canada where attention is needed that would be of far greater moment than the measure now before us. I want to say also that if the Prime Minister and the government think that by the passage of this measure they can possibly slough off the electorate of the province of Quebec with the thought that they have done something for them, when the real and major issues at stake in that province have been left untouched, then I think they are acting most unwisely. They are acting in a way that is detrimental to the future of the nation and to national unity itself.

This flag that we are asked to endorse, which we on this side of the house say should be put before the Canadian people in a plebiscite along with other designs; this measure that the Prime Minister wants to push through parliament, could well become the symbol of discontent more than any other flag Canadians have ever had in the past if little or nothing is done to meet the everyday problems that face Canadians not only in the province of Quebec but in the other provinces as well. When we consider that the Prime Minister has already told the people of Canada that he is making the gesture of giving them a flag, while at the same time he brings before parliament another measure enabling him to say that the union jack will continue to fly to represent our connection with the commonwealth, what a hollow gesture this is. It is one of the shallowest manoeuvres ever to be undertaken in Canadian history.

I am surprised that so few from the government benches have spoken in this debate. Surely some of them must have some opinions to express on the advisability or otherwise of holding a plebiscite. I can think of many members across the way who must have opinions in this regard. I think of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. McNulty), I think of the hon. member for York-Scarborough (Mr. Moreau), who interrupts from time to time. I think of the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Mullally), the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. O'Keefe), the hon. member for Hastings South (Mr. Temple), the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Roxburgh), who I believe made an apology the other day; the

hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Cashin). I think of some of those on the front benches, and I ask myself what manner of government we have in Canada today whose front bench members can remain so silent on a question so near and dear to the problem of national unity.

Why is there this silence? Why is the Prime Minister not in his place in the house during the greater part of this debate?

Mr. Moreau: Why is your leader not here?

An hon. Member: A nice gesture on your part when a man is sick in bed.

Mr. Nasserden: I do not say the Prime Minister should be here all through the debate, but if this is the greatest thing to come before this session of parliament, if this is the most important matter that will come before this session of parliament, surely the Prime Minister should take some time to listen to the debate on this measure and try to get something of the atmosphere in which it is being carried on.

We have not had that kind of interest on the part of the Prime Minister with regard to this important matter and, Mr. Speaker, it should be of interest to him to answer the call for a plebiscite. After all, the design submitted by the committee is not the design he submitted to parliament. As soon as one thinks of that, of course, one thinks of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson). I recall his remarks earlier in this debate. The three maple leaves flag had inspired him. There was something about it that was truly Canadian. It would carry Canadians forward to a greater measure of national unity.

Mr. Matheson: Will the hon. member admit it is the royal badge of Canada?

Mr. Nasserden: Yet in the special committee the hon. gentleman voted against it, as did all his colleagues on that committee. All the Liberal members of that committee voted against the design that had been brought forward by their own Prime Minister, a design for which the hon. member for Leeds was supposed to be responsible. What was the situation when that design was presented to parliament and throughout the six weeks when we debated it while they sneered? Each one of them privately and publicly, though not in the House of Commons, was issuing statements to his electors and to the newspapers and radio stations in his riding about what a great design parliament had before it, and was saying that parliament should accept it with speed for otherwise great damage would be done to national unity. Yet they went into a committee of the House of Commons and destroyed that design. Now they tell us that they have come up with a design that will enhance national unity. This is the question that Canadians in all parts of the country—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Tardif): Order, please.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, that is not the question. The question that is before the house at the moment is whether this matter should be referred back to the flag committee for a recommendation that there be a referendum. I submit, sir, on all the authorities that have already been cited during this lengthy debate, and particularly the dicta from May, that we do not have a right now to anticipate a point that is clearly not in order, and that is the merits of a particular flag which will be debated after this matter of the referendum has been decided upon.

At this time I submit that the hon. member has a right to discuss only the referral back to the committee for a recommendation on a referendum. The merits of a particular design is a subject on which he can talk at full length, without any limitation of debate, on the main motion, that is the motion to concur in the sixth report of the committee which is before the house.

Mr. Churchill: While you are considering the point raised by the hon. member for Leeds, Mr. Speaker, will you take into account the fact that when the hon. member for Leeds was speaking on the amendment he never once mentioned the question of a plebiscite. He spent a great deal of his time talking about the design of a flag. I do not believe it is fitting that the hon. member for Leeds should be the one to raise a point of order at this time when a member on this side of the house is talking, because he himself was not within the rules for one minute during the course of his remarks on that day. If the ruling is that only the plebiscite must be mentioned, you might also take into consideration that this is not a debate in the fashion of Gertrude Stein where you say a rose is a rose is a rose, or where we must be limited to saying a plebiscite is a plebiscite is a plebiscite. This would make nonsense out of the debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Tardif): I realize it is difficult to keep saying a rose is a rose or a plebiscite is a plebiscite. However, I do

believe there is enough in the amendment before the house at this time for the hon. member to keep to the point that is under study. It has been drawn to his attention on several occasions, and I know he does not want to make the task of the Acting Speaker any more difficult than it is, so he will endeavour to keep to the point.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, I have never left the point. The hon. member for Leeds and the shilly-shallying shell tactics of those on the government benches, who yesterday wanted the three leaf flag and today want a one leaf flag, provide the best argument that can be put forward for Canadians to have a plebiscite on this important matter. The government cannot make up its mind, and this is plain to see. Government members would take any design so long as it is not the Canadian red ensign. This is one of the facts that have emerged out of this debate. The hon. member for Leeds has been most guilty in that regard. I believe that is the reason he raised the point of order in the way he did. He feels the burden of his guilt.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Tardif): Order, please. The guilt of the hon. member for Leeds does not excuse the hon. member for being out of order. May I draw to his attention again, for the fifth time—I do not know what rule applies—that he should not be called to order too often. May I ask him to co-operate with the Chair and keep to the subject under study.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, I may say that perhaps the last word or two were out of order, but I was only led along that path by the things that were said from the opposite side of the house. There should be some fairness in this debate right across the line.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nasserden: Somebody says "Oh, oh". If hon. gentlemen opposite have something to say, let them get up and say it. They say these things while they are seated, and they do not get on the record.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): You were attacking the Chair.

Mr. Nasserden: No one was attacking the Chair. If I may return to the matter under discussion, that is whether or not a plebiscite should be held, I want to emphasize what I just said; that the statement made by the hon. member for Leeds, reinforced by members of the flag committee from the Liberal party, reinforced by the decision made about the design that was presented to parliament, represent the best arguments for a plebiscite that any one could wish to have.

However, there is a further argument, and that is the silent, unnamed members of the house who are either afraid or careless of presenting their views on this question of a plebiscite, and they must be considered when we are dealing with this whole problem. When members across the way come to us and tell us they are glad we are requesting a plebiscite on this question—

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Only one.

Mr. Nasserden: I can say this, it certainly was not you who asked for a plebiscite on this question. I would not be proud about that, either, if I were the hon. gentleman.

Today we are considering whether or not there should be a plebiscite on an important matter such as this. We were told at the beginning of the debate by the Prime Minister himself that this was vital to national unity. If it is vital to national unity, and a great portion of the Canadian people are not in accord with what is being done, then that particular aspect of this situation should be taken into consideration, whether those people live in one part of the country or in another part of the country. As we hear the interjections that come across the floor, we wonder why hon. members do not make speeches. We wonder why 90 per cent of hon. members opposite have failed to answer the call to national unity uttered by their leader, the Prime Minister, during the discussion of this measure. When approximately 60 per cent of the Canadian people are in favour of a plebiscite on this important question, why is it that the Prime Minister would destroy his own party, destroy this parliament and the image of parliament as well, on a question such as this? The hon. gentleman laughs, but as time goes on that laugh will change to something else just as it did during the debate a week ago when charges were made and many hon. members laughed at them.

We hear a great deal about trying to get on with the business of parliament.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Nasserden: The hon. gentleman opposite says this is the business of parliament. I was glad to hear that interjection.

Mr. Rock: Who said that?

Mr. Nasserden: There were so many speaking I could not tell which one said it, but someone opposite did. This is the business of parliament, and that is what we on this

side say. It is the responsibility of members to make sure that this government does not take action that in the final analysis might do more to hurt Canadian unity than to enhance it. After all, that is the purpose for which the measure was brought before parliament, as stated by no less a person than the Prime Minister.

When we consider whether or not we should hold a plebiscite, I cannot help but look at the empty seat of the Prime Minister and wonder why he is not in that seat during the greater part of this debate.

Mr. Rock: What about your own leader?

Mr. Nasserden: My own leader, at the present time, happens to be sick in bed. The hon. gentleman knows that, but he still refers to it because he thought I would not know about it.

Mr. Rock: I just mentioned the fact that your leader is not here either.

Mr. Clancy: Oh, get lost.

Mr. Nasserden: Well, we have the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Greene) here. Why doesn't he tell us why we should not have a plebiscite? Is he one of those who hope he is going to become a judge, or sit in the Senate; or does he want to take a trip somewhere?

Mr. Greene: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, any time I want to speak in the house I can assure the hon. member I do not need any help, aid, or improvisation from him; and when I do speak I shall have a little more to say than he has to say, and I shall not do any filibustering or hold up the business of the house when I am speaking.

Mr. Nasserden: Well, I will say this for the hon. gentleman—

Mr. Rock: He is honest.

Mr. Nasserden: I did not say that, Mr. Speaker, but that does not mean I would not agree with it. The hon. gentleman of course, had ambitions in another place. He was one of those who were frustrated here—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Nasserden: They shake their heads, Mr. Speaker, and I will take their word for it, but I know one of them opposite was frustrated, as was related in one of the leading newspapers.

Mr. Greene: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has stated I am frustrated. I would point out the only frustration I feel is at the prostitution of parliament being carried on in this filibuster by hon. gentlemen opposite.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Tardif): Order, please. Both hon. gentlemen who have spoken are out of order. There is nothing in the amendment which mentions frustration on either side of the house. I am afraid if this keeps up on both sides of the house the only frustration that will result will be the frustration of the Acting Speaker. May I once again ask the hon. member for Rosthern not to make my task any more difficult, and may I ask those on the opposite side who keep shouting "order" to give me the privilege of calling somebody to order when he is out of order.

Mr. Clancy: On that point—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Tardif): It has been decided that point is out of order. It is out of order for you as well as for me, because it has nothing to do with the subamendment.

Mr. Clancy: But generalizing, Mr. Speaker, it has been said there is frustration in the house. There certainly is.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, I want to say I am frustrated too. The government does not want to submit this issue to a plebiscite. I am not going into what the hon. gentleman opposite said because Your Honour has stated the matter is disposed of, and we want you to have a happy time in the chair today.

All I will do is put on the record the reasons for which I think a plebiscite should be held. I only regret hon. members opposite do not want me to do that. At least this is the only conclusion I can draw from these interruptions. The decision by parliament to designate a Canadian flag is one of the most important decisions parliament could ever take. There are thousands of Canadians who think parliament has spent too much time on this issue—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nasserden: Hon. gentlemen opposite are applauding.

Mr. Grégoire: We are too.

Mr. Nasserden: And the hon. gentleman in the far corner wants to get honourable mention, but really and truly I cannot think of anything good to say about him today in that regard.

Mr. Grégoire: You never have anything very good to say.

Mr. Nasserden: I am not going to be drawn into that, Mr. Speaker. There are many reasons why Canadians in all parts of the country should speak out on the question of the flag they want. If we are to accept the views that have been expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite—and they have been few in number—Canada has not had a flag, and this procedure we are engaged in is the adoption of a new flag. Then surely it is of sufficient importance that Canadians, great and small, in every part of the country should be given an opportunity to choose from a variety of recommendations.

It may be said that this would divide Canada, but in all sincerity I say it could not divide Canada any worse than Canada is divided today by the divisive practice employed by the government and the Prime Minister in pushing this matter through parliament. If the opposition has a primary job in parliament it is to preserve the rights of minorities, a task which is not easy on a question such as this.

When we think of the number of Canadians who are growing tired of the time wasted in parliament, because of a Prime Minister who has given such priority to this matter, we cannot help but wonder why he is not in his place today. We cannot help but wonder why he does not give some attention to the requests that have been made. When I say that I take nothing away from him or his image because I know at times he has to be other places, but surely we could see him some time during the course of this debate. This is one of the questions which go unanswered day after day, and it is one I find most disconcerting when I think of the image of parliament and of the slogan used by hon. gentlemen opposite, "Let's get on with the business of parliament." If the Prime Minister really felt this matter warranted such priority he should be in the house to give it proper attention.

Under normal circumstances I do not believe a plebiscite would be the best course to take in a matter such as this, but in view of all that has happened, in view of the way this issue was introduced and of what has taken place since then, I think a plebiscite is the only recourse available to us in order to preserve some of the unity that we hold dear. I regret that apparently the Prime Minister and hon. members opposite do not hold that view.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

Mr. Grégoire: How many speeches has he made on this subject?

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, there is a question from an hon. member who has not participated in the flag debate.

Mr. Grégoire: I will vote.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Churchill: I shall answer him immediately. This is the third time for me to speak in the debate on the flag.

Mr. Grégoire: A hat trick.

Mr. Churchill: I have the courage of my convictions in this matter. I consider this to be a serious matter, and I think members of this house should participate in the debate and advance arguments either for or against.

Mr. Grégoire: I have heard them all.

Mr. Churchill: The hon. member for Lapointe spends his time interrupting and making a mockery of the House of Commons.

Mr. Grégoire: No.

Mr. Churchill: I waited before rising because I thought some members from the Liberal party would rise to take part in this debate. We have heard two members of the Liberal party advance reasons why they propose a new flag should be adopted. The hon. member for Leeds, who was the progenitor of the three maple leaf flag with the blue borders and the hon. member for Terrebonne, who was on the committee, gave us the benefit of their views on this subject. They were the only members of the Liberal party who advanced any reasons for the adoption of the proposed flag, and of those two only the hon. member for Terrebonne said anything about whether or not a plebiscite should be held. We heard from the ranks of the Liberal party a very profound and courageous speech by the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan), a real contribution to a debate of an extremely serious character.

Now, I thought there would be some support from the Liberal party for the proposal now before the house. It makes for a debate when opposing views are presented in this cham-

ber. That is the purpose of debating. We are putting forward our case; the other side should be putting forward their case, if they have one. It makes it very difficult when members on the government side do not enter into the debate. Obviously they have no interest in this matter; they are fainthearted with regard to the flag now proposed, or else they hesitate to put on the sackcloth and ashes and tell us they were all wrong six months ago when they were talking about the three maple leaf flag with the blue border.

I intend in the course of this debate to put forward two reasons why this matter should be referred to the people. But I propose, in leading up to those reasons, to deal with matters which have been mentioned by the hon. member for Leeds and the hon. member for Villeneuve, because those gentlemen have presented a point of view to which I am opposed, and in the course of this debate I think I am justified in drawing attention to their remarks and giving an answer to them. I also hope to deal with other matters, all leading up to the two main points I intend to make during the course of this debate. I appreciate the nature of the ground rules which have been staked out. All I ask is the same privilege that was extended to the hon. member for Leeds, the hon. member for Terrebonne, the hon. member for Villeneuve and various hon. members who touched on other matters rather than the question of a plebiscite; and I hope I shall not be asked to use the word "plebiscite" in every other sentence.

In the speech he made to the house the hon. member for Leeds once again brought us information which I consider to be inaccurate. I refer to his interpretation of the proclamation of 1921, which he uses as a basis for advocating the adoption of the proposed flag now before us, the flag with the white centre and red borders having a red maple leaf superimposed in the centre, as recommended by the committee. I dealt with this subject when I was speaking in August, but apparently I did not convince the hon. member for Leeds, who has repeated in this house the argument he used on that occasion. Consequently I must again draw the attention of the house to the fact that I believe the hon. member for Leeds and others, including the hon. member for Danforth, have been misled by the interpretation given to the royal proclamation of 1921.

They have stated here that the national colours are red and white, and I say they have no evidence that such national colours were ever established. I said in August and I say again now that the committee which drew up the proclamation of 1921 and delivered it to the government of that day said nothing in its brochure, which was published later, about the establishment of national colours. No reference was made to them in subsequent brochures until the one published in March of this year under the present Liberal government. The others said nothing about Canada's national colours being red and white. I say the information supplied to us to the contrary is misinformation and should be rejected.

My second point is this, and I reiterate it because of the statements which have been made with regard to the coats of arms as determined in 1921. The only maple leaf which was coloured in red was the maple leaf resting in the paw of the lion, and it was put there for the express purpose of commemorating Canada's sacrifice in the first world war. It represented Canada's losses in that war; 60,000 Canadian young men lost their lives in that struggle. That is why the red maple leaf was incorporated in the coat of arms. I argued in August, and I do again, that having used a red maple leaf for this purpose it is disgraceful to abandon it now and use it for some other purpose, as has been done in the revised coat of arms and as is being done in this proposed new flag. The red maple leaf on the coat of arms represents the sacrifice of the first world war. Is this Liberal government going to wipe that out and forget about it? I say, no.

An hon. Member: Put it on the flag.

Mr. Churchill: And it should not appear on the flag of Canada, a red maple leaf. We should go back to what it was originally, a green maple leaf as was determined in the proclamation of 1921; because in that proclamation the red maple leaf was mentioned and given its proper heraldic term, gules, and the three maple leaves were given their term "proper" which means "in their natural state" which means green.

The coat of arms was revised a few years later. I say it was improperly revised, and that our government was misled by that revision and that a correction should be made. I say that the red maple leaf should not be used on a flag of Canada; that the red maple leaf represents the blood sacrifice of Canadians in the first world war, and it should be retained for that purpose. If the Liberal party intend to wipe that out, let them conduct another revision of the Canadian coat

of arms from which this flag is being drawn —the references are always to that. If this message could only get across to the people of Canada—and this is why we suggest referring this question to the people of Canada—we believe they would reject the proposed new flag because it improperly uses the red maple leaf.

This committee was set up after a rather lengthy debate in the House of Commons in the expectation that some solution would be found, through the work of the committee, that would be acceptable to the house, to parliament and to the people of Canada. I commend the committee for its diligent work. I regret to say that the committee failed in its task because it did not come up with a solution that is satisfactory. I have given one reason why their solution is unsatisfactory. We had hoped that some compromise might be effected during the work of that committee. The stand taken by our party in the debate in August and September was very largely this. We wished to retain the Canadian red ensign, modified, if you like, in the fly, replacing the coat of arms with the maple leaf, adding the fleur-de-lis and recognizing the history and traditions of our country, which would constitute a distinctive and acceptable Canadian flag.

When the committee met I entertained some hope—not very much—that the committee would bring forward a design somewhat along that line. I had hoped that the committee would start with the design approved by the parliamentary committee of 1946, which voted 23 to 1 for a modified Canadian red ensign, with the shield removed and a golden maple leaf placed in the fly. I thought the committee, starting from that point, would perhaps add the fleur-de-lis; because I have always thought—and this is where I have been mistaken, as I have discovered from the debate in the house during August, September and this month—that the fleur-de-lis should have more prominence on our flag than it has just in the coat of arms. I will point out where I have been mistaken in that belief as I proceed with what I have to say.

The committee, which started off with great expectations, ended in failure; and it ended in failure because the Liberal members on that committee did not apparently deal with anything in the nature of a compromise in which our history and traditions would be recognized, because they rejected any reference to our past and rejected the flag which was brought in with the blare of trumpets last May by the Prime Minister. They threw out the three maple leaf flag with the blue borders and substituted the white flag with a red maple leaf and red borders.

Where was the compromise? There was no meeting of minds with regard to the position put forward by the Conservative party, and we represent quite a number of people in Canada; it runs into millions. Why could there not be a meeting of minds? We have had pointed out to us that the Conservative members on that committee endeavoured to bring about a compromise by superimposing on the red and white flag the union jack in one corner and the fleur-de-lis in the other. Quite frankly I did not think that was a very attractive design, but it was a sincere effort to bring together opposing points of view. But the committee rejected that design and insisted on bringing before us a new design, falsely called a design based on Canada's alleged national colours.

Mr. Matheson: Nonsense.

Mr. Churchill: Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, a reference to the people of Canada becomes more urgent than ever. We went through a debate in which opposing points of view were presented; the committee sat for a lengthy period—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Churchill: —it rejected the personal choice of the Prime Minister and brought in a flag which is not a compromise solution. Surely under these circumstances a reference to the people of Canada is essential. I believe that had a suitable compromise been produced, giving recognition to the history and traditions of this country as we have maintained right from the very first, and with greater emphasis placed on the maple leaf—which to my mind is acceptable as a symbol of Canada, but not as a flag—which the hon. member for Leeds and others have talked about so frequently, it would have been acceptable. Here were the two points of view, and surely the committee could have arrived at a solution, not necessarily acceptable to individuals here and there but something that would assist parliament to come to a decision with regard to this very important matter.

I am very disturbed, sir, that during the course of this debate we have not heard the position of the Prime Minister and members of the cabinet. They are non-participants; they do not take part in debates in the House of Commons.

Mr. Rhéaume: They are writing codes of ethics, which are very important.

Mr. Churchill: They leave it to other members of their party. We are interested, and I am sure the people generally are interested, in knowing what is the attitude of the Prime Minister. We know the attitude of the member for Leeds; he said just the other day that the proposed flag, and I quote his words:

—meets all the tests for a distinguished flag. It is a flag of dignity and grace, worthy of a great sovereign nation.

He said substantially the same things last summer with regard to the flag which he was then putting before us.

Mr. Rhéaume: He will say whatever he is told to say.

Mr. Churchill: What is the position of the Prime Minister? Because we have not heard the point of view of the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, I say that a reference to the people is essential. Let the people know where the Prime Minister, the leader of the Liberal party, stands. Are they to accept what he said last May and June with regard to a flag? The present proposed flag is not the one he was talking about last June. With regard to what he said on June 15—which was the last time he participated in a debate in this house except for comments on rules and procedure —do the things he said six months ago hold true today? There should be some leadership given in this country, and that leadership should come from the Prime Minister; and he should be supported by members of his cabinet, if they are confiding in each other these days. On June 15 the Prime Minister said:

—I believe that a national flag of the kind described in this resolution—

That was the three maple leaf flag with the blue borders:

—that will be exclusively Canadian, will bring us closer together; give us a greater purpose of national identity and unity.

Then in the same speech he went on to say:

I know, also, that a flag issue is bound to raise strong and deep and genuine emotions.

He went on to point out—and these are his own words as reported at page 4321 of *Hansard*:

In my view, the time has come for a further and a final change.

The further and final change in June was to a three maple leaf flag with blue borders.

Now where are we? If you have a final change in June—the personal choice of the Prime Minister—and you reach a situation in November, six months later, where the Liberal party proposes another flag, where is the final change and what is the position of the Prime Minister? We need to know the Prime Minister's position on this matter, and then having got that position let us refer the matter to the people of Canada for a decision. The Prime Minister's final change, according to his own words, is that:

—it should be based on three red maple leaves because that is our formal and historic emblematic link with our Canadian past.

We are now down to one red maple leaf. Is that our formal and historic emblematic link? I should like an explanation of that remark. I should like to know what the Prime Minister says about the flag now proposed. He said of the other one that because its design had such a history and went with the blue sea to sea border, it made a striking and beautiful flag. What has happened now to the sea to sea border? Have we abolished the Atlantic and the Pacific? He said at the time that the single maple leaf has not the same historical and heraldic significance. These are indeed conflicting points of view, and I should like to know where the Prime Minister stands today. Let him guide parliament. Let him guide the people of this country. If he is now prepared to reject the three maple leaf design let him say so publicly, and let him tell us his reasons.

He also said with regard to the resolution on the order paper providing for the three maple leaf flag with the blue borders that that resolution did indeed mark a break with the past. Strangely enough, in saying that it made a break with the past he was also telling us that the proposed flag of that day had great historical significance derived from the past. So how do you break with the past and yet retain the historical significance derived from the past? I should like an explanation of that, and I should like the Prime Minister to tell us whether the present proposed flag represents a break with the past or whether it is founded on a historical link with the past.

I have expressed my regret, sir, that we have not heard from the Prime Minister and members of the cabinet. They have become silent. We have heard from only two members of the Liberal party with regard to the present flag. We heard from the leader of the Creditiste party when he spoke in this house on December 1, at which time he was applauded by members of the Liberal party. I was here and listened to his speech, and I saw the approval which came from the gov-

ernment side. Therefore I would have to assume that what he said then represented the views of the Liberal party. Nobody on that side of the house has criticized him for what he said on that occasion; therefore I would say they must agree with his views. Last June he said that he did not feel the flag issue could strengthen national unity in Canada, and I do not recall even then that the members of the Liberal party found fault with his speech on that occasion. He told us on December 1, as reported at page 10742 of *Hansard*:

> I have said, on several occasions, that the design of the flag is of little concern to me.

He cares not what the flag is. He went on to say:

> —if the Canadian symbol, now represented by the maple leaf on the flag proposed by the committee which considered this question, is not satisfactory, then let us remove the maple leaf and put a beaver, or a sheaf of wheat, or indeed anything else—

Now, Mr. Speaker, what stage are we at with regard to the Creditiste party? The leader of that party, supported by his own members and applauded by the Liberals, says he is not concerned—

Mr. Greene: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Churchill: —with the nature of the flag at all.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. An hon. member is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. gentleman has a very hard time discerning just what is going on in this house, but with the greatest respect, Mr. Speaker, I think the subject matter of the debate is supposed to be the holding of a plebiscite, and for the information of the hon. gentleman that is the topic on which he is supposed to be speaking. With respect, I would ask that Your Honour keep the hon. gentleman in order, if he has it within himself to speak within the rules of the house, and not permit him continuously to abuse the rules.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I can now understand very clearly why the hon. member for Renfrew South was not elected as leader of the provincial Liberal party. He lacks the intelligence to understand a sound argument.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre now speaking to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Renfrew South?

[Mr. Churchill.]

Mr. Churchill: I certainly am, Mr. Speaker, if you think it was a point of order. I suggest I am strictly in order, because I am developing the thesis that there are two main reasons why this issue should be determined by the Canadian people and not by this House of Commons. I want the same privilege that is afforded every other hon. member of the house to develop my thesis without interruptions such as that from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sure the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre will recognize that another hon. member has the right to raise a point of order and that the Chair should be allowed to rule on the point of order.

Mr. Nasserden: May I just speak to the point of order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am wondering whether anything can be served by having a long discussion of the point of order. The Chair recognizes what are the ground rules of the debate, as the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre mentioned at the start of his remarks, which are that the debate is supposed to deal with an amendment now before the house. In beginning his remarks the hon. member did say that he intended to lead to the question of a plebiscite, and I assume that is what he is doing now. I did have some doubt whether his reference to the position of the Créditiste party was really relevant to this particular point, but in any event I take it that he is leading to the question of a plebiscite and I should like to hear the continuation of his speech.

Mr. Churchill: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am not only leading up to it but I have been on the subject all along. I was pointing out that the position of the Creditistes is certainly important for the very simple reason that that party has been supporting the government all during the present session, and the statement—

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that must be denied. If we look at the record of all the votes taken in the house since the beginning of the session we will see that those supporting the government are the Conservative party, or that their members were absent during votes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. That is a point of debate.

Mr. Grégoire: They used to be out of the house when there was a vote.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, it is a rather strange thing when the leader of the Creditiste party will say in the house in the flag debate that the design of the flag, to use his own words, "is of little concern to me". Then he went on to say, as found on page 10742 of *Hansard*:

> However, I do not oppose the adoption of another design provided it is Canadian—

He also said:

> ... let us remove the maple leaf and put a beaver, or a sheaf of wheat, or indeed anything else—

No member of the Liberal party objected to that statement, and it is customary in this house in a proper debate for people to answer arguments of which they do not approve. I say, sir, that in view of the fact that the Creditistes have taken this stand it is incumbent upon us to draw this to the attention of the people of Canada, because I believe that people who are going to say they care nothing about our national flag, that they do not care what is on it—

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege—

Mr. Churchill: —who will say "or indeed anything else"—

Mr. Grégoire: A question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

The remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) are dishonest, for we have never said that we were not interested in the flag, but rather that, regardless of what flag is proposed, provided it is Canadian and distinctive, we will accept it in a spirit of co-operation with all the citizens of our country. In this regard, the hon. member's remarks are dishonest, for we have never spoken those words.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I do not believe there is a question of privilege in what has been raised by the hon. member for Lapointe. It is rather a point of debate. If he thinks that the position of one of his members or of himself is being misrepresented by another hon. member, he has an opportunity later in the debate to set things straight if he believes this should be done.

Mr. Grégoire: We have to put it on record that he is dishonest, and he should know it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Churchill: I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that you have joined with me in encouraging the hon. member for Lapointe to enter the debate—

Mr. Mandziuk: He will never do it.

Mr. Churchill: —and show his courage and his honesty. He accused me of being dishonest, but I will accept the fact he is honest and let him enter the debate and display that honesty to the rest of us. I do not overlook the fact that the Créditiste party has a following in this country, and I have heard from their leader that he has support not only in his own province but elsewhere throughout Canada. But my argument is that when a party in this house say they do not care what the flag is, that they do not care what is on the flag, the people of Canada should be aware of that fact. I say that for this reason. Suppose this issue came to a vote in the House of Commons and the votes of the Créditiste members determined the issue. These are the people who would determine for all Canada what the flag would be—

Mr. Grégoire: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: —and according to their argument it might not have on it a red maple leaf or a green maple leaf. It might not have on it a beaver or a sheaf of wheat. Through the mouth of their leader they say "or indeed anything else". But what would it have on it?

Mr. Grégoire: Something Canadian, not British.

Mr. Churchill: This verges almost on subversive tactics, Mr. Speaker, the destruction of things that are treasured by Canadians. I say now, Mr. Speaker, that during the course of the debate last summer and from the action of the committee I have discovered that no compromise on the issue of the flag is possible in the present House of Commons, and that is why the issue should be referred to the people. We have had this clearly demonstrated by the failure of the committee. After all its meetings the committee failed to come up with a compromise. I said earlier that I was under the impression months ago that a suitable compromise would be the addition of the maple leaf and the fleur-de-lis in prominence on the Canadian red ensign. I was wrong.

Mr. Grégoire: May I ask a question? What would the fleur-de-lis represent on that flag?

Mr. Churchill: I think the fleur-de-lis would represent on that flag what it represents on the provincial flag of the province of Quebec. It would represent the traditions of a great race, and I have been an admirer of the French race.

Mr. Grégoire: We can laugh at that. That is a joke.

Mr. Churchill: I considered that the fleur-de-lis would be representative of the history and traditions of the French race in Canada.

Mr. Greene: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Churchill: If Mr. Speaker will allow me additional time.

Mr. Grégoire: We want something Canadian.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I believe the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre is allowing a question by the hon. member for Renfrew South.

Mr. Greene: Would the hon. member tell us whether, in making the statement that the fleur-de-lis would represent Quebec adequately on the flag, he is speaking for any organization in Quebec or whether there has been any such request by any popular organization in Quebec, including his own party; or whether this is just his own idea?

Mr. Churchill: I will answer the question. I regret that the hon. member is unable to follow an argument very closely. I said it had been my opinion several months ago that the fleur-de-lis would represent French Canada on our flag but I have found out during the course of the debate and as a result of the proceedings of the committee that I was wrong. That is why I say the people of Canada need to know the situation, because hundreds of people have written to me and friends have spoken to me who have been in favour of a compromise, and in their opinion it was always that the Canadian red ensign should be modified in order to give greater recognition to the French founders of this country.

Mr. Grégoire: Did you ask the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer)?

Mr. Churchill: I say we have been wrong on this point and those people who are still writing to me about a compromise are unaware of the circumstances. They are unaware that we have been told in the house by members of the Liberal party, by members of our own party and by members of the Créditiste party that the fleur-de-lis would be unacceptable as a compromise symbol. This is a grave disappointment to me. I have been under a misapprehension all these years in that regard. In talking about maintaining the history and traditions of the two founding races of this country I had always thought that these symbols would be satisfactory for that purpose.

I say that no compromise is now possible because of the facts that have been brought out in debate in the house and by the work of the committee. That being the case, the people of Canada should be made aware of the situation. Therefore the most suitable thing to do in respect of the whole flag problem would be to put it in abeyance for a very considerable time until there is an opportunity for greater knowledge of the facts right across the country. The second point I want to make, in conclusion—

Mr. Grégoire: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: Well, I will conclude and the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) can get up and make a speech. The other day the hon. member was handing out appropriate insignia to the various members who participated in the debate. I should like to confer upon him the order of the eviscerated chicken unless he gets up and makes his speech on this flag issue.

Now, sir, I want to say this, that in light of the attitude taken by the Liberal party, the statements made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) six months ago, by the member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) and others, and the actions of the Liberals on the committee, the policy of the Liberal party throughout the whole course of this thing has been the destruction of the Canadian red ensign. I hope the people of Canada realize this. The Liberal party will take anything except the Canadian red ensign, anything except something on our flag to represent our history and our traditions. What other conclusion can be arrived at than that the Liberal party aims at the destruction of the red ensign? Six months ago the hon. member for Leeds loved the three maple leaf flag with the blue border. Now he loves the one with the white and red on it. Where does the Prime Minister stand on this question? We have not heard. I say, sir, that the reason this whole matter should be referred to the people by way of plebiscite is the action of the Liberal party. We have now found out what they want to do, clearly

and distinctly, through the work of the committee plus their inactivity in this debate, plus statements they have made in the past. They want to destroy the Canadian red ensign and they care not what is substituted in its place.

Mr. Matheson: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; the hon. member's time expired a few minutes ago.

An hon. Member: Let the member for Leeds make his speech.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions can be asked of the hon. member who just resumed his seat only with the consent of the house, because his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Matheson: May I ask the hon. member these two question? First, does he not agree that the three maple leaves on one stem was, in fact, the Canadian emblem on every Canadian red ensign since 1868? Second, is it not a fact that the words in the royal proclamation—

> And upon a royal helmet mantled argent doubled gules the crest, that is to say, on a wreath of the colours argent and gules—

—do, in fact, determine the colours of Canada to be red and white?

Mr. Churchill: In answer to the first question, I may say that I am aware of the fact the three maple leaf design has been on the Canadian flag, and it should have remained there in the colour green. I accept it as a symbol of Canada and I have never objected to it as a symbol of Canada. I do not believe it should ever be made the main part of a Canadian flag.

In so far as the second question is concerned the hon. member, drawing from his knowledge of heraldry—perhaps I can assist him in this—has reached the conclusion that because the mantle under the helmet is described as being red and white, that this constitutes the national colours of Canada. I say there is no authority for that statement. I suggest to him that he produce the evidence from the books of heraldry to show that they constitute the national colours. They may constitute the colours of the monarch whose helmet is there, but not necessarily the colours of this country. If he will examine the coat of arms for Australia and the coat of arms for New Zealand, he will see that there is no mention of national colours in their coats of arms. As I pointed out earlier today, the committee that sat on this problem in 1921, and to whom the hon. member paid tribute, as I do, said nothing in their descriptive booklet with regard to Canada's determining at that time that her national colours would be red and white. I said further that having used the red maple leaf for the sacrifice of Canadians in the first world war it could then not be used as a Canadian flag, and therefore would be rejected as a national colour.

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time I have risen to participate in this debate. If there are those who do not wish to participate in it, that is their privilege. I have spoken now at least four times, but only twice in this year. The other occasions on which I spoke were January 21, 1962 and November 21, 1962 which, by a peculiar coincidence was just 41 years after the date on which King George V is purported to have wanted to incorporate, as the Canadian flag, the three maple leaf design, which has been now abandoned. The three maple leaf design certainly had some merit. I suppose most of the designs which came before the flag committee had some merit.

When the flag committee was established I hoped, as I presume most of us did, that they would be able to come up with a proper decision which would be acceptable to everybody in this house. I, for one, did not want the matter decided that way. I think the matter should be decided by parliament if it is possible. I believe this is our job and this is the reason we were sent here. We were given a mandate by the people, not necessarily or only to fulfil election promises because we live in a dynamic society, a changing world. In any event, the people who voted for me expected me to put what talents I have to work to solve the problems of the day as they arise. Some people are saying, therefore, that we have no right to decide this matter by means of a plebiscite; that we should decide it in parliament. I rather supported this view up until the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and his government made it impossible for me to vote freely in this house. They forced us all to take a partisan attitude. A free debate would have permitted us at least to instruct each other, if not provide us with better ideas on how to act like gentlemen and on how the people in our own districts feel.

This is what I have done. I challenge anyone to say this is not so. I hear remarks in the corner to the effect that I have spoken four times already and this will be another

empty contribution. Hon. members should at least do me justice by reading what I have said before they condemn me. These four speeches were as long as I am permitted under the rules. I stated what I sincerely felt. No one could construe from my words that I had anything but the greatest respect for that other great race of people, the other partner in confederation, for whom I have great admiration and affection. What do I get? When I get on my feet I get abuse, hisses and catcalls. If any member doubts my word, he has only to read *Hansard*. I do not want to name the man who said these things, but at one point he went so far as to say I would be rubbed out. Those are the exact words. His name does not appear on this page of *Hansard* to which I shall refer. I do not know if he was not identified or if he was talking behind his hands so that the *Hansard* reporter could not get his name; but I know who he was. I am not going to say who he was, but his exact words can be found at page 6938 of *Hansard* for August 17, and they were, "We will rub you off." By no stretch of the imagination can anybody take any meaning from that other than it is the language of the underworld. I hope the hon. member did not mean it. I hope he was not speaking for any group of people when he said that. I spoke from my heart and in my speech there was not one word which anybody could say was narrow-minded, controversial and so partisan that I should have been subjected to that type of abuse.

The only reason I mention this today is because the same type of remark is being made, and I do not think it is the type of remark that will keep partisanship down. I have been trained to control my temper. Perhaps at times I may sound a little warmed up but I shall never get to the point where I threaten the life or safety of another hon. member of the house.

I expected at the time that, after seeing it in *Hansard*, the hon. member might deny it because it is the kind of talk Canadians dislike. By rights we could have asked the Speaker to have him removed from the house. The fact that such a threat is made under the protection of parliament does not add any lustre to it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. It seems to me that having made this point the hon. member should go on to discuss the amendment before the house.

[Mr. Bigg.]

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Speaker, if I have gone a little beyond the bounds it is because I am trying to show that if this type of attitude persists in parliament and creates the kind of atmosphere we have, then the press and T.V. commentators can assume we have lost our heads and are no longer fit to make a proper decision on this subject.

I started out by saying I wanted parliament to decide this question, but how can it when threats are made on a person's life? I hear groans opposite, but I point out that that remark has never been removed from *Hansard* and is to be found at page 6938.

Only one man on the opposite side got up on his feet and gave his true and unchanging attitude to this whole matter, the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan). He made a courageous speech and I can only assume he must speak for the Liberal party because they have not repudiated or refuted him. No hon. member on the other side got up and took exception to what he said. I believe it is the duty of hon. members not only to oppose arguments put forward by the opposite side of the house but also to qualify such definite statements as appear to be entirely in opposition to the stand taken by one's own party. In the absence of that I can only assume the hon. member has the approbation of most of the members in his party. If the rest of them do not agree then they must be 100 per cent behind the three maple leaf flag which was originally introduced and upon which the Prime Minister said the government would stand or fall. Then he said there would be a free vote, but the ink was hardly dry on *Hansard* before he returned with a different proposition, a double flag for Canada.

If there was an election promise that we were to be seized of this question and had to decide it before going home for Christmas, why did the government not stand behind its pledge to have one flag for Canada, one flag for one nation? It was a courageous act on the Prime Minister's part to introduce a motion on the flag issue, but it was not particularly courageous on his part to back down almost immediately, and to continue to back down until now we have reached the position where a flag recommended by a parliamentary committee is before us, a flag originally proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), a single maple leaf flag.

You may argue all you like about the colour, and design but to my way of thinking this decision to abandon the three maple leaves and adopt one maple leaf was nothing

but a political gimmick. Those who staked their political future on the three maple leaves back in May have forgotten them completely. They now say they believe in a gentlemanly compromise, but it is hard for me to believe this is a gentlemanly compromise.

It is hard for me to believe that the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson), who was the spiritual mother of the three maple leaf flag, could be convinced by a short argument in a plugged committee—plugged in the sense that there were more government members on it than we had on it—that he should abandon the child of his own imagination. I can only assume he was told to do so. I know he is a man of great courage and conviction, but I cannot understand why he did not stand up like the hon. member for York-Humber and fight this thing to the bitter end.

Mr. Matheson: May I ask my hon. friend if he does not feel it makes very good sense that there could be several really excellent possible flags for a country, all of which in one way or another tend to relate to or dignify the heraldry of that country or the history of that country? Does he feel there must be only one right flag for a country?

Mr. Bigg: No, I do not think anything I said suggested that at all. I am talking about why I insist on a plebiscite, because parliament has made a political football out of this thing. The question has gone beyond that of design. We have made a political football of this, perhaps on all sides. I am not accusing the government alone of doing this. We have been driven into a corner where we are perhaps putting up too strong an argument for a particular design which we happen to prefer, but I certainly do not see anything wrong in my standing on my feet and saying I prefer one particular design, or in the hon. member for Leeds supporting his spiritual child. No one would criticize him for doing that. In fact this is all so reasonable that a member of his own party agrees with me.

But when the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) says, "I will have anything that is not British," surely this is a partisan point of view. Why not something that is partly British? I do not object to any design which may have some connection with the French race, whether remote or not. Personally, if I had to design a flag—and I know a little about heraldry—I would like to see the union jack quartered with the lily banner of France. This would represent the marriage of two nations and would be correct in heraldry. It would designate the differing points of view and loyalties but show them co-operating together.

I hope my contribution to this debate has been positive. I have tried to find the proper compromise. At no time have I said I want to ram the union jack, or any other design, down hon. members' throats. I believe in democratic free speech. I believe in it to such an extent that I did not make a point of it when a threat was made against me. I thought the important thing here was to decide, if we could, on some compromise—if we must. I do not think any member of the Conservative party has said: We must have the red ensign and that alone. If we were rabid about our British connection, surely we would make no objection about having the double submission to parliament. I want one flag for one nation. I had hoped we could reach agreement by compromise on such a flag. If we had started with a clean slate and kept it out of politics and if the Prime Minister had not risked the life of his government on it, we might now have something like the lilied banner of France, and the union jack quartered in our national flag.

Some day Canada may be a republic; I do not know. We may be moving in that direction. If such should be the will of Canada as a free democracy, I suppose I must accept it. I am not a great royalist, but I still believe there are many ways in which the British commonwealth is of great help to Canada. I think the monarch as referee under our parliamentary system is still essential to proper debate, to British justice and to that loyalty which unites us all in one big, happy family. There were many people in Quebec who went out, perhaps to jeer the Queen as she passed. But when they saw the cultured woman who went by, in all her majesty and simplicity, a woman who speaks the two languages, English and French, as well as any member of this house, they began to change their minds and were even proud of her. And all I want to do, is to present my attitude toward democracy and co-operation in such a way that members will perhaps be proud of me. I mean by this that I love the French nation. I am trying to learn the language so as to be able to speak to Canadians of French origin in their own tongue.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boutin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder in what way the remarks of the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Bigg)

are related to the amendment now before us and calling for a plebiscite?

I suggest that the hon. member should be called to order so that we might vote without delay.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have to say that the point is well taken. I have the impression that the hon. member is somewhat distant from the question we are discussing today. His remarks are very interesting and the Chair has been following them closely but perhaps at this time he might wish to relate them to the point which the house must consider.

Mr. Bigg: Possibly I am trying too hard to make my point. But I do not think the House of Commons is in the mood any longer to discuss this question in the way it should. This is because we have made a political football out of it. And, as I have said, perhaps I have some responsibility here; perhaps some of the things I have said could be considered in that light, though I hope they cannot. But this issue has become a political football, and in the circumstances the argument I put forward in favour of a plebiscite at this time is one based on the wishes of my own people in the Athabasca district. They want a plebiscite. I do not have the facilities to conduct a Gallup poll but I sincerely believe the majority of them want an opportunity to make their views heard on this particular subject. I do not only mean those who vote for me, by any means. I have received letters from people who I know as well as any politician can ever know do not vote for me. Yet they have sent letters—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Cyr: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I should like to point out, for the record, that there are only six Conservative members in the house at present. Therefore, only six are interested in the debate.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. That is not a question of privilege.

An hon. Member: They are all reading the new code of ethics.

Mr. Bigg: The people of my riding want a plebiscite and I would be delinquent in my duty if I did not tell the members of this house how they feel. That is, surely, my first, second, third, fourth, and every other duty, namely to do what the people back home want me to do. That is why they sent me here and that is what I have to do. This is why I have no difficulty whatever controlling my temper; I will stand here and represent them no matter what is said. They want a plebiscite. They want a chance to express their opinions because—and I think I can say this quite properly—they think we have abdicated our position here; they can have no faith in any decision we may reach, now, in the House of Commons on this subject.

As to whether or not we are engaged in a filibuster, let me say this: On September 8 we had a vote in this house as to whether or not we should end the flag debate and get along with more important matters. The Liberal party voted 100 per cent to carry on the debate. Apparently they did not want to carry it on themselves; they wanted to hear us. Well, we are doing what this house voted to do; we are carrying on the debate. And I think the debate could soon be put into its proper perspective if we were to vote on whether or not we should hold a plebiscite.

There are arguments that a plebiscite should not be held because that is not the Canadian way of doing things. I remember the last plebiscite. It was during the war and a plebiscite was taken to decide whether or not individual Canadian citizens should be forced to bear arms in the service of their country. The questions on that plebiscite were worded in such a way that they were difficult to understand and interpret. It may well be argued that if a plebiscite is hard to understand and if its results may be misconstrued it has serious defects. But I am convinced that plebiscites are not without value and that they are legitimate and normal when a parliament has got itself into a position where it cannot carry out its duty properly. I am convinced we are in that position today and that it is my plain duty to vote so as to give the people a chance to get us out of the unholy mess we are in. The people have their ideas. They want to be heard and I believe they have the right to be heard. They have asked me as their representative, as their member from Athabasca, to make their views known in no uncertain terms, because they agree with the fourth estate and the representatives of other news media in what they say to the effect that we have not done a very good job here in parliament on the flag.

I do not intend to accuse members of being partisan in anything they have said or done since the start of this debate. I do not believe in accusing other people. I believe that if you accuse other people of being crooked,

the accusation carries within it an indication of your own character. I would advise the people who accuse me to read my speeches and see whether I am a narrow Anglo-Saxon. They might even look into the latter statement more closely. I have in my constituency people of other origins, and sometimes from people of those other origins I get letters saying: Why do not the two great founding races, so-called, get together on this question and behave like gentlemen? Our native people say: We kept our side of the treaty, why don't you keep yours? They were promised conditions in which to live superior to those they had. They were men of honour, and they expected to be dealing with men of honour.

The position taken by our own French speaking members is often regarded by members of the opposition as a horrible example of disunity within this party. I can give an explanation of this. It is not possible to expect unanimity, even on such a matter as a plebiscite, because in our party we are individuals, each and every one of us. Our leader has been accused by people outside the party, of trying to ram this plebiscite idea down our throats. I believe the idea of a plebiscite is very largely backed by the members of our party, although we are not unanimous. It would be strange if 95 men at any time—if they were men of thought and courage—were able to say they were absolutely unanimous and could find no reason for difference. If this was human nature, if this was the Canadian way and we could expect 20 million people to be unanimous, why would we need this institution? Surely it is to decide whether a question such as the holding of a plebiscite can be resolved here like gentlemen, having free speech and tolerance one for another.

I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, because I do not think it can be repeated too often in this atmosphere, that I do not deny to people of French origin or people who merely live in Quebec, perhaps, their full opinion on this matter. I do not object to any symbol which they may want incorporated in their flag. The only reason I have stood up for the red ensign myself is because since a child I have considered it my flag. Since 1921 it has in fact been our legal flag, and is until parliament decides to the contrary. Since 1944 it has been confirmed, and was confirmed by a Liberal government at that time who thought that perhaps Canada was not mature enough to accept the responsibility for changing its flag and perhaps putting on that flag something entirely new. There are arguments in favour of that point of view. I do not object to giving the people of Canada the opportunity to remove the union jack or any part of it from our flag; I merely make my own contribution and say that I like the union jack, and I know why—because it stands for British justice. Is it strange that a man like myself, who spent 23 years in the mounted police, should have some respect for that flag which flies every day outside our detachments? It is a lifelong habit of respect, if nothing else. But I do not expect everybody to respect that flag; all members of this house were not mounted policemen. We do not have unity even in the army on this subject; there are many servicemen who do not want to retain the red ensign. They have the right to get up and say so, if that is their opinion. And many of them are of British origin.

If you read all the speeches in *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker, on this subject I think you will find that most of those which have come from this side of the house have been reasonable, well thought out, factual and even unimpassioned. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am sometimes surprised at the restraint with which we accept the barbs; I am surprised at the way we accept hisses and catcalls when saying merely that we like the flag under which we serve.

Surely it is not strange that men should stand up and say, "I respect this flag because I served under it". I wonder what citizen of the United States would even dare get up and say, "Let's pull down old glory". We are a very tolerant people; we allow people to get up and say, "Get rid of it and everything British, regardless". That was said in this chamber this afternoon. I have not said, "Let's shoot them. Let's take them out and hang them", or that sort of thing. A member has a perfect right to say that he wants no part of this flag to be retained as a symbol; but I would object very strongly if, having voted on the matter and having decided on one particular design, he said he was no longer going to be loyal to that flag and serve under it. The hon. member has not said that and I am not accusing him of it. Surely we have a right to stand up and put forward our views in connection with those things we love dearly. I do not only love things that are of Anglo-Saxon origin, but I love things of French origin; their literature, songs and the people themselves. There are times when I wonder whether this feeling is mutual. I do not like to wonder about these things; I do not want ever to wonder whether we are a united nation. But people talk that way

sometimes. I like to hope it is only because they are taking things a little too seriously; that their passions are aroused by things said over here, or things which they think have been said over here. These things do make people angry.

I believe I am making my point, Mr. Speaker, that in this atmosphere we cannot decide this matter like gentlemen and therefore we should let the people decide what they want in this regard, who after all are a little more removed and can be more dispassionate than we in this house. The people should be given the opportunity to make their views known in this matter. There are objections to this course being followed. It is said that we cannot put this problem to the people in a reasonable manner. I think we can. I do not think there is any haste in this matter. I do not see any reason why, even though the government has in the past committed itself to something—I think they committed themselves to a foolish promise—they cannot withdraw this matter. I would admire them more if they withdrew as gracefully as they can and said, "Really there is no haste. We made our promise to bring this subject forward and intended to dispose of it in parliament; but we have got to the point where we cannot". I do not think we can, and therefore I believe the only solution is to send it to the people. I do not think it is beyond our legal brains to draw up a plebiscite that would be fair and would allow everybody to vote on this question. I do not think it would be very difficult to decide upon one of a number of designs in this manner. I would suggest that the most important thing to be decided is whether or not we are going to have the red ensign or some modification thereof, or a complete denial of that type of flag. If that is what the Canadian people want, what is wrong with there being two votes on the question. We could get rid of the first question first and then decide, if we can, between the three maple leaf design, the one maple leaf design, or four, five or six designs. At this juncture I do not think it is a question of design. I do not believe this is bothering most of us. It is a question of method; it is a question of whether we can make a rational decision of some kind with a gun at our heads—economic, perhaps.

I do not believe most of us are here to earn a living. It is a tough way to earn a living, if that is what it is. Some of us like home life. So don't use that kind of economic gun, because it doesn't work. Some of us would come here for nothing; some of us would pay to come here and have the privilege of putting forward the views of our people at home. Men on both sides of the house have paid; members of the Liberal party in this house have served their country with great distinction and great personal sacrifice, perhaps even to the point of death. How much their services in this house have contributed to their early death, I do not know; but these people did make great contributions. I am not going to say—and never will—that because a man sits on the opposite side of the house he has no contribution to make; and I hope there are men over there—in fact, I know there are—who will not write me off as nothing but a partisan, because I am not.

If a plebiscite is put to the people, the three maple leaf design may well be resurrected, and if the people of Canada vote for that flag, I will do the same as the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) and serve under it. He and I served under the old flag and I am certain we will do it again. I know it is that kind of thing that will bring us out of this difficulty. Let us have some of this spirit now, and co-operate; let us admit that we are in a boghole and resolve this difficulty. Let us admit that we have called each other too many names and have been impatient with each other. I hope that my speech today will induce members to let bygones be bygones so that we may have a free vote, a vote free of political pressures of any kind. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that is what we came here for. This would be far and away better than holding a plebiscite. However, I do not think there are ten men in this chamber who believe we can decide this question here fairly and squarely, because it has already gone too far. I accept responsibility in this regard. On behalf of myself and my party I do not say the fault rests with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker). It certainly does not. I share the responsibility with him. I am not speaking for the rest of my party but I am speaking of my impressions from what the rest of my party have done when this matter has been discussed—unless they have had secret meetings which I have not heard about. The Leader of the Opposition has merely been expressing the feelings of our party arrived at in a democratic way; we are democratic in our party and in our country. There are times when we have to take a stand somewhere, especially when we have this political and economic gun put to our heads. We are forced into a corner in

which we have to make decisions that perhaps would not be made if people had the courage of the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan). I am quite sure he made his decision all on his own. It is a mistake, to my mind, for the rest of the Liberals to be silent and to suggest that the whole case has been made for their flag. If I were the hon. member for Leeds I would be disappointed if my colleagues did not rise and speak in the debate in this house. They knew they would be here, because they planned it. They had no legislation or anything else—

Mr. Greene: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Bigg: Yes.

Mr. Greene: I wonder whether the importance that his party puts on this question is indicated by the fact that a while ago there were six members of his party in the house, and now there are 12? If this question is so important why is there not a better representation?

Mr. Bigg: The hatchet men of the Liberal party are at work again. These interruptions come from the same area at about five minute intervals.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Bigg: I hear groans coming from hon. members opposite. Is there anybody else who would like to ask a question? At least the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Greene) stands on his feet.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Apparently an hon. member is accepting the invitation of the hon. member for Athabasca.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boutin: Mr. Speaker, I think every argument in favour of a plebiscite has been mentioned in the various speeches made to date.

In the last several days the speeches made in the house have only been a repetition of the same arguments, whether valid or not, according to the member who makes his contribution.

Can the hon. member for Athabasca tell us why the Conservative party goes on rehashing the same points instead of giving the house an opportunity of deciding for or against the Conservative amendment concerning a plebiscite?

[*Text*]

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the cooperation of the hon. member in instructing me in my parliamentary duties, but I am trying to make a positive contribution in the few minutes I have at my disposal, and if I waste them I suppose that is my responsibility and my loss. At the present time I am sitting on the edge of my chair in anticipation of the contribution the hon. gentleman will make, which will show me in better manner than the short lecture he has just given me how he will contribute to the united stand to be taken toward this new flag. I should like to be convinced I am wrong. I should also like to be convinced that he, as a French speaking Canadian gentleman, will give me my right to make my points, even though they be made poorly and weakly, and then I assure him that I will sit here quietly in my seat for another 40 minutes and listen to him with close attention. The translation system which the Conservative party was instrumental in putting into this house makes that possible. Again I can only regret that my efforts at learning "la belle langue Française", have so far been somewhat abortive.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boutin: Mr. Speaker, to answer the hon. member forthwith—

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I should remind the hon. member for Athabasca that he has just about one minute left in his allotted time, and if he invites questions the time taken must be charged to him.

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to invite any controversial questions. I had hoped I was putting forward principally ideas of my own as to why we need a plebiscite. It is obvious that the interjections and questions are not relevant to the point at all but are merely efforts to interfere with the time allotted to me. The hon. member for Renfrew South can carry on reading his paper or join the rest of his party in the lobby; they are not in the house either. I did not bring up this question about the attendance in the house, which we all deplore. This question was brought up by the hon. member for Renfrew South. I did not mean to mention it during the flag debate, but I will now. I should like to know where the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) has been during the flag debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I must interrupt the hon. member; his time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boutin: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of pursuing the Conservative filibuster,

but since I am asked to make a speech, I shall cut it down to five words: I am against a plebiscite.

[*Text*]

Mr. G. H. Doucett (Lanark): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with keen interest and attention, and despite the absence of many, to the many speeches which have been made on this issue. At the outset of my remarks may I point out that in a democratic country we cannot all be of the one opinion, and I am in favour of a plebiscite on this issue. I think that if the entire population of this great country of ours had the opportunity to voice their views and opinions there would be a greater degree of unity and satisfaction than would be the case if a flag is selected by this house and forced on the people. Regardless of the fact that this choice may be the flag which becomes the flag of Canada, it will not be the flag of the majority. I am not of the opinion that questions such as this should be decided by 265 representatives in this house. I agree, as do many others, that in most cases that is right; and the position is stated by Mr. Bruce West much better than I could state it.

Mr. Brewin: May I ask the hon. member a question. Does he not think that decision by parliament is the traditional British way to decide things; and is he not a strong supporter of British traditions? I believe he is.

Mr. Doucett: I am just going to explain that, Mr. Speaker. The selection of a flag is different from many other questions, in fact from all of them. There are no experts or specialists who can select or determine what should be the flag of this country. I should like to quote Mr. Bruce West, who says this:

> All I can say is that we did not introduce this contentious question into our country's affairs. It was introduced by the advocates of the new flag. Let them demand a new flag if they choose to do so. This is their right, as citizens of this country. But when some of us object to this proposal, let the blame for spreading disunity fall upon the heads of those who introduced the proposal, not upon those who exercise their right to oppose it.
>
> Much has been said about how undesirable it would be to hold a nation-wide referendum on the flag question, on grounds that the ordinary man in the street should be content to leave this matter in the hands of his elected representatives. Ordinarily, I would agree with this theory.

That answers the point made by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). Mr. West continues:

> But not in the case of the proposed new flag. For one thing, every Canadian is fully qualified to make a decision on this particular matter.
>
> [Mr. Boutin.]
>
> In fact, I'd like to see even the children have a chance to express their views. Second, I do not believe that in the case of the flag our members of parliament are actually representatives of our people in the broad sense although they are, of course, in the legal one. You know and I know that the cards in this important game are politically stacked in Ottawa in such a way at this time that the true wishes of the people have become greatly obscured.

I have read that because it is a very good editorial. I have said that I am in favour of a plebiscite. I am happy to have this opportunity to voice my view and the views of many of my constituents and many other people, groups, organizations and individuals, many from a great distance, who have written me letters and who have sent me petitions. They are deeply concerned regarding the heritage and traditions of our country.

At the outset I want to go on record that the whole flag issue is, as I said when I spoke on August 25, a very important one though not one of immediate urgency. Decades have come and gone and Canada has gone forward. So let us, I suggest, lay a proper foundation for the selection of what touches on the very soul of our nation. I am more and more convinced that the only way this nation can have any reasonable degree of unanimity in a problem as emotional as this one is by a plebiscite.

It has been suggested that the reason for bringing about a new flag is to have a purely Canadian flag for the nation. If this is so, then it must be one that is the choice of the people. What other way can we get the democratic opinion of our entire population than by giving them the opportunity to voice their views in a plebiscite?

The navy has always had its own flag, the white ensign. The R.C.A.F. has had its flag with the blue background, and the army has used the red ensign. All these flags have one thing in common, the union jack in the upper quarter. Over the years these flags have come to mean much to those who have served in the forces and have therefore become part of our heritage and the focal point in rallying the nation in times of emergency. I say that a plebiscite would be most fair to those gallant men and women who have served this country, in that it would give them the opportunity to voice their own likes or dislikes. To prevent this now would seem to me to strike at the very foundation of our nation and discount entirely our past heritage. It would mean that we would be turning our backs on the many glorious

sacrifices made in the past that have built up this country to where it stands among the nations of the world today.

These sacrifices were not made by one ethnic group alone but by individuals of all groups who had come to regard Canada as their homeland. As a Canadian I am proud of this heritage and these sacrifices, and I see no legitimate reason for tossing them out without giving all our people the chance to voice their views in respect of this important matter.

In this fast changing world, Mr. Speaker, are we trying to establish a new Canada today, something which began in 1964 and which posterity will look upon as dating from 1964? Yes, Mr. Speaker, a plebiscite is what thousands of Canadians want. We have been made aware of this through the petitions which have been addressed to the house, to the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and the members of his cabinet and to individual representatives of the different ridings. The people feel it is their democratic right to have the right to decide on their nation's emblem.

I further realize that feelings in regard to this important issue are mixed, but to what extent is one of the things that I think is unknown. They are mixed and we cannot be sure as to the situation. We do not know whether 30, 40, 50 or 60 per cent, or what percentage, hold a particular view; but if a plebiscite is held it will establish to what degree and satisfy all.

There are many besides those who have spoken in this house who have endorsed a plebiscite and the democratic right and privilege of the people of the country to voice their opinion. I should like to quote from *The Legionary* of July, 1964:

> *The Legionary* therefore takes what is probably the last opportunity available to make one more appeal to the Prime Minister to let the people of Canada decide this crucial question. We do so because we earnestly believe a national plebiscite is by far the most clearcut way of settling the problem once and for all, and because we sincerely believe it is the only means of avoiding, so far as it is possible to do so, making it a partisan issue. Even if a "free" vote of M.P.'s and senators were allowed there would be a natural tendency, human nature being what it is, for government supporters to vote for the government's own design, and it is far from certain that a parliamentary vote on an issue of this nature would accurately reflect the feelings of the whole people of Canada.
>
> As we said in our May issue: "In a free democratic country, where public opinion is neither regimented nor suppressed, instances occur when the people are stirred to the innermost depths of heart and soul. Then it is that government by the people, for the people, is given true effect by a national vote on the issue at stake, and on that only."
>
> *The Legionary* believes that the flag question is such an issue and again strongly urges the Prime Minister to let the Canadian people decide it, one way or another, through a national plebiscite. It is the most democratic way of solving this problem. It is the only way to ascertain what the people really want. And the request for a plebiscite is sure to be warmly supported by all Canadians of good will and moderation because, no matter what the result, if the issue were settled by a parliamentary vote only, grave doubts would arise in the minds of a great many citizens that it represented the will of the people. These doubts would linger on for many years and would remain a serious obstacle to the attainment of national unity.
>
> So please, Mr. Prime Minister, let the people decide. It would be a statesmanlike solution and might well be a nation-saving move.

Now, those are the sentiments of the Legion which has, I suppose, upwards of a quarter of a million members. Many of their comrades who served in the war paid the supreme sacrifice and are not here to tell their story. I said before, and I repeat, I feel the government got off to a wrong start by introducing a definite design. This contention has been borne out by the report of the flag committee. The committee voted 100 per cent against the proposed three leaf flag. Surely, Mr. Speaker, when an issue tugs at the very soul of a nation great care should be taken in arriving at a solution. Each citizen should be given the democratic opportunity to express his or her opinion. In my opinion, if this were done it would do a great deal to curtail much of the controversy which the choice of a flag has created and bring about a greater degree of unity in our country, which the fathers of confederation endeavoured to create by binding us together in one great family.

I say, give the people a voice. They will remember our great inheritance. By the same token, we are the custodians of a sacred trust. Let us remember the religious emblem which permeated the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II. Let us recall the significant reply given by Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent, the then prime minister of Canada, when he was asked why the new Queen had been proclaimed in Ottawa as the defender of the faith. He said that this was a Christian country. As a Christian country, I believe the majority of the people wish to retain the emphasis of the cross in our national flag. The cross is primarily the symbol of the Prince of Peace, the Saviour of the world. Every city, town and village throughout Canada has a church building upon which there

is a cross as a symbol of worship and racial tolerance.

Like many hon. members who have already spoken in this debate, I have received many letters and petitions from individuals and organizations throughout the country concerning the way in which the flag should be selected. Since I have received many petitions, I should like to quote from just a couple. First, I should like to quote a short portion of a petition coming from my own constituency of Lanark, which I have the honour and privilege of representing:

We, the voters of Lanark county, go on record as being opposed to the proposed new flag—or a new maple leaf flag to replace the red ensign. Every Canadian should be given the right to vote on this vital matter by means of a national plebiscite.

I said before, Mr. Speaker, and I say again, there are no experts in this matter of deciding a flag; there are no specialists in this field. It is purely a matter of emotion and sentiment. It is for this reason I am so definite and strong in my conviction that the only equitable way of bringing about maximum unity is to allow the people to go to the polls and decide by means of a plebiscite.

I should like to quote now from a letter from the Canadian Corps Association which, on many occasions, has been in favour of the red ensign. I quote:

The comments of our Prime Minister that those who support the retention of the Canadian red ensign are endeavouring to pressure the government into an election have been made by him to simply confuse the flag issue. It is not the supporters of the present Canadian national flag who have been pushing this flag issue to the priority decision position that it has at this date reached in parliament, but it is the Prime Minister's personal endeavour to place his flag design on the flag poles of this country that has resulted in this issue reaching such controversial prominence. With such divided opinion throughout Canada on the flag question, we cannot understand why Mr. Pearson will not allow the people of Canada the opportunity to choose between the Canadian red ensign and his new suggested maple leaf choice.

It is true that the government is elected by the people to change or set policies from time to time with regard to the conduct of this country's business, i.e. Canada's pension plan, income tax rates, baby bonus, agricultural policies, national defence policies, immigration policies, etc. However, the changing of Canada's national flag cannot possibly be classed in the above general business procedures of our country. We, as Canadians, do not feel that we want Canada's national flag to be changed from time to time at the whim of the various governments. Does our Prime Minister not realize that millions of citizens living in Canada today of voting age will still be alive for another 50 or 60 years, and therefore why should 265 members of parliament whose average years in office are approximately 15 to 20 years, choose the flag which all Canadians would then be expected to respect during their entire lifetime? This is the reason why a plebiscite on the flag question is most necessary...

We would also like to point out in this letter, that the Canadian Corps Association, dominion command, considers the advice of the Prime Minister that a referendum on the flag would cost over $10 million is again simply another smokescreen in the flag question. Those who support the retention of the present Canadian national flag have not urged that the flag plebiscite need be conducted immediately—

—we do not wish to see our government waste money either, for it is the people of Canada who supply the money. The flag question ballot could be placed in with the regular voting ballots in the next scheduled general election of this country, and there most certainly is no need of either an election to be called, nor a $10 million immediate referendum when the question can be placed before the voters of this country, when the next regular general election is scheduled, and in the meantime the present national flag should be flown as it has been for the past many years until the people of Canada signify to the contrary.

Our organization fully realizes that there are many important national problems before the present members of the House of Commons that should most definitely take precedence over the flag question, and again we reiterate that it is not the supporters of the retention of the Canadian red ensign as Canada's national flag who are forcing this issue to the foreground in parliament.

In conclusion, I would like to mention that for the past half a century or more, this country's prime ministers and members of parliament have always indicated that Canada's veterans' views were respected statements by citizens who had served their country well in war, and were continuing to serve it loyally in peace through the welfare and service work of their organizations. During the past few weeks because of our present Prime Minister's open-combat attitude against the veterans organizations' views on the flag question, politicians, newspapers and general citizens have openly ridiculed the ex-servicemen who down through the years since 1900 have served Canada both at home and abroad. This type of criticism by those particularly in government authority has damaged the prestige and character of "service organizations" and we trust that it was never the intention of our present government to do so.

That is signed by the president of the Canadian Corps Association. As mentioned in that letter, there is no rush.

Much discussion has been given by many concerning the design of a flag, as though we never had one. It is strange that we should exist as a nation for nearly 100 years, sending our representatives to all corners of the earth, with our armed forces serving on every continent and recognized as Canadians wherever they have gone, yet our present government has wasted valuable time stirring up discord and resentment in every part of Canada.

Distinction is something that is earned. Culture is something that time creates. You do not build culture trying to destroy another, or denying that it exists. You give free

vent to all worth-while cultural influences. Surely it is not wrong to look back over our shoulders at yesterday. The fact that we are still predominantly British and French in outlook is what really makes us Canadians. If we forget sentiment and abandon tradition we may court extinction rather than distinction. We cannot live in the past, but we can live by it. A country which does not honour its past has no future.

This is no time for party politics. We should rise above it. The democratic world is watching. This is a matter in which history is being made, and some day a boy may ask his father to tell him the story of our flag and the father should be able to say, "Son, it was our finest hour." Let us see that our efforts are such that the generations to come will be able to say, "Son, it was our finest hour."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Some hon. Members: Dispense.

Mr. G. L. Chatterton (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I hear remarks of "dispense" and "question." That indicates the attitude of mind of people across the aisle and on the far left. They know in advance what I am going to say. Their minds are made up, but I can tell them they do not know what I am going to say.

Mr. Grégoire: You have already said it.

Mr. Chatterton: If the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) would listen for a moment he might learn something. It is unlikely that he will do so but it is a suggestion he might follow. I am speaking on the amendment which in effect proposes a plebiscite on the question of the national flag.

At the outset let me say that I am strongly opposed to the principle of a plebiscite—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chatterton: I hear applause from the other side, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps they will hear me out on why, in spite of my strong convictions against the principle of a plebiscite, I nevertheless feel that under certain circumstances, including the present, the advantages of a plebiscite overbalance the disadvantages.

An hon. Member: What about the political considerations?

Mr. Chatterton: Responding to the interjection from the other side may I say the political considerations are entirely from those on that side.

In conveying to hon. members my conviction against the principle of a plebiscite when it is up to parliament, the governing body, to accept the responsibility, I would like to relate that when I was in local government in British Columbia, before I became a member of this house, on many occasions I decried the provincial legislation in that province which required consent of the people—in effect a plebiscite—when in my opinion the local body of government should have had the responsibility or right of decision. Yet in spite of my strong aversion to the principle of a plebiscite, I nevertheless feel there are valid arguments for supporting the proposal at this time.

The mere fact that, in spite of my convictions as to the principle of a plebiscite, I have arrived at my present position must surely indicate—at least it does to me—that we have arrived at a sorry state when we have to resort to this measure. If the whole issue of a flag had been approached in a different manner the question of a plebiscite would never have arisen. For example, if the same approach was taken by the present government as was taken in 1945-46, I doubt if this question would ever have occurred to anyone in the house.

An hon. Member: They never had a decision.

Mr. Chatterton: Mr. Speaker, I hear from the other side, from some person who is afraid to stand up and make a speech, that there was no decision. There was a very clear decision from the special joint committee of 1945-46; but the difference in procedure at that time and today was this, that in 1945 the joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons was set up to propose a national flag for Canada and it was not told in advance that this or that flag for the preference of the government or the prime minister.

The committee entered upon that debate with a completely open mind. No instruction was given to them as to what they might or might not do. As a result of this approach the 1945 committee came up with a recommendation. As a matter of interest only, the recommendation happened to be the Canadian red ensign with the shield replaced by a maple leaf. The pertinent point is that the committee came up with a recommendation based on a vote of 23 to 1.

Mr. Moreau: Fourteen to nothing.

Mr. Chatterton: That vote of 14 to nothing was, of course, the committee's vote against the flag proposed by your Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson).

It is unfortunate that after the committee reported in 1946 the government of the day neglected to take action. But the fact remains that if the flag question with which we have been dealing had been approached in the same manner, and if the government had proposed the adoption of the report, there would certainly have been the odd person here and there who would raise objection, but generally speaking there was a consensus. To me, the question of the flag is akin to certain matters which are defined in the British North America Act. In other words, I feel that questions such as the flag should be treated as constitutional amendments, and that only when there is general consensus among the major groups within Canada should a change be made. If this question had been approached as it was in 1945 and had the report been acted upon by the government, then the question of the plebiscite would not have arisen. As it is, the manner in which the government opened this flag question has created difficulty and disunity. I intend to quote from certain newspapers across the country to substantiate my contention that the manner in which this question was raised has resulted in disunity. Because of the disunity which has been created it becomes necessary, unfortunately, to proceed with a plebiscite as the only way out of the dilemma in which we find ourselves.

There are one or two alternatives and if the government were to accept them a plebiscite would not be necessary. However, I doubt whether the government will accept these alternatives; I will come to them later. On the basis that the government is determined to pursue its present course I believe a plebiscite is the way out, because this government is creating and compounding disunity.

In support of my contention that the government's approach to the flag question is creating disunity I would quote from the Victoria *Daily Colonist* of May 29, 1964 which says, referring to the proposed change in the flag:

> Such attempts were resisted by Mr. King and Mr. St. Laurent but their successor, Mr. Pearson, is now leading the attack on the pretext of unifying the country.
>
> Why the change? It doesn't require much insight to realize that Mr. Pearson is after additional seats in the House of Commons and thinks this is one way he can get them.
>
> No matter what his scheme there can be no doubt that the Pearson way of handling the flag issue has caused bitterness that goes very deep; that it is bound to weaken the country; and that it will not satisfy those who have been and still are shouting for a nation made up of a partnership of states.
>
> Certainly, Mr. Pearson has no right to expect that his arrogant action will be applauded or accepted by millions of his fellow Canadians.

Perhaps I can relate my personal impression of this disunifying action. What has disturbed me more than anything else, and I speak with the utmost sincerity, is the reaction which has been created, certainly in British Columbia. I agree that most of this reaction is not justified. But it exists and it makes the necessary reconciliation very difficult. This reaction has been caused by the manner in which the Prime Minister and the government have treated this question of the flag—a very emotional one. Incidentally, I may say that those who are interested may read the speech I made in this house during the previous debate. I come from an area which is probably one of the most pro-red ensign parts of the country, but I have been most conciliatory. As a matter of fact, I have been blamed by many people in my riding for being too much so. I read from an editorial which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of June 16, 1964, of which this is the opening paragraph:

> Prime Minister Lester Pearson's claim that he has pressed the issue of a national flag at this time to promote national unity is now no more than a bad joke—a sick joke. It is painfully apparent that he has succeeded only in encouraging disunity.

The first point I am trying to make in justification of the holding of a plebiscite is that the present course of the government is continuing to create disunity and that, therefore, a plebiscite would be the least objectionable course open to us. I wish to quote an editorial which appeared in the Vancouver *Province* of October 31, 1964. These opening paragraphs refer to the flag debate creating disunity:

> Undue prolongation of the flag debate. ...would bring about a general election which would be fought on the French-English issue, would set province against province, group against group and would jeopardize confederation.
>
> The foolish tragedy of all this is that the whole flag argument is a phony, politically-manufactured issue of relatively little importance compared with the urgent and important agenda confronting parliament. And yet it has been allowed to stalemate the nation's business and threaten a minor civil war.
>
> Mr. Diefenbaker and those who support retention of the red ensign are told they will destroy Canada if they don't knuckle down to Mr. Pearson's new flag. They are warned that on them rests the onus of responsibility.

This is an enormous distortion that should not be allowed to hide the truth. And the truth is that the ugly, nonsensical dilemma in which Canada finds itself is the direct result of pathetically inept leadership on the part of Prime Minister Pearson and his little coterie of brain trusters.

If the Prime Minister has an ounce of statesmanship he will recognize the danger of his foolish flag policy and withdraw his flag proposals until times are more propitious.

I have shown that the procedure adopted by the government in regard to this flag question has tended to create disunity. May I digress by saying that in my opinion the right in Canada to hold a plebiscite is not reflected only by our statutes, but by the British North America Act. It is reflected also in the minds of people. I think the most unfortunate part of this flag debacle is the fact that in the minds of people, particularly those in western Canada, there has been created a suspicion which will take a long time to overcome. It must be overcome, and I believe that every member from those parts of Canada is duty bound to try to overcome it. But the fact is that this suspicion has been created and it has tended to destroy the mental attitude of the people toward understanding our difficulties in Canada.

I now come, Mr. Speaker, to the way in which the flag question was handled by the flag committee set up during this session. At the time the flag committee was set up—I believe that was on September 10—I think there was a genuine desire in all parts of the house to arrive at some compromise conclusion that would have been satisfactory or at least reasonably acceptable to most groups across Canada. To my mind that feeling was very obvious from speaking to members on both sides of the house. I believe that if the feeling which was prevalent at that time had prevailed when the committee was considering this question—I hope I am not wrong in saying this—they might have come up with a conclusion which would have been reasonably acceptable to all groups within Canada. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Prime Minister perhaps largely because of misjudgment, in his statements immediately after the flag committee was set up tended to prejudice the chance of the committee's arriving at a near-unanimous and acceptable report.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Chatterton: I am giving my reasons for believing that the present and past procedures of the government make it necessary or advisable to have a plebiscite. According to the transcript of the program "Conversation with the Prime Minister", on Sunday, September 13, 1964—that was just three days after the flag committee had been set up—the Prime Minister was asked a question by Mr. DePoe. This is the question:

Just time for one more quick question—perhaps a very quick answer, sir. Are we going to have a new flag by Christmas?

The Prime Minister: We are going to have a new flag by Christmas. It's going to be a distinctive national flag and it will be based on this historic and proud emblem of Canada, the maple leaf.

I was watching television at that time. I believe the committee had been set up on the previous Thursday, and I was most hopeful when it was set up that an acceptable conclusion would arise out of the committee; but when I heard the Prime Minister on that Sunday night I said to my wife, "There isn't a hope". Mr. Speaker, whether or not the Prime Minister meant that, in my opinion those statements of his made it extremely difficult for the members of the flag committee to go into the committee with a completely open mind and a sincere wish to arrive at an acceptable compromise.

I should now like to quote from the Victoria *Daily Times* of September 17. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the Victoria *Daily Times* is a good newspaper but it is not one that has been renowned for its support of our party. In this article, written by Mr. Frank Rutter, it is said:

Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson Wednesday night brushed aside any question of a personal compromise on his new Canadian flag.

A crowd of 750 people who came to shake his hand at a coffee reception held by the Liberal party cheered wildly as Mr. Pearson rededicated himself to his maple leaf design.

He made it clear that he expects the House of Commons special committee to approve and the house itself to adopt the recommendation without further fuss.

I maintain that with a committee operating under those circumstances, whether or not its members did in fact make the sincerest effort to arrive at a compromise, in view of those remarks of the Prime Minister in advance of the committee meetings it certainly made any recommendation of the committee suspect in the minds of a great number of people.

Another reason I say a plebiscite should be held is this. I believe the flag committee could very easily have arrived at a recommendation which might have been accepted by this house with no or with very limited debate. I say this of my personal knowledge, Mr. Speaker. I believe that one of the flags considered by the committee would have been acceptable to members on both sides of this

house if there had been no debate or argument as to the design subsequently. I refer now to one of the three final flag designs to which the committee had boiled down all the designs. As the house knows, the committee divided all the designs they had received into three groups. The first group was based on the single maple leaf, the second group was based on the three maple leaves, and the third group were those that contained the union jack and/or the fleur-de-lis. From each of these groups the committee selected one as the best design.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Chatterton: I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that if a design had been selected such as I am going to describe, the question of a plebiscite would never have arisen. To repeat, I maintain that if the design I shall describe had been selected, the question of a plebiscite would not be before us today. This particular design, for the record, is exactly the same as the one finally selected—that is, the red maple leaf on a centre white background and a red border at each end—except that there are two small additions. In one red column there is a small union jack, and in the other red column a small, equally sized square with three fleur-de-lis in it. As soon as the committee report was filed, I believe on November 29, I became curious as to what this flag looked like. I happened to get a copy of the flag and it immediately seemed to me that this was a perfect solution. This design had many advantages. In the first place, it was not a political flag; it was not a flag proposed by the Conservative party, or any other political party. It was apparently a design of the experts on the flag committee. That design has as its central motif a maple leaf; it is a maple leaf flag.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. In spite of the suggestion made by the hon. member to the effect that what he is now saying is relevant to the question before the house, the Chair has very serious doubts about it and it seems the hon. member is now discussing the question of the work done by the committee. He says that if the committee had reached a different conclusion or had made a different recommendation, then a plebiscite would not have been necessary. To my mind this is rather far fetched in the line of relevancy. I would ask him to relate the argument he is now proposing to the Chair to the subject matter under discussion.

Mr. Chatterton: Mr. Speaker, if I may eliminate my references to the findings of the committee, I am trying to state the case that under certain circumstances I for one would not support a plebiscite, but that under the circumstances which prevail I would support it. I am trying to describe these circumstances which do prevail, and one of the factors which make up the circumstances is that I believe there is a design which might be acceptable, which would therefore eliminate the necessity for a plebiscite. This particular design I have described could, I believe, be acceptable to members on both sides of the house, and I hope I am not too optimistic when I appeal to the Prime Minister and to hon. members opposite to take another look at the question of design. A design which met the requirements of the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition would surely eliminate the need for a plebiscite.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are not very far from arriving at such a design. To me, the whole question whether we should have a plebiscite or should not is not necessarily one which the people have the right to determine. I believe that if the members of this house came to a consensus on a selected design and there was no major group in the house which took strong exception to it, then I for one would not for a moment consider the necessity for or advisability of a plebiscite. I think the whole question boils down to the selection of an acceptable design.

There is at the moment an amendment before the house, and on the basis of the present amendment I could not within the rules move another amendment which would bring about what I have in mind, which is reconsideration by the committee of a design which might be acceptable to groups in all parts of the house. Such a design, of course, would eliminate the necessity for debate. I would go as far as to say that if such design were agreed upon by even the two major parties I would, under those circumstances, support the government if it were to invoke closure in order to bring about a design which is acceptable to the majority of the groups within Canada. I do not know whether it is too late to do this. I do not know whether the positions of the various parties have hardened too much. But I would make an appeal to the members on the other side of the house. I have spoken to many members from all parts of the house, and I must say I had hoped that we might reach agreement in spite of the recommendations of this committee. I have spoken to individual members on an individual basis, and they agree with me that possibly there is a design which would be generally accept-

able and which would eliminate all necessity for extensive debate, and certainly obviate any stipulation that there be a plebiscite on the flag question.

With regret, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I must now support the proposal for a plebiscite in spite of the fact, as I have pointed out, that I am strongly averse to the principle involved. As to what should be covered by a plebiscite, that is another point; but if this question were referred to a committee, I would hope that the committee would come up with two designs, and I do not think the red ensign should be one of them.

If this question were to be covered by a plebiscite, I think the designs which the committee should come up with are these. First of all, the committee grouped some flag designs into three kinds. I say that the committee should consider two groups of various designs. Everyone seems to be agreed that a new flag should be based on the maple leaf, which would be its main motif. Then the committee could recommend that two flags be submitted to the people from which they could choose. The first flag should be based on the maple leaf but carry no symbols of our heritage, our traditions or our past—as the present one recommended by the committee. The second one should be a design something of the order of the one I have described. It too should be a maple leaf design but should carry something of our history and of our past. I know from what some of my colleagues who are French speaking have told me that they are not anxious to have the fleur-de-lis on the flag. But let me tell them that the people in the west consider that the contribution made by our French speaking colleagues is a most important one and they would like to see some indication on the flag of the major contribution they made to Canada.

May I call it six o'clock?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Walker: I see a quorum, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich.

Mr. Chatterton: Mr. Speaker, I hear members opposite yelling "question". Of course, when they had a chance to call "question" they did not make use of it. Last Thursday night it was moved that the debate be adjourned so that we could go on with other business but at that time, of course, members opposite were in favour of continuing the flag debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I might mention to the hon. member that this is the second time in the course of his remarks he has offended against one of the rules of the house that requires members not to reflect on votes of the house. So I would ask him not to refer in this particular way to the vote which was taken earlier in this debate.

Mr. Chatterton: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I accept your ruling. Sometimes it is difficult to stick to the rules in the face of provocation.

I want to conclude briefly the remarks I was making before six o'clock. I said that I was opposed in principle to a plebiscite but that the circumstances were such that I thought a plebiscite was the only course open to the house in view of the situation to which the government had brought us. I still think at this late stage that although positions have hardened, particularly the position on the government side, there is room for manoeuvre, room to arrive at a conclusion which might eliminate the necessity of what I consider would be an unfortunate plebiscite. I say that because if we did have a plebiscite, no matter what its terms might be, it would tend to continue and perhaps even deepen the disunity that has been caused by the raising of this question. But at least after a plebiscite I believe the people would accept the decision that might be made, whatever it might be. But if the decision is to be made on the basis of the present course of the government, then, Mr. Speaker, judging by what a great many people in my area have told me, it will take a long time, a generation or more, for those people who feel so strongly about the flag that they considered was our flag, to overcome the feeling that something has been taken away from them, something which they have revered, something they thought was an essential part of Canada as they saw it.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, unless the government is prepared either to postpone the flag issue or unless they wish to consider a further referral to the committee so that the committee can come up with a proposal

that will be acceptable generally to the various groups within Canada, I maintain that the only alternative, and a regrettable one, is to refer the question of a flag for the decision of the people of Canada, and in my opinion the decision should be made simpler by having two designs submitted to the people.

Mr. C. O. Cooper (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I am going to be brief. I did not intend to speak in this debate, but since the last flag debate I have had so many letters and so many comments on the way this matter has been conducted in the house that I am almost forced to say a few words.

On Armistice day, when I watched the parade with the four red ensigns being carried at the front, I felt sad and with heavy heart I said to myself: Is this going to be the last time we will see our grand old flag being used on Armistice day? I was standing in front of the west block and a gentleman and his wife came along. The Canadian red ensign was flying side by side with the stars and stripes. This man spoke to me and he said, "Why do the people of Canada want to throw away the red ensign?" He looked with pride at his American flag. He reached over and stretched it out and stretched out the red ensign and his wife took a picture. He said, "I want this picture for fear the red ensign will not be seen flying again beside our stars and stripes."

I was in St. Catharines over the week end. Having been born near the water, I love boats. On the prairies we do not see many boats and I spent a lot of time at the Welland canal watching the boats of almost every nation in the world go through the locks. On their masts they all flew the Canadian red ensign along with the flag of their own nation. As to the ships that were coal burners or diesel types, the white in the flags they were flying had become dirty, but the Canadian red ensign stood out with its loud colours. It is a very picturesque sight.

While I was standing there talking to some people, one man said to me, "You know, the Canadian red ensign looks great on those ships." I said, "Yes". He said, "Why are the people in Ottawa trying to throw it away?" He did not know I was a member of parliament or that I was standing up for it. He gave me quite a talk on his feelings about throwing away our heritage, all our past experience, for a flag with none of our traditional symbols on it.

These are just a few of the comments I wished to make on some matters that have been brought to my attention since the flag debate took place a few weeks ago. I am still getting quite a few letters. Here is one from the Canadian Corps Association, which reads in part as follows:

> The Canadian Corps Association, dominion command, at this time reiterates that no change in Canada's present national flag should be made unless the government is so instructed by the citizens of Canada by means of a plebiscite vote held in conjunction with Canada's next general election.

I do not know why those sitting on your right, Mr. Speaker, are so afraid to let the people decide. I believe this is the fair method. We are down here to make rules and laws, but I do not believe a minority should decide on an issue upon which the people of Canada are so divided. I am one of those who are willing to go along with the opinion of the majority after the people of Canada decide. If it is the majority wish to have a distinctive Canadian flag, I would go along with that. I was born in Canada and spent my whole life here. I was not overseas in the first world war, but as a boy of 16 I offered my services and was led by the Canadian red ensign. I was proud to be one who marched behind it.

I said my remarks would be brief, Mr. Speaker, but I felt that because of the way things have been handled in this parliament this issue should be decided by the people. If they choose the red ensign, that is O.K. If they choose a distinctive Canadian flag, that is fine. I cannot see any of the traditional symbols of Canada on the flag that has been proposed. As I have said, I just wanted to make a few comments on these matters. I am still receiving letters about the flag. I have received 154 letters from my constituency and 152 of them have asked me to stand up for the red ensign. Oh, yes, I received one letter from a man I know very well. He said, "why should we worship England all our lives?" I answered that letter and I suggested that regardless of the flag upon which we decided, he would not be satisfied unless it had the hammer and sickle on it. I also received a letter from a 15 year old school boy. He did not say what kind of a flag he wanted, he just wanted a change. The other 152 letters asked me to stand up for the red ensign and to bring this issue before the people of Canada.

I hear a few railbirds down there, Mr. Speaker, but they do not say much. I am sorry I do not speak French, and your speeches are not worth the bother of putting on earphones.

With these few remarks, I will resume my seat, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. L. E. Cardiff (Huron): Mr. Speaker, I, too, did not intend to take part in this debate. I took 20 minutes of the time of this house during the last debate, and I do not regret it. I tried my best not to say anything that would provoke anyone else. I have sat in as many parliaments as any man in this house except one. In the 25 years I have been here, I have never sat in a worse conducted parliament; I can say that truthfully. I am not referring to the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker. They have had an impossible job, and for the life of me I do not know how they control themselves. It is ridiculous, the things they have had to put up with, and mostly from members on the government side. We on this side know enough to keep our mouths shut and remain quiet when there is someone speaking from the other side. Apparently all hon. members opposite want to do is make interjections to try to confuse the person who has the floor.

I have a few things I want to say and because I have only a few things I wrote them out during the supper hour. I am one of those who has to either speak without notes or follow my notes closely. I do not want anybody razzing me about reading my speech. I am not going to read it all, but if I have to throw it away it will be all the worse for you. As I see it, there is only one excuse for bringing the flag resolution before the house and that is the lack of preparedness on the part of the government to introduce other important legislation. I could add that the legislation which has been introduced was withdrawn and redrafted before it even had a change of being passed by parliament. The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) used the flag issue to stifle parliament for his own selfish, personal advantage. He used the flag issue also to kill time in order to get more important legislation ready to bring before the house. What an excuse that is. It has cost the Canadian taxpayers millions of dollars. If I were the Prime Minister of Canada and responsible for introducing a controversial subject such as the flag, I would at least be in my place in the house to hear what members had to say about it.

I have a clipping here from a newspaper that is very favourable to the government. I would not quote from any other newspaper because I want to be very fair to them. This comes from the Winnipeg *Tribune*.

There was nothing wrong with Prime Minister Pearson's speech to the Royal Canadian Legion except its object.

He chose this occasion to haul down the red ensign.

The speech was in reality a declaration of Liberal government intent. At the same time it was an attempt to justify a new emblem on the grounds of national unity. The case was unconvincing.

Prior to his visit to Winnipeg, Mr. Pearson had let it be known that his government would stand or fall on the flag issue. It is the government which has selected this particular time to force a showdown.

It is this newspaper's opinion that the timing of this flag proposal is bad. If the main purpose is to consolidate unity it is a peculiar approach for, as witnessed at the Legion meeting, the dominant reaction is disunity. Unfortunately, too, the Prime Minister's approach leaves little ground for thoughtful consideration. He asks, in effect, for a surrender of what is known for something unknown. He entertains a mystique about the price of unity which he is unable to articulate.

In addition to poor timing, the method of introducing the design was odd. In Ottawa last week a high level press conference made it clear that the Pearson government would stand or fall on the new flag. The following day in the Commons Mr. Pearson said that a new design had not been decided upon. At the Legion meeting on Sunday, he left the impression that only the maple leaf motif was firm. Yet the next day Mr. Pearson unveiled his choice at a press conference.

Just how much the cabinet was apprised in advance of all this is unknown. But certainly parliament has been kept completely in the dark.

I might mention at this point that the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) made a statement in the house to the effect that this subject was never brought up in the Liberal caucus, and nobody knew anything about it except a few at the top levels of government.

In attempting to force an absolute decision in this ill-defined region, the Prime Minister has created a maelstrom. It is true that he has attempted to reduce the problem to straight political terms but unfortunately this does not provide the flexible basis required.

He has placed himself and his government on the record to introduce a new flag. He has rejected the proposal for a national plebiscite and insists that the issue must be decided on a free vote in the Commons. But then he has also added that the result would be interpreted by his government as a vote of confidence.

In other words he is prepared to fight an election on the issue. He is willing to jeopardize national unity in the hope of political advantage but he is unwilling to seek an expression of opinion in a plebiscite in which the issue would be the flag, not seats in parliament.

This places the M.P.'s in a position where they no longer will be truly free to exercise their

judgment on the merits of a flag. Instead they will have to weigh the significance of the consequences, a government defeat and, even worse, an election to be fought on the design of a flag.

Such an unpleasant encounter could scarcely be an ingredient of unity. It would also be mischievous and perhaps seriously harmful, for surely the problems of this country cannot be resolved in the flag alone.

An hon. Member: Question.

Mr. Cardiff: You will get the question soon enough, don't worry about that; but you will not be satisfied with it after you get it.

We have a great number of people all over Canada who would vote for a truly Canadian flag if for no other reason than unity. On the other hand the great majority of our people would much sooner have what we now have than take a chance of separating Canadians even more than they are already. There is only a very small percentage of people in Quebec who are separatists or revolutionists, thank God. We even have a few in this House of Commons but they are still a little afraid to stand up and be counted because of their extremist neighbours.

A lot of legislation was introduced before the flag debate started, and most of it had to be taken out again and redrafted because it had not a chance of being passed by parliament in its original form. The Canada pension plan has been redrafted four or five times.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. I think the hon. member will admit he is straying far afield and I would ask him to return to the subject matter before the house.

Mr. Cardiff: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, because I do have a great deal of respect for you.

This is a quotation from a letter sent to all hon. members by the Manitoba branch of the Christian action movement:

> The red ensign probably commands a greater following than any other individual flag design submitted to the committee. Though, unfortunately, the flag has been made a party issue, many rank and file Liberals prefer to retain the red ensign but out of party loyalty may avoid overt opposition. The flag should not be a party issue, or the subject of a personal battle.

I do not know how many Christians we have in the house but, believe me, we would be better off with a few more. I am now going to recite a piece of poetry and then, you will be glad to know, sit down:

> Our flag, our flag, our glorious flag,
> The emblem of the free;
> It proudly flies in every clime, it floats on every sea.
>
> Beneath its grand old sheltering folds,
> There never treads a slave,
> Before it tyranny must sink to an unhonoured grave.
>
> Unfurl it free to every breeze,
> Long may it wave on high,
> The ensign of the bravest race
> That dwells beneath the sky.
>
> Beneath it stands the empire vast,
> Girded in power and might.
> Ready, aye ready to defend its honour,
> And ready to defend its right.
>
> Our flag, our flag, our glorious flag,
> The symbol of the free.
> Our flag invincible on land,
> And a flag that rules the sea.
>
> Our red ensign,
> Why trade it in on another?

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, on two other occasions I have spoken on a resolution on the flag, or on one of the amendments. On June 20 I did my level best to try to plead with the house that we in Canada must always remember we are a country of minorities. I tried to remind the members that we should be an example to all the new countries of the world where several languages and several races have to get along within the same geographical boundaries.

On that occasion I reminded the house that most of us in Canada do not favour the technique of the plebiscite. It is foreign to the system of parliamentary responsibility we have learned to trust, but I pointed out that there are certain occasions which touch the heart and affect the rights of minorities when we have to consider whether we should use the plebiscite technique or not.

In that speech of June 20 I reluctantly supported a plebiscite, on the grounds that looking back at the last plebiscite we had during the war, on the conscription issue, the speeches made in the house on that occasion contained all the arguments that could be used against holding a plebiscite; yet a plebiscite was held, and when it was finished Canadians found it easier to accept the will of the majority than they did in 1917 in the first world war when conscription was imposed by parliament. When the rights of the individual are affected, when matters close to the conscience are affected, there is sometimes a place for the plebiscite. That was the burden of my remarks on June 20, though I did not succeed in making many converts.

I want to remind the house of what I said on that occasion. All the veterans of our country have asked for, through majority votes in their Legions, is that a plebiscite be held. They have promised if a plebiscite is held to honour any flag which the majority may choose. What more can you ask of them?

The same is true of the other organizations. I would point out that if the government turns down the formal request of the official organization of most of our veterans it has done something which everyone of us in Canada will live to regret. Surely after what they have done they deserve our best consideration.

In the second place I want to remind the house that according to Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent, speaking in this house as prime minister, by a single resolution here in parliament the guarantees to the French language could be taken away. I suggest that if we set a precedent in this debate by taking away an emblem of a minority culture, we are setting a precedent for things to happen in the future when passions are aroused which will tend to break this country apart. I say this slowly and deliberately with no sense of malice whatsoever. If someone moved a resolution in this house to take away the rights accorded to one of the founding races of this country I would expect every person on the Conservative side to fight as long as they could within the rules to protect the rights of that group. This is what is happening today.

I do not know what percentage of the people of this country wish to retain on the flag an emblem of their tradition and their past. I do not really know, but I am aware that it is sizeable. Certainly if one third of the people of this country want to have something of the union jack as a reminder of their great history, their rights must be considered if we wish to maintain this country as a democratic country of minorities. Rightly or wrongly the flag is one of the symbols of one of the founding races of this country. As I said earlier, this speech of mine on June 20 did not make much of an impression across the way. But on August 20 I tried again and this time, in the middle of that long debate, I asked that this question be considered by a committee. I laid down four basic principles which could, I thought, have united this house and the whole country behind the work of that committee. These principles were apparently not considered by the government. It was not until after the long Labour week end, after a motion on the Thursday by the New Democratic party that the debate be adjourned so that the house could go on to more important business; it was not until the Tuesday after the week end, when the Créditiste members had come back from the rural seats and said they wanted to adjourn the debate because the people demanded it, that the government, saved by a narrow squeak, realized that every opposition party was united behind the idea of sending this matter to a committee. It was only after 22 days of debate that they let the question go before the committee. Did they consider the four basic principles which were laid down by the opposition—and I was speaking on behalf of the opposition that night?

What were those four principles? First, that in a matter such as the flag we should all strive, regardless of whether we are Conservative or Liberal, to start off with the largest possible percentage of the people behind it. That was the first principle. It was wrong to take a personal flag, a party flag, and force it on parliament saying: If you do not accept it there will be an election. We fought against that blackmail, and with the help of all the opposition parties we forced the government to place this question before a committee, after 22 days of the time of this house had been wasted in discussion. I say this loudly and clearly, Mr. Speaker, because I believe you know we are speaking from the heart on this subject on this side of the house. It would make no difference to us if all the people of Canada were to turn against us as long as we remain faithful to what we consider to be the right. It is not a question of counting noses in this house or even across the country. Above all our party divisions the people sometimes expect that we should, on certain occasions, stand up in this house and say what we think as individuals. This is what I am trying to do.

What was the second principle I enunciated at that time? It was that on any flag the symbols and the background of the two founding groups should be there in equal parts, neither superior and neither inferior. I said this not because I was unaware that our country today is a multiracial country but because I thought it is recognized that certain understandings were reached in the early days which we must honour today. The flag now put forward ignores this fundamental principle.

Third, I said there should be something on the flag to represent the humility which any country should have if it hopes to have a future. And the only way I knew for us to do that was to put something of religious significance on the flag. Because of the faith which is accepted by the vast majority of people in the western world, the only thing we know as a generally accepted emblem of religious significance is the cross—and I say this without

wishing to assert the superiority of the Christian faith over other faiths. But in the flag of Canada should be expressed that humility, that acceptance of the fact that there is a greater power than ourselves.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

I just want to know if the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton) is now talking to the amendment.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: A point of order has been made by the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis). Perhaps the hon. member was not addressing his remarks strictly to the question before us at the present time, which is the matter of the amendment to the main motion. Possibly he would want to relate his remarks to the subject matter of the amendment.

Mr. Hamilton: I bow to your judgment, Mr. Speaker, but if what I was saying is not relevant to what a plebiscite should contain, I do not know what is.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. With respect, I would like to suggest to the hon. member that the question before the house is not what a plebiscite should contain but whether or not there should be a plebiscite.

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Speaker, perhaps it has passed your memory for a bit, but I would like to read from the motion:

> —the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to conduct a plebiscite to be held at the next general election in order that the Canadian people may be given their rightful opportunity to declare their choice concerning a national flag; and that the committee for such purpose be revived.

Certainly if we are going to revive the committee I would suggest, with deference to Your Honour, that you have to discuss what the terms of reference of that committee are going to be. That is why the previous committee failed. That committee was formed; they took five members from one party, seven from another and one from each of the others. But they did not have any terms of reference beyond the general reference to go into committee. If there had been basic terms of reference to produce a flag that would meet the wishes of the house, I believe such a flag could have been produced. To put it very bluntly, Mr. Speaker, that committee should have been instructed to bring out a flag that would get the support of the two major parties here, with the support of one or two of the others if they wished; a flag that would be unanimously accepted, in effect, by the majority of the two main parties. That committee did not have any terms of reference and they ended up voting purely on party lines, with one exception.

However, I would like to leave that point. If it bothers the hon. member, I know that at his own expense he got thousands of flags printed and they are no good to him any more; but that was because of his own cupidity and it is up to him to get out of that mess. If he is a little angry today, he should not blame it on me; he should never have allowed his Prime Minister to bring it in.

Mr. Herridge: It was a poor investment.

Mr. Hamilton: What is the situation now? We have no certain way of knowing, but all sorts of polls have been taken from one end of this country to another. These polls, lacking anything better, are the best indication of what is the feeling in the country. One particular poll is taken every week. This poll showed at one time that a certain percentage of people of the people of Canada wanted a plebiscite; the last one showed that another percentage wanted a plebiscite. This figure has been quoted many times but I will quote it again. In the 11 cities covered by this poll 60 per cent of the people asked for a plebiscite three weeks ago; only 33 per cent wanted parliament to make the choice, and the balance had no opinion. If that is the best information we have from the cities, what would the figure be if you took a survey of the country areas, where people hold more closely to their traditions and institutions? I think it is safe to say that two thirds of the people of Canada do not want the members of this house to take away from them something that is a matter between themselves and their God. They want the right to choose the flag under which they serve in peace and in war. Ignore that, on the other side of the house, at your peril; because ultimately you must answer to these same people.

I want to make that very clear, Mr. Speaker. We are going to be watching very closely to see that every man stands in his place and is counted. We want the members of every constituency to be counted, and I could go along the front benches and the rear benches here and name them all.

An hon. Member: Then let us vote.

Mr. Hamilton: We want to know why they have sat idly and silently here when a matter affecting the whole spiritual basis of our country is being decided. And they claim

they are under a free vote. The hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) performed a great service for the Liberal party when he told the truth. The Liberal government that was thrown out in 1957 had become historically famous and notorious because it was a party of trained seals. This one is down on its knees waiting for free handouts from the Prime Minister. This is the party which ignores 60 per cent of the people; which ignores a Legion, representative as it may be of only part of the veterans of this country but who surely deserve the right to be listened to when they ask for a plebiscite. But you have closed your ears; you have closed your minds—

Miss LaMarsh: We have quite a few veterans over here.

Mr. Hamilton: —to anything or anyone who suggests that these people should be listened to.

Miss LaMarsh: Wait until you have had some service before you speak for the veterans.

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Speaker, the distaff side of the house has spoken.

Mr. Grafftey: Not very honourably, either.

Mr. Hamilton: I would like to give you another fact, Mr. Speaker. The Gallup polls only measure a very small number of people but they do try to give some evidence of what the people in the country are thinking. The latest figure we have had from a Gallup poll, I believe, indicates that approximately 50 per cent of the people polled want some form of new flag; but it also indicates that 42 per cent want the present flag, and about 6 per cent have no opinion. This means, Mr. Speaker, that we are dealing with a flag for which there is no majority of support as yet, because it is a new flag, and the house is being asked to accept it. In other words, because 50 per cent of the people want a new flag, all the rest must accept it. I would suggest that when a Prime Minister wanders about this country speaking on one hand about unity and reaching out with the other hand slapping his party down into miserable conformity, to divide this country by bringing in a flag like this, those actions should be spoken of in language that everyone can understand.

Why do we want a plebiscite? First of all, I do not think there is any chance of persuading any person in this house to accept views other than those he has made up his mind on: I do not think there is any chance of making one vote's difference or change here. But it is our duty to fight on as hard as we can to give the people a chance to speak on something that is their right, namely to decide the flag that flies over them. The fairest way now, in view of the attitude in the house, is to let the country decide; and if the decision is made in a plebiscite that will give them their right to express their will; the minority will obey the wish of the majority. I also point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that many of us have fought very hard to get here and none of us likes the burden of elections. But this government, now wracked and torn with dissension as it is, faltering in its last few months before it disintegrates, has to face up to the people one day; and when they do each member opposite will have to stand up and answer for his actions.

Those from the poor areas of Ontario, Quebec and the maritimes will have to go before their farmers, who have the lowest income of any part of Canada, and say, "We have not done anything for you; but look at the beautiful white and red flag". Ask them then about your wonderful fight for this new flag, which not one of you stood up and supported. When I say "not one", I use that expression in the euphemistic sense of "very few". We want a plebiscite held.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Several conversations are going on across the floor and this is unbecoming to the dignity of the house.

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Speaker, some of the debate across the house is due to the provocative nature of my remarks. Hon. gentlemen opposite are usually quiet and mannerly and act like $1,500 a month men should act; but since they have chosen me for their target I am glad to accept their challenge. I should like to make my views clear, and my time is running out. I suggest that we hold a plebiscite to give the people the chance to decide the matter.

I do not know whether you will rule me out of order, Mr. Speaker, but before you take any action in this regard, what I want to discuss now is the type of things which the committee should recommend as matters to be dealt with on a plebiscite which will make sense. We have already suggested to the house that the plebiscite should contain four choices. Obviously with the three maple leaf flag shot down in flames the proposed committee flag will have to be left as one of the choices on a plebiscite. Because of the strong emotional feelings for the red ensign, that will have to be left off. Therefore I am going to propose

at this time, as a suggestion from an individual member of the opposition and not from a party, that there is still one chance for us to come out of this matter united. I suggest we realize the strength of feeling behind the traditional, distinctive national flag we now have, but at the same time realize the strength of feeling which would be created by a brand new flag. My suggestion is that we get down to basics and realize that most people in this country are not ashamed of their past, be they English or French. We would all like to have on our flag our own symbols. If the union jack is not acceptable because it is an indication of subservience to a colonial structure, let us take off the union jack the two crosses, one white the other red; one standing for the cross of St. Louis which was flown on the ships in which Jacques Cartier landed here in 1534, and the other the cross of St. George which was the standard of John Cabot when he landed here. I know that many French Canadians do not regard John Cabot as the equal of Jacques Cartier, but that is a small consideration in the achievement of unity. I know that the Scots, the Irish, yes and the Welsh, will feel a little unhappy that their symbols have been removed. But for the sake of unity I suggest that if we had the two flags of the two founding races, the two crosses, we would have both insignia that I and my party want to see.

I think that if there was a willingness in this house to reach some sort of compromise instead of complete division, and we could get 80 to 90 per cent of the members together—and they could come together on this—if the government still wanted to fight for a maple leaf flag I am sure that not one of us would oppose the emblem of the maple leaf centred on the two crosses. Whether it was a green or red maple leaf I do not think would bother us too much. But if this flag compromise were reached, I would hope that the background would be either blue or red. I say that, because who wants to see a white flag flying over Canada? Colour is very important to us.

The hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska (Mr. Vincent) had his own suggestion about a flag. He unveiled it in his counties and found wide acceptance for it. He tried it out in deep dyed ensign country and it was found acceptable there. Why would it not be acceptable to the members of parliament here?

[Mr. Hamilton.]

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. gentleman would permit a question. I do not want him to yield the floor until he knows why I have risen. Is he prepared to answer a question?

Mr. Hamilton: Yes.

Miss LaMarsh: Perhaps the hon. member would tell the house why it is that he takes such strong objection to what he alleges is a design proposed by the Prime Minister of Canada and then has the temerity to suggest his own design to the house?

Mr. Winkler: Surely that is his right.

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minister for her question, because that is the very point. We discussed alternatives long ago. We said we should not put forward a party flag.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle had, I realize, some qualms himself as to whether the line he has been taking during the last few minutes was acceptable and in order. It is the impression of the Chair that the question of what should appear on a plebiscite was discussed for many days during the original debate and was voted on, and I am wondering whether at this stage the debate which has been held in this house and on which there was a decision should be revived. I thought the hon. member should be given an opportunity to state his point briefly, but I feel it might be better if he did not unduly extend his remarks in that direction.

Mr. Skoreyko: I rise on a point of order, but only because I want you to extend to this house the proper degree of fairness. Your Honour allowed a question from the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) which I thought was completely irrelevant, and then reprimanded the former minister of agriculture, who did a tremendous job for this country, when he made a statement.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I suggest to the hon. member that his words are rather strong. The Chair did not reprimand the hon. member for Qu'Appelle but was as discreet as possible in asking him to be relevant. The Chair had no way of knowing what question would be asked by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh). She was allowed to put a question after this was requested and accepted by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. Whether

the question was in order or was not in order the Chair could not decide in advance.

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to go to the final stages of my speech, and I am watching the clock very closely. I should like to say to my hon. friend who questioned me that many of the members in our party wanted to bring forward suggestions months ago but thought that the whole principle was wrong. We thought that if a party brings forward an idea automatically opposition is built up to it. We had hoped that the committee, which had the basic principles at heart, would come up with something which grew out of the committee, and that is the reason we held back. The hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska mentioned this matter once but he was not on the committee. The point is that the committee did not accept any basic terms of reference, made no effort to get complete unanimity from both major parties, and as a result it failed.

I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, with a statement which I make with very great caution because it is one I have pondered for many months. I want to make absolutely clear to hon. gentlemen opposite that when I stand up and vote in the house on the amendment we have before us, and finally on the main motion, I shall be voting on the selection of a Canadian flag. I believe in one Canadian flag, not two, and when the next motion comes up I am going to do all I can to persuade as many members as I can not to vote for a second flag so there will be no union jack flying over Canada by any resolution of this house. I want to explain why I am going to take that stand because it may make some sense to some of the people over there with regard to how they may vote on the particular amendment now before us. You are being asked here to vote on a plebiscite.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Dorchester has a point of order, I believe.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boutin: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I find it surprising that you should let the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton) go on when his remarks are not related to the matter under discussion, especially after calling him to order three or four times. We are not talking about the flag but about whether a plebiscite should be held. Consequently, I would ask you to call the hon. member to order and remind him to keep to the matter under consideration.

[*Text*]

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Speaker, I know you must be getting tired of these points of order because if you cannot do your job by now there is not much hope for you. I suppose the hon. member has earned his $1,500 a month by that intervention.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hamilton: I want to conclude with a statement I think may have some sense and some meaning to my hon. friends from Newfoundland, from the maritimes, from British Columbia and parts of Ontario. This I know, that many members on the other side have indicated to me privately that they are only voting for this flag because they think the union jack will be flying alongside it. I want to say here and now that the union jack is a proud flag—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Hamilton: —but it is not my flag. It is the flag of another country. I fought hard for it in the war.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. May we have order. I think the hon. member for Qu'Appelle will agree with the Chair that his reference to the particular subject matter he was just mentioning is obviously beyond the terms of the amendment now under consideration.

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Speaker, I think it is very clear that before the people vote in a plebiscite they have to know what the implications are. I want to make absolutely sure the people know that if a plebiscite is turned down by the house there will be only one flag when this matter is finished. Many people in this house on both sides are prepared to vote against the second resolution.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Hamilton: Therefore the choice now in voting on the amendment is in your hands. I want to make that very clear.

On the question of the debate itself, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the contributions of those who have remained silent when the time came for them to speak have been confined to raising points of order and questions and making interruptions and interjections. Their contributions indicate that they do not have freedom of expression of opinion.

Mr. Winkler: You are hamstrung.

Mr. Hamilton: Members of this party have got up and expressed their views absolutely in accordance with their consciences, and we are proud of one another that we have had the courage to stand up and say what we think. These gutless wonders whose contribution is silence or heckling, who are not willing to get up on their feet and say whether they are for or against this flag, hope that no one will look at the votes and that in this way they will be able to get away with it. This is not a free vote on the other side. They do not want to speak because they know the orders are out not to speak. They have not got a free vote.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I think the hon. member's remarks are not relevant to the amendment under consideration.

Mr. Hamilton: This is all the more reason for a plebiscite. This is why we need a plebiscite. We need a plebiscite because this house needs a detergent to clean out all these garbage cans, to clean out all those people who are more concerned about remaining here for four years than they are about going out and telling the people what they have done, who are more concerned about keeping the house from doing its legitimate business. When many segments of the population are crying for action, all they get is long debates on the flag. The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) brought the flag into the house and he can get out of the situation in two or three ways, by agreeing to a plebiscite, by letting the matter go back to a committee, or by withdrawing the matter entirely and taking it off the order paper. Those are the ways. The people of the country are going to hold this parliament responsible for not doing things which have been undone for the last year and a half. There is only one guilty group and you are looking at them right now to your right, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Charles J. M. Willoughby (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I greatly regret and it is indeed amazing and at least ironic that it should be necessary for the members of the loyal opposition to rise repeatedly at this time in the house and sincerely plead with the government of the day with all the power at our command not to abrogate the democratic principles which all of us were elected to uphold. I rise at this time to endorse the amendment that a plebiscite should be held. I do so not only because I sincerely believe that this would be in the best interests of national unity but also because I feel that by doing so I am representing and expressing the wishes of the majority of the constituents whom I have the honour to represent. I would challenge every other member of the house to rise and speak for his constituents in the same manner.

An hon. Member: They are not allowed to.

Mr. Willoughby: I would particularly challenge all members from British Columbia to support the amendment. I am confident that in doing so they would be representing the wishes of the majority of their people.

Mr. Winkler: All of British Columbia.

Mr. Willoughby: I ask every member if he is willing to sell the democratic rights of his constituents down the river of political expediency over the flag issue by denying them the privilege of expressing their individual opinions. How often we have heard that we, the elected representatives, even though nearly all of us were elected by a minority vote, should not hesitate to take the responsibility of selecting a flag for all future generations, and at the same time discarding without the expressed wish of the people that which has been our national flag for most of the time since the birth of our nation. With this attitude I most heartily disagree.

What is the compelling urgency about settling such an emotional issue? Most people never heard of the flag issue during the last election and they certainly did not mark their ballots to decide the issue. They voted to send representatives to the House of Commons to carry out legislative duties on behalf of their constituents. I feel that a national flag certainly does not fall into that category. It is an emotional issue, Mr. Speaker, that should be held over until the next election when a plebiscite could be conducted by means of a transferable ballot.

Why the urgency? During the last world war we were faced with the possibility of conscription. The prime minister of that day, in his wisdom, would not undertake conscription without a plebiscite. If ever there was urgency for a decision, Mr. Speaker, it certainly was during that time of war. We all hear expressions of opinion from across the country, and particularly from our constituents. We see the results of polls being conducted, but they are not always reliable. I know the majority of Canadians want a plebiscite held. Recently I listened to a radio broadcast in which the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) participated. I note he is back in the house and he may be able

to correct me if I misinterpret his remarks. He was being interviewed with regard to the flag, and what did he say? The words he used were to this effect: I do not know if the majority of the people in my constituency would be in favour of the suggested design, but I do know they want to see the matter settled.

Of course, the people of Canada are sick and tired of the way the flag issue is being handled. I am, too. However, I was interested in hearing the member for Medicine Hat admit he did not know how the majority of his constituents felt about this design. If this be true, perhaps under those circumstances he would agree that the only way he could find out would be to support the amendment to hold a plebiscite. I believe this applies to every constituency in Canada. After the people decided, they could forever hold their peace. Why all the urgency, Mr. Speaker? Why all the unnecessary delay of important business when the amendment could be passed so that we could get ahead with those matters which were promised in the speech from the throne, such as the labour code and other unfinished business? Incidentally the flag was never mentioned in the speech from the throne. Suddenly we were faced with a demand for a flag by July 1; then again for the Queen's visit, and now we are supposed to have a flag by Christmas. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the decision on a new flag must be left to a plebiscite. It is too important to do anything else.

It is not too late for the government to listen to reason. I hope they will listen to reason. The present adamant program is so destructive of our national unity that it is doing damage beyond repair. The obliteration of our national symbols, which most Canadians cherish, is destructive in the extreme and cannot be creative of national unity. The only feature of this government's obsession to force a flag on Canadians that could be helpful eventually would be to make future generations flag conscious. This discussion has awakened the people to the real significance of something we have accepted as a matter of course. We have neglected to impress upon our rising generation, as well as upon our adult generations, the true significance of these symbols.

What does history really mean to our country? It has been said, unthinkingly I hope, that people could not care less about a flag. They say that any old rag will do. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this signifies nothing more nor less than complete ignorance of the real significance of our most important emblem. We should learn from this experience the importance of educating our young people with regard to such matters. We could well follow the example of our United States friends along this line. As the Prime Minister said in the house, this is a serious, a solemn and an historic occasion. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is indeed just that. It is an historic occasion, and I hope the record will show that we acted with forethought and wisdom; that we did not allow ourselves to become an arrogant dictatorship, but we chose the method of true democracy. We referred the matter, not hurriedly, not impetuously with political bias, but with careful instruction to the people so that they could properly exercise their thoughtful judgment in choosing what our national flag must be for all generations to come.

It is said that the majority of the committee made a recommendation which should be acceptable. It is my impression that the majority of Canadians are concerned and do not find this design acceptable. I could be wrong, but I am agreeable to leaving the decision to a plebiscite and I will abide by the decision of the majority. The report of the committee set up in 1945 was approved by a majority of 95 per cent. The report of this recent committee was approved by only 70 per cent. Prime minister Mackenzie King, in his political wisdom could see that a decision supported by even 95 per cent could cause serious national disunity, so he never presented the report to the Commons. During the following 11 years no other Liberal government would dare subject the country to such a division. The 1945 report never reached the Commons.

I most urgently suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it would be the part of great wisdom if this report could be withdrawn and either forgotten or have the matter left to a plebiscite as suggested by the amendment. If this were done, it would have a double barreled effect. First, it would remove a most dangerous, divisive subject from the political arena. Second, it would also allow us to get ahead with more important legislation, which would be in the best interests of the country. What is of secondary importance is that it would allow parliament to have a long overdue recess, so that we could return to our constituencies and clear our brains of the cobwebs everybody has been collecting in the house. We could then return to our duties here, better informed and more refreshed to

continue with our responsibilities. If this session represents the "continuing diversity" which was mentioned in the speech from the throne in 1963, we have sure had it. Ambiguities of this kind have certainly not been constructive or in the best interests of our country.

If the decision in 1946 was to drop the flag issue—a wise decision I know—probably by reversing the figures 46 to 64, the same decision today could be one of the greatest wisdom. Failing this, a plebiscite is the only sensible answer. However, it would seem that the government has developed a complete mental block regarding the issue. Its obsession to have a new flag regardless of the consequences has created a psychiatric problem in the House of Commons.

It would seem from the way the flag issue has been brought in and out of the house—consuming about one tenth of our time that could be given to important legislation—that it is brought in and not purely to gum up the works, and also to make those of us who have the courage to stand up and speak for what we sincerely believe to be the wishes of our constituents, to appear to be obstructing. If defending the rights of the people against arbitrary rule, if defending the people against not being allowed to vote in a plebiscite is to be classed as obstruction, then I am proud to be one of those on the list.

If there was anything to be gained in the interests of our country by refusing a plebiscite, I might be agreeable to some reconsideration. I have not heard any expression of objection to having a plebiscite, except the same old argument that the committee has brought in a report and we must accept it. Without a plebiscite we can only create disunity. It has already been admitted by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) that reaching agreement in parliament on the choice of a flag will not achieve national unity. I understand a quotation was made to that effect the other day and I did not hear any contradiction from the hon. member.

What we want is national unity. Let us leave the flag question to the people of Canada so that we will not create disunity. Supporting the amendment is the only true and loyal way we, as Canadians, can work in the best interests of our country. I ask all hon. members, regardless of party, not to deny the people of Canada their God given democratic rights. Let us all support the only method democracy knows as being truly democratic. Let us support the amendment so that the voice of the people may be heard and that Canada can continue as a united country. I plead with the government, I plead with the members of the house to please reconsider. Otherwise I am afraid it may be too late.

[Mr. Willoughby.]

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should apologize for barging in on this one-party debate, but I am going to take the chance and make a few observations tonight with respect to the issue that is before the house. First of all I would like to remind the house that the position of our group has already been set forth as being a free vote—each and every one—

Mr. Rhéaume: He said that with a straight face.

Mr. Matheson: If he said it, it is true.

Mr. Patterson: I notice that the hon. member for the Northwest Territories (Mr. Rhéaume), not satisfied with making his own speeches, and he has made plenty of them, has to take part in other people's as well.

Mr. Rhéaume: I am not ashamed of speaking up.

Mr. Patterson: If you were, you would be ashamed all the time.

Mr. Rhéaume: You will go to Africa, too; you go to Africa next.

Mr. Patterson: I wonder where you are going? Each member of the Social Credit party will be expressing his own point of view as he votes on this issue. So far as my observations tonight are concerned, I am expressing my own views and my own opinions relative to the matter before the house. Furthermore, lest the hon. member for Northwest Territories insists on interrupting, I am going to say what I have to say in far less than 40 minutes.

Mr. Skoreyko: You never made a 40 minute speech in your life.

Mr. Patterson: I could not say that for you, my friend.

Mr. Skoreyko: It is obvious you have not read *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Patterson: Mr. Speaker, my purpose tonight is to voice my personal support for the amendment that is now before the house. Might I point out that the idea of a national plebiscite was set out by my colleague, the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Leboe) on

February 27, 1964 as recorded at page 315 of *Hansard,* and I refer to part of the statement he made at that time:

> I think the solution lies in having a committee set up that will choose perhaps four or five designs out of the some 2,500 or 2,900 designs that have been submitted, and put these on a ballot. They should include the red ensign, and should be put to a referendum of the people, with a transferable vote, so that each individual would choose the first, second, third, fourth and fifth in the order he preferred—

He also outlined other steps he felt were necessary or advisable in order to conduct this in a satisfactory manner. Evidently this suggestion caught the imagination of the Canadian people, and also the Conservative party, and as a result there has been a growing conviction that this would be the most democratic way of settling an issue so controversial in nature. The hon. member mentioned various steps that should be followed in conducting a plebiscite, but I shall not go into them in detail tonight because I realize I would be quite out of order in doing so.

Though, of course, the vast preponderance of correspondence from my constituency favours the red ensign, there is some which indicates the contrary, and I believe this is true of every constituency from coast to coast. Therefore I believe that in order that this question may be resolved satisfactorily or at least as satisfactorily as possible the idea of a referendum should be taken under consideration, and arrangements made for it to be held some time in the future. I think there are several reasons why such a course is advisable. We have already had an extended debate on the question of a flag for Canada and I believe we have dealt with the subject in every conceivable manner. Every angle has been considered. Controversy has raged and I believe the very fact that this debate has consumed so much time is an indication that we should submit this issue to the people and find out what their wishes are.

This matter was submitted to a committee and I am sure all of us hoped that the committee would be able to arrive at some satisfactory solution. Perhaps we were naïve in thinking it could, in the light of the positions taken by the various parties before the committee was set up. But we did hope they would be able to find some compromise design acceptable to the committee and to the members of this house. The result was disappointing, in spite of the commendable work the committee did. I do not think we should detract from the excellent work of that committee. But despite its efforts it was unable to arrive at a design which commanded the support of the great majority of its members.

The committee has made its recommendations. It has submitted a design which has been placed before the house; but I fail to find much enthusiasm for the flag which is proposed, even on the part of those who are convinced we should have a new flag. I fail to find many who are in sympathy with the new design which has been submitted to us.

Mr. Herridge: Hear, hear.

Mr. Patterson: I had the opportunity of attending the commonwealth parliamentary association conference and as I walked up the lawn of the University of the West Indies I saw the array of flags and studied the red ensign in a prominent position; I tried to visualize how our flag would look had the design submitted to us been flying on that occasion. I must confess I could not get enthusiastic about the proposition. I thought it would be very anaemic and washed out in the line-up of the flags which had been designed by the other nations. Because of these various considerations I do believe this matter should be submitted to a plebiscite so that the people of Canada can voice their individual convictions—not just their views, or their opinions, but their convictions—with respect to a question as controversial as this one.

In saying this, I am not taking a new position. Some time ago, speaking on the idea of a new flag I suggested that this proposal should be allowed to lie on the table for a while to permit some cooling off time. Well, perhaps we have had that. But I also suggested that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) should give consideration to the holding of a referendum on this important issue. I am still of the same opinion and when the vote is taken on this amendment I intend to vote in support of the amendment.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Acadia): I desire to speak on this amendment for two reasons. I realize that the people across this country are completely fed up with the way in which this parliament has handled the flag question. People in all walks of life and of all ages are in a complete turmoil over what is happening here in Ottawa. They are asking why this dissension has arisen over the flag. They are asking why it is necessary to have a new flag now. They are asking why the Pearson flag was changed and whether the flag proposed by the committee represents a compromise. These are the questions which people are asking their members of parliament.

Why not wait until the next election and hold a referendum or a plebiscite at the same time as the nation chooses its candidates for the federal parliament? Why is there this urgency about having a new flag now? This is the question which is uppermost in the minds of most of our people. They are tired of this flag matter; they are completely fed up with it.

We are told—or at any rate we were told a couple of weeks ago—that a general election might come at any time, even this winter. Newspapermen are saying that nowadays the west can take an election even in the middle of winter because of the improvement which has been made in the roads in the western provinces. There were confident predictions of an election at least in the spring of 1965. So why not refer this question to the people at the same time?

It has been said that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) has promised he will bring in a new flag inside two years. But two years will not be up until next April and if some of the pundits are correct we may have an election by April or shortly thereafter. Why not give the people a chance to express their choice? What is wrong with a referendum? If those who advocate a new and different flag feel the country really wants it, they have nothing to lose by placing their confidence in the national choice. In this way the people would be satisfied and the government would be satisfied because they know, they tell us, that their design will win. So who would lose? What is the government afraid of? Do its supporters feel that their confidence in the new design is not well placed? This is the only conclusion I can reach—that they must have very little faith in their design. I am sure that if a referendum were held on the flag question and the Canadian red ensign did not receive a sufficient number of the votes, even the strongest supporters of the red ensign would realize that it had died a noble death, and accept the result.

There is something strange about this whole question of a flag having to be settled now. We were told we had to have a flag by July, then by November 11, and now by December 25. Why the urgency? There is something strange about this whole question. We were told first of all by the Prime Minister that he would give his party a free vote on the question. Two weeks later he took that away and said no, the government would stand or fall on the question of a new flag. The whole of the Liberal party said it was Pearson's pennant and there would be no committee. That was said at one time. However, they went back on that; they had a committee. Then, lo and behold, every one of the Liberal members on that committee voted against the three maple leaf design that was before the house prior to the setting up of the committee. It is a shame that in this debate two or three members of the Liberal party have not stood up and explained the reason for the change in the attitude of that group. Not one Liberal member has explained this.

An hon. Member: They are not allowed to speak.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Could they not just inform us of their reasoning? This is a place for debate, and surely we are entitled to such an explanation if they want us to accept this flag. If they have faith in their persuasive powers as speakers, surely they believe in themselves enough to be able to stand up and explain the reasoning behind the fact that one day it had to be a design of three maple leaves, with three colours, and now we are back to one maple leaf and two colours. Does it not matter to them what they have on Canada's flag? It is a symbol that is supposed to represent Canada for years and years and years to come. Does it not matter to them what it is composed of?

I would be quite prepared to accept the new flag if the majority of Canadians wanted a new flag; but one thing that bothers me, Mr. Speaker, about this whole flag question is that we have seen the government vacillate from one flag design to another with no reason or explanation as to why this has been done. We are only clear on one thing—at least I am—and that is that the government will not accept any flag that bears any relationship whatsoever to Great Britain. This is the one conclusion I can come to.

Miss LaMarsh: What about the union jack?

Mr. Grégoire: Question.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I have always been in favour of feeling out the public on this question; I have always been in favour of trying to determine whether Canadians want a new flag. During my last speech on the flag question I was interrupted two or three times by the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) who quoted from previous speeches I had made as reported in *Hansard*. Anyone who reads those speeches can clearly see that at page 1318 of *Hansard* of 1960-61 I said this:

> I agree with the hon. member who proposed an amendment to the resolution.

The resolution at that time was that a national referendum be taken on a flag. I

said that I agreed with the amendment, which referred the whole question to a census. Then I went on to state what I thought should be in the census form with regard to a national flag. The other speech which I made on the flag prior to taking part in this debate was during the same year, on February 17, as reported at page 2183 of *Hansard*. At that time the census had already been taken, or was being taken, and I said:

> The questionnaire should be sent out, or the people should be canvassed on whether they want another flag.

I am still of that opinion; government spokesmen have not convinced me that there is any real urgency in this question and that it has to be settled before Christmas. I am not convinced that we have to accept a new flag or that the majority of the Canadian people want a new flag. I am sure there would be no opposition in this house to a new flag if the government could stand up and prove that the majority of Canadians want and desire a new, truly distinctive flag with no reference whatsoever to either of our two founding races. If they could stand up and say this, there would be no opposition to the idea. If they could stand up and prove to us that this flag must be brought in by Christmas or by December 31, whichever date they would like to choose, there would be no opposition to it.

I noticed on Telepoll a few weeks ago that this question was put to Canadians. Of the people canvassed, 6 per cent had no opinion, 33 per cent said we should accept the committee's report, and something like 61 per cent said that it should still, even after the committee had brought down its report, go to a plebiscite; that the Canadian public should decide which flag we should have.

Many questions remain in my mind, Mr. Speaker, as to why the government has changed their mind on this question. They have changed their mind with regard to the original design introduced in this house and are now supporting the design contained in the committee's report. I have met many people across Canada in recent months and most of those to whom I have spoken prefer the three coloured design submitted by the Prime Minister some six months ago. Since then we have had the report of the committee. Of course they would prefer neither design, if they had a choice. I speak of the majority of persons with whom I have spoken on this question.

On one hand we are told that an election is imminent, and we wonder why a plebiscite could not be taken at the same time. Then on the other hand we see an article in the Edmonton *Journal* of August 8, 1964, wherein the Canadian Press seemed to think that this whole flag question is to be settled before an election; that it is the government's purpose to settle this question long before an election is held, so that it will not cause disunity between the two founding races of this country. They apparently thought in August that this whole question had to be settled long before an election, and at that time of course there were not so many rumours around the hill that an election would be held in the spring of 1965.

Mr. Rhéaume: They are not so anxious now.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): An hon. member says they are not so anxious now. I suppose he is referring particularly to the events of the last few weeks in this house, which have caused a great deal of concern across the nation. However, I do not wish to refer to them in my speech on the flag at the moment. I am sure the whole house would like to hear from some government members on this subject. We have just heard a very good speech by the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Patterson). That member of the Social Credit party outlined his position, and his reasons were the same as mine, namely why is there this urgency now? What is the harm in submitting this question to a plebiscite? Let us take a national count on a plebiscite so that there is no disunifying effect. I should like to hear some hon. member on the government side give the reason why this matter cannot be decided through a plebiscite. Why must it be decided now? What are hon. members afraid of?

Mr. Korchinski: Because they have no legislation ready.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): That is right. This must be the underlying reason why we are now debating the flag question. The government brought in the labour code some weeks ago. We are now informed it has been amended and is not ready to be brought in again.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): However, I do not want to deal with that matter now.

The Canadian Press pointed out in the Edmonton *Journal* for August 8, in summarizing the whole flag fanfare, that if the flag question was one of the issues in an election it would mean a slim majority for the Liberals in the House of Commons. Then the editorial goes on to say that it might create a great deal of disunity in the country.

Mr. Grégoire: We are ready for the question.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): These interruptions are certainly interesting, particularly having regard to the corner of the house from which they come. We all know the devotion of that party to Canada's present flag. One question which remains uppermost in my mind is whether they will support a new flag, if one is chosen, as much as they have supported the old one.

Mr. Grégoire: That remains to be seen.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): That is exactly it, and I have my doubts, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Grégoire: We have more faith than you.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Well, if the hon. member would like to make a speech he can follow me.

Mr. Grégoire: May I ask the hon. member a question. I am wondering whether he wants us to speak so as to pass the time. Has he nothing else to say, and is that the reason he invites everyone to speak?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): That was not a question really. The hon. member asked me why I wanted him to speak; it was because I thought he wanted to say something and was interrupting me. I thought he had more than he could hold in his brain and wanted to release some of it. If that is the case I will take my seat and allow him to speak.

Mr. Grégoire: I am being brainwashed by you now.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): There is no question but that there is something strange about this whole flag question. Why has the matter to be proceeded with now? What is so strange about it? These questions confront me daily. I have reached the conclusion, as have a great many people across Canada, that the only desire the government has regarding a flag is to remove any attachment to symbols which date back in our history and remind us of our British traditions.

Mr. Grégoire: Hear, hear.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Is this the last step or just the first step? What is going to be next? Will our money system be changed? Will the Queen's picture be removed? Is that to follow? What about the British system of law?

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Are we to remain under British law or will the government want to change that? What about our parliamentary system of government? Are we to form a new republic? These are questions many Canadians are asking.

Mr. Moreau: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Certainly.

Mr. Moreau: How many plebiscites have they had in Great Britain?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): This question has no relevance at all to the debate. I was expressing my concern over the flag question. Where will it all end?

An hon. Member: When will it end?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): It will end. Certainly it will end. Perhaps it will end after I have finished speaking, I do not know; but it would end a lot quicker if hon. gentlemen would stand up and tell us, first of all, why this matter has to be settled now, and second, why it cannot wait until next spring when, according to all the pundits, we are supposed to be having an election. What are hon. members opposite afraid of? Have they no confidence in their decisions? They tell us that the majority of Canadians want a new and distinctive flag with no reference to Great Britain. Why cannot they take this matter to the people? Then everybody will be satisfied. The only conclusion I can draw is that they are afraid. They have no confidence in their decisions on this question. There are many questions such as these which remain in my mind and will continue to do so as long as hon. gentlemen opposite sit silent. What is to come next?

We have heard some reference made to changing the constitution. Is this coming next? Are we to become a republic? The ultimate question is: Where are we going?

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Hon. gentlemen call order. If they had any faith in their decisions they would rise in their places and explain why we cannot take this question to the

people by way of a referendum. Not one hon. member opposite will rise to answer the fears which exist in my mind and in the minds of many Canadians. Why are they satisfied with any flag? It does not matter whether it has three colours or two colours, one leaf or three leaves, as long as it has no resemblance to our connections with Great Britain or to either of the two founding races. Why are we to be ashamed of our past? Why are hon. gentlemen opposite not proud of the traditions Canada has upheld over the years? I can only conclude that these hon. members are ashamed of the British system of law on which Canada has been founded.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): All we get are catcalls, Mr. Speaker. One would much prefer to have some reasoning.

Mr. Cashin: You are right, there.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I see it is ten o'clock, so may I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

At ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, December 8, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

BANKING AND COMMERCE

Ninth report of standing committee on banking and commerce—Mr. Pennell.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

PROPOSED CHANGES IN PERSONNEL OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce) moved:

That the names of Messrs. Woolliams, Fairweather, Nugent, Rhéaume, Simpson and Hales be substituted for those of Messrs. Grafftey, Irvine, Millar, Muir (Lisgar), Noble and Stenson on the standing committee on industrial relations.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved, if I may have unanimous consent, by Mr. Walker, seconded by Mr. Winkler—

Mr. Grégoire: No unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker: I am informed it is not customary for a member of Her Majesty's loyal and royal opposition to move changes in committee personnel in this way. It is the practice to have the whip of the government party suggest these changes. Therefore I would like to put it, with the consent of Mr. Walker—

Mr. Grégoire: No.

Mr. Speaker: —that he, seconded by Mr. Winkler—

Mr. J. A. Walker (York Centre): I wonder if I may speak to this for a moment, Mr. Speaker. The other night I attempted, in co-operation with other parties in the house, to move these committee substitutions. It is something we all desire, but I was unable to get consent. I have certainly no objection to this, but I would like to suggest, if the house is agreeable, that the complete motion, which contains names of members of other parties, be embodied in this motion.

Mr. Churchill: Agreed.

Mr. Walker: If the house would agree to allow me to do this sometime during the day's proceedings I will be very happy to have it done.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker—

[*Text*]

Mr. Smallwood: Oh, sit down.

Mr. Caouette: It is all right; I will sit down when I am finished.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, under ordinary circumstances we do not object to names being substituted for others on the committee which was mentioned by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Winkler). However, under the present circumstances we believe that the discussion concerning the flag has priority over any amendment, suggestion or motion whatsoever. Until the flag issue is settled so that Canada may have a distinctive national flag, we will not give unanimous consent to the house.

[*Text*]

Mr. Walker: It would not take any time away from the flag debate if the house were to agree to allow me to do this at ten o'clock tonight.

Mr. Caouette: No, no.

Mr. Winkler: May I point out that this is the proper time in our procedure for such a motion to be put forward. I would not have done this in the manner I did but for the fact that it is very necessary that these changes be made so the committee may proceed with its work. It does not matter what business is to be brought up in the normal course of events, whether the flag debate or a debate on any other question; this is the correct procedure to be followed, and I would ask that permission be given to the government whip to proceed.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, may I suggest that unanimous consent is not required.

Mr. Churchill: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles: If the government whip, acting on behalf of the leader of the house who is a cabinet minister, rises at the proper time to make such a motion, I suggest he is

perfectly able to do so under our rules. The reason it was possible for him to be denied that right at ten o'clock the other evening was that he was seeking unanimous consent to revert to motions—

Mr. McIlraith: But the house was on motions.

Mr. Knowles: It was ten o'clock and consent was sought to revert to motions. At this point, while I see objection to the hon. member for Grey-Bruce trying to make a motion without consent, I do not think the official government whip needs consent.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it is necessary that the unanimous consent of the house be obtained in order that such a motion can be adopted without 48 hours' notice. Evidently the chief government whip may introduce such a motion, but he must give 48 hours' notice, and that motion can only be adopted 48 hours hence. However, if it is to be adopted immediately, the unanimous consent of the house is required, and we refuse it.

[*Text*]

Mr. Walker: Then I give notice that I propose to submit these names tomorrow at this time on motions.

Mr. Lambert: If I may briefly intervene on a question of procedure—

Mr. Speaker: I do not wish to cut the hon. member short, but I now have the assurance of the government whip that he will submit these and perhaps other names tomorrow. In the circumstances, in order that we may get on with the other business before the house, this will be called tomorrow.

Mr. Lambert: Well, there is a point that is wrong.

CANADIAN FLAG

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SIXTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Monday, December 7, consideration of the motion of Mr. Batten that the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, be now concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Monteith.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Acadia): I have just a few more words to say on this flag question and the position in which parliament finds itself now concerning it. I pointed out last evening that I have long been of the opinion that this whole question should have been submitted to the people at the very beginning by way of a referendum or plebiscite.

Speaking to the amendment now before the house, I can only repeat my earlier contention in this regard. It was brought in initially with very little forethought. It was not even mentioned in the speech from the throne. The whole house has been continually confused as to why we are faced with the flag issue now. Away back in late June we argued that the question, if it was to come before the house, should first go to a committee. We tried then to get the question referred back to the people in the form of a referendum. We are trying once again to have this done.

I realize there is a percentage of the population of Canada which does want a new flag. I have no objection to a new flag if the majority of Canadians desire one, but it has long been my opinion that a flag is the symbol of a country that should be respected by everyone. It should not be a flag born in haste, one that perhaps represents one of the founding nations of our country and not the other, or is more favoured by one of our founding nations than the other; one that has political tinges, or anything of that order. I have long been of the opinion that a flag should be favoured by the majority of the people, who will respect it, hold it dear, revere it and serve under it proudly. I think a flag should bear some relation to the history of our country; and a flag, above all, should aid in bringing greater unity to a country. This flag and the manner in which this whole question has been handled have convinced everyone, I am sure, that it has done nothing to unite Canada but has in fact done more to disunite this country than any single piece of legislation that has been before this house for a good many years.

I have wondered why there is urgency now, why this question cannot be referred back to the people in a plebiscite. There has been much talk of an election next spring and I ask, would it not be better to settle the whole question to everyone's satisfaction at that time? If the government are so confident that the majority of Canadians want a new flag and are prepared to accept the committee's recommendation for a new flag, why is there the urgency of pushing it through now? Why not wait until an election is called and settle this question by way of a referendum? The only conclusion I can come

to is that perhaps it is a stopgap; perhaps other legislation is not ready; perhaps they want to tease and torment the country and tear the country apart.

This is what this whole debate has been doing. The country is completely fed up with parliament's action on this flag question. I am sure the opposition did its duty in representing the large number of Canadians who showed in one way or another that they were opposed to the flag originally submitted by the Prime Minister; and surprisingly enough a large number of Canadians—this has been shown by all kinds of polls that have been taken week after week—are still opposed to the flag submitted by the committee.

It was my understanding that the committee would do its utmost to bring about a compromise. In a way one might term the committee's recommendation a compromise flag, but a compromise in only one direction. They retained the maple leaf idea and did away with one of the colours. Many people have long thought that the colours red, white and blue meant something; they respected those colours. Now we have one less colour on the flag and two less maple leaves. There is nothing on it to really signify our history, to dignify our country. In my opinion there is really nothing on it that Canadians across the country can worship, respect, and to which they can pay homage.

It has been pointed out that the government, while they promised a flag in two years, did so in such a manner that only a certain part of the country heard of the promise. The two years have not yet expired, and to a great many people it is questionable whether the government has a mandate to bring in a new flag. As I have said, during the last election it might have been mentioned in some parts of the country that a new flag would be designed within two years, but there was no mention of the disappearance of our historic emblems from the flag or that it would be a completely new flag which would erase our past.

The country is completely fed up with parliament's action on this flag question. It is the government's duty to bring in the business for the house to debate. I feel it is high time we passed on to more urgent legislation, legislation which is required across the country. For example, the labour code, railway financing and rail line abandonment are matters which should be discussed, using our time in a worth-while manner instead of holding a lengthy debate on this flag question at a time when there is considerable opposition across the country to this flag as well as considerable doubt whether the government has a mandate to bring in a new flag.

As I said last evening, I am surprised to see government members on the flag committee willing to accept a flag design which completely erases our past. Are they sure that all Canadians are of the same opinion? Are they sure that all Canadians desire and will support the flag which has been suggested by the committee?

An interesting comment was made by Conn Smythe which I think bears some relation to the question whether or not the government has a mandate to bring in a new flag. He said:

> Now, all the experts in radio and television and the press are saying people are tired of the flag issue.

I certainly agree with that.

> These experts are very often wrong. Last week the Vancouver Lions proved this point.

They certainly did that.

> The millions to whom the Canadian ensign means so much are not tired of the ensign, and want the flag issue settled in a democratic manner. What right has a minority government, the great number of their members never having received a mandate from their constituents, to keep on forcing the flag issue? And now that this government is under the shadow of suspicion with respect to bribery and corruption, how can they expect the people to respect a flag of its choice? Why doesn't Mr. Pearson shelve the flag issue now, get on with our national business and, at the next election, give the people of Canada a chance to vote on this issue—

It is as simple as that. This whole issue should be shelved, and at the next election it could be solved to everyone's satisfaction. I think this would satisfy practically everybody in the country.

It is with that thought in mind that I move this debate be temporarily set aside so that the many questions on the government's activities in domestic and foreign matters may be answered by the ministers, and in order that government business dealing with the labour code, C.N.R. financing and provincial-federal matters may be dealt with immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale), that this debate be now adjourned.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must advise the hon. member that the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale), has already spoken during this debate, and therefore under our rules cannot second the motion.

Mr. Mandziuk: I second the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Division

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the hon. member for Acadia, seconded by the hon. member for Marquette:

That this debate be now adjourned.

Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Horner, Acadia), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Alkenbrack
Bell
Bigg
Cantelon
Cardiff
Chatterton
Churchill
Clancy
Cooper
Cowan
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Doucett
Fane
Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke)
Flemming (Victoria-Carleton)
Forbes
Gundlock
Hales
Harkness
Horner (Acadia)
Horner (The Battlefords)
Howe (Wellington-Huron)
Jorgenson
Kennedy
Kindt
Korchinski
Lambert
Leboe
Loney
MacEwan
MacLean (Queens)
Macquarrie
MacRae
McBain
McIntosh
Madill
Mandziuk
Millar
Monteith
Moore
More
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nasserden
Nowlan
Nugent
Ormiston
Ouellet
Pascoe
Pugh
Rapp
Ricard
Simpson
Skoreyko
Slogan
Smallwood
Southam
Starr
Stefanson
Stenson
Thomas
Wadds, Mrs.
Watson (Assiniboia)
Webb
Winkler
Woolliams—68.

NAYS

Messrs:

Addison
Armstrong
Asselin (Notre Dame de Grâce)
Badanai
Barnett
Basford
Batten
Beaulé
Béchard
Beer
Benidickson
Benson
Boulanger
Boutin
Brewin
Byrne
Cadieux (Terrebonne)
Cameron (High Park)
Cantin
Caouette
Cardin
Caron
Carter
Cashin
Choquette
Chrétien
Côté (Chicoutimi)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Cyr
Davis
Deachman
Deschatelets
Dionne
Douglas
Drouin
Dubé
Dupuis
Émard
Eudes
Fisher
Forest
Forgie
Francis
Frenette
Gauthier
Gelber
Gendron
Girouard
Godin
Gordon
Granger
Gray
Greene
Grégoire
Groos
Guay
Hahn
Harley
Hays
Hellyer
Herridge
Honey
Jewett, Miss
Kelly
Klein
Knowles
Konantz, Mrs.
Lachance
Laing
LaMarsh, Miss
Lamontagne
Lamoureux
Langlois
Laniel
Laverdière
Leblanc
Leduc
Legault
Lessard (Lake St. John)
Lessard (St. Henry)
Lloyd
Loiselle
Macaluso
Macdonald
Mackasey
McIlraith
McMillan
McNulty
McWilliam
Marcoux
Martin (Timmins)
Martineau
Mather
Matte
Moreau
Morison
Mullally
Munro
Nicholson
O'Keefe
Olson
Otto
Patterson
Paul
Pearson
Pennell
Pepin
Pickersgill
Pigeon
Pilon
Plourde
Prittie
Prud'homme
Regan
Richard
Rideout, Mrs.
Rinfret
Robichaud
Rochon
Rock
Rouleau
Ryan
Saltsman
Sauvé
Sharp
Stewart
Tardif
Teillet
Temple
Thompson
Tremblay
Turner
Wahn
Walker
Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Webster
Whelan
Winch—139.

[Mr. Mandziuk.]

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Brown: I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. Mitchell: I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I was waiting to see if a Conservative was going to take the floor. Moreover, I must point out that, according to my information, the flag debate will not come to an end before the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) is back in the house. That goes to

show how one man's illness can delay parliament for a whole day. In fact, we cannot vote today because the leader of the official opposition is ill.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity I have of participating in this debate which has already lasted 29 days. During that time, 93 hon. members spoke once, 33 made two speeches, 18 took part three times in the debate and two spoke four times. Consequently, 146 members made 229 speeches.

You will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that that is truly freedom of speech.

In addition, the moment I say "plebiscite", that word will have been said 4,081 times since the beginning of the flag debate. That is what we call freedom of speech and even freedom of repetition.

Mr. Speaker, at present—

[*Text*]

Mr. Kindt: On a point of order, the hon. member is not speaking to the question before the house.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I had just spoken the word "plebiscite", pointing out that it had been spoken 4,081 times, which now makes 4,082 times.

Up to now, the debate has been going on for 119 hours, and when multiplied by the number of members, or 265, this makes a total of 31,535 hours of lost time. There are also the personnel of the house, interpreters, translators, the Clerk of the house, the second clerk assistant, pages, reporters, etc. As a matter of fact, I am told that the personnel includes 60 officials, which makes a further total of 7,140 hours.

There are also 125 members of the press gallery. This makes a total of 14,875 hours lost by the members of the press gallery who listened to this flag debate.

There are also the *Hansard* subscribers. It is said that they number 12,000 for the English version and 4,000 for the French version, that is a total of 16,000. If you multiply that number by 119 hours, supposing that the subscribers read *Hansard*, you get 1,905,000 lost hours.

We have now reached 1,958,555 hours.

Mr. Dupuis: What about those who read the papers?

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, supposing that six million people spend an average of five minutes a day reading what is said about the flag—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I listened with great attention to the remarks of the hon. member for Lapointe and I must admit that I have serious doubts about their relevancy.

The hon. member might perhaps tell me how the statistics he is quoting are related to the proposed amendment now before the house.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I feel that in mentioning the cost, or the eventual cost of holding a plebiscite in Canada, the hon. member for Lapointe is strictly in order when discussing the Conservative amendment with regard to a plebiscite. It would be an ideal way of allowing the Canadian citizens to express their opinion. Under the circumstances, I am of the opinion that the hon. member for Lapointe is being relevant in speaking of the cost in time and money of holding a plebiscite in Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: To the extent that the remarks of the hon. member for Lapointe will be connected with the matter under consideration, in the way indicated by the hon. member for Villeneuve, they will certainly be relevant.

Mr. Grégoire: Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I have learned to distinguish between sophisms and syllogisms, I have learned that with syllogisms one can argue in two ways, either by induction or by deduction. Today, my argumentation is quite simple, I proceed by induction. That is why, in the light of the figures I am going to quote, you will notice that the conclusion will be drawn automatically and that is why I shall keep on quoting those figures.

Mention has been made of newspapers. If we take for granted that about six million people take an average of five minutes a day to read what is published on the flag issue, this amounts to 140 minutes for 28 days. Six million people reading an average of 140 minutes amount to 840 million minutes, or 14 million hours.

If we consider now the news bulletins on radio and television, which take an average of ten minutes a day—it is more, but let us assume it is ten minutes. This amounts to 280 minutes in 28 days. With a minimum average of six million listeners and viewers, this amounts to 1,680 million minutes or 28 million hours.

We now have, Mr. Speaker, a grand total of 43,958,555 hours on the flag issue.

If the average salary is $3 per hour, up to now the flag debate has cost $131,875,650.

Mr. Dupuis: At the least.

Mr. Grégoire: At the least, Mr. Speaker.

Up to now there has been spent $131,875,650 on the flag, not to mention interest. Those figures only represent lost time.

Let us figure out the cost of materials. In the official report appear about 1,200 written pages on the flag issue. Now, with two columns to each page and an average of 62 lines to a column, this makes 124 lines for every page of *Hansard*.

I found that each line measures 2¾ inches, or a total of 30 feet per page. Since each page contains 341 inches or 30 feet of text, for 1,200 pages this makes 37,500 feet, or 7 miles of text. You get on the Queensway, you leave it at the other end, and the text on the flag is still running.

If you consider that there are 1,048 words per page, you get a staggering total for 1,200 pages. All that about the flag; 1,257,600 words spoken about the flag.

Mr. Speaker, you will agree that no one can ever complain that freedom of speech—freedom of repetition and freedom of obsession for madmen—does not exist in the House of Commons.

And now multiply all that: the number of pages, the amount of energy, the amount of calories burnt for the flag, the number of hours, the amount of dollars, and divide that by whatever you want, you will come to a single conclusion, that some lunatics are still walking about.

Mr. Lambert: Some are standing.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, 18 members of the Conservative party each spoke three times. Eighteen hat tricks during the same season, that is almost a record. Two spoke four times, and that is an even more impressive record.

I would like to apply to the members of the Conservative party the sentence which was uttered by the Greek hero at the Thermopyles, and I will quote the Greek text in order to simplify things:

Ou kataiskunô opla ta iéra
Oud'en kataleipsô ton parastatein
Otô'an stokeisô

Mr. Speaker, that is the Conservative party, and I am not afraid of saying so to their face.

Mr. Dupuis: Translation please.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I would like to parody a vituperous statement made by Cicero in his famed Catiline Orations where he was attacking Catilina, the Roman despot. By substituting the name of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) for that of Catilina, I would say, with Cicero:

Quo usque tandem abutere Diefenbaker, patientia, nostra?
Quamdiu etiam iste furor tuus nos eludet?
Quemquem ad finem sese effrenata jactabit audacia?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Dupuis: There are two official languages here.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Has the hon. member concluded his remarks?

The Chair cannot determine whether his last words were intended to close his remarks or not.

An hon. Member: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Lapointe knows that rather serious difficulties could arise during the discussions in this house should the hon. members be allowed to speak in another language than the two official languages of the country, for instance in Greek or Latin.

Mr. Grégoire: I will translate each sentence:

Quo usque tandem abutere Diefenbaker patientia nostra?

To what extent will you, Diefenbaker, abuse our patience?

[*Text*]

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Before the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi raises his point of order I would say that even if the hon. member for Lapointe is quoting in Latin, he should know that he cannot refer to any hon. member by name and should refer to him by his constituency; and in the case of the Leader of the Opposition, I suggest by his title.

Mr. Grafftey: That is right.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Since it went so well with the text; it was rolling out—

I shall translate it, Mr. Speaker.

Quo usque tandem abutere, Diefenbaker, patientia nostra?

To what extent will you, Diefenbaker, abuse our patience?

Quamdiu etiam iste furor tuus nos eludet?

How much longer will thy furor make game of us?

Quemquem ad finem sese effrenata jactabit audacia?

To what extremity will thy unrestrained boldness let itself be carried away?

That is a text, Mr. Speaker, which really applies to present circumstances.

If I may, I shall make a French quotation which will also apply perfectly to the situation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I hope that the quotation the hon. member intends to make will be relevant to the discussion.

Mr. Grégoire: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is a quotation by Corneille. In Corneille's *The Cid,* Don Diègue, in his old days, speaks out his bitterness, his rage, when he cries out:

O rage, ô désespoir, ô vieillesse ennemie,
n'ai-je donc vécu durant tant d'années que pour voir
en un jour flétrir tant de lauriers.

That applies well to the Leader of the Opposition: rage, bitterness, implacable old age, those are the incitements behind the actions now taken by the Leader of the Opposition.

That is why we have a debate like the one that is going on today: 43,958,550 hours. That is where the Conservative party is leading us; $131,875,550; that is what it costs. Enough words, if laid end to end, to cover the trans-Canada highway, from coast to coast. You will admit, Mr. Speaker, that this must have lasted long enough.

I do not know whether the Conservatives will understand, but they have spoken at length, more than freedom of speech should allow generally; this is not freedom, but abuse, a tremendous abuse of the freedom of speech.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. In my opinion, the present remarks of the hon. member are not really related to the matter under discussion, namely the amendment to the motion now before us.

I would ask the hon. member to restrict his remarks to that matter.

Mr. Grégoire: Very well, Mr. Speaker, I will close with four verses by François Villon which express exactly my idea on the plebiscite we are now discussing, and through which the whole Canadian population would vote on a flag proposal. In my opinion, the request is for something which is unnecessary. There are here representatives of the voters. Let everyone take his responsibilities and vote according to the wishes of his constituents.

The four following verses of François Villon illustrate quite well my thought:

Dans un vieux cimetière.
Un fossoyeur creusait,
Il fit jaillir de terre un crâne qui dormait.
"En veux-tu du vieux frère" me dit-il,
mais je refusai.

This is an example of the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition. As the grave-digger, he tries to dig up in an old cemetery the traditions of other countries and he offers me a skull, but I am not interested.

I am ready to accept something new for our country, something which would really represent Canada and not a foreign country, something which would give us a little more pride in the future of our country, that is a really distinctive flag which we could call our flag and would not be the fleur-de-lis or the union jack. It would be the flag of Canadians living in Canada.

[*Text*]

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Edmonton West.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, at the risk of incurring your censure but in the spirit of the remarks that have been permitted this afternoon and the personalities engaged therein, I might say that the braying of jackasses is the loudest noise heard in the barnyard. Also may I say that there are no fools like those who laugh at themselves.

[*Translation*]

I am speaking here to those who might seek to hold a certain power of veto over us and prevent us from expressing our views. Every hon. member has the right to express his opinion in the house and without commenting on the vote we have just had, this afternoon, it is obvious that opinions are divided here on the issue, both on the government side and the opposition side. We have not failed to notice it.

At the beginning of the debate on the motion which gave rise to this discussion, the Prime Minister agreed to a free vote on the flag issue. Consequently, we are all free to express our feelings.

I find it strange that certain young parliamentarians should be willing to muzzle anyone, since there are differences of opinion. I grant them the right to stand up and discuss this matter. After all, the debate centres in this assembly. Since opinions differ, we are here to express them.

I can well say to the hon. members that, on a tour in my native province over the week end, I realized again that opinions vary greatly—

Mr. Drouin: Might I ask the hon. member a question at this point.

Mr. Lambert: I will allow the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes to ask a question later on, when I have completed my remarks.

[*Text*]

I make no apology, Mr. Speaker, for speaking on this question this afternoon. It may be that some people feel this debate on the flag has exhausted the supply of ready headlines or that there is no juicy scandal to uncover or discuss, and it might have been interesting to have had orders of the day last week, or even this week.

Mr. Rinfret: More insinuations.

Mr. Lambert: I am not saying there are; the hon. member can read the newspapers for himself. I think the suppression of the opportunity of clearing the air in this regard creates more slander and scandal if that is the case.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. May I suggest to the hon. member that perhaps at this stage he would want to return to the subject matter of this debate.

Mr. Lambert: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I apologize to the Chair for having been provoked into a minor excursion, shall I say, but hon. members, in so provoking me, are breaking the rules themselves, of course. They have no right to speak; therefore if their remarks appear on the record I am sure the Chair would grant me a certain latitude in challenging them.

I would have thought the situation was clear to those people who, because they are in favour of a certain proposal, say this debate is finished, that there is no further need to speak. They say "I have spoken. I am in favour. Therefore those of you who are against this have no right to speak".

Mr. Olson: You have spoken three times.

Mr. Lambert: I beg to differ with the hon. member for Medicine Hat. I have spoken fewer times in this debate than he has. This is my second opportunity since the resolution was introduced. I also hope to make this my last contribution.

Coming from where I do, and with my own personal ancestry, I think this matter calls for the expression of the individual's point of view. To me the flag of my country is something more than an amendment to the customs tariff or the discussion of a redistribution bill. Perhaps I am completely different in this regard from other hon. members, but that is the way I feel. I have always indicated that I felt this question from its inception should have been approached by asking the people of Canada for a personal expression. After all, a flag which is imposed on the people will not be one which is readily acceptable. This flag is not born out of revolution. It is not a symbol of revolution. This flag is a symbol of agreement, and I think there is a clear distinction.

Many people ask why Canada could not emulate some of the new countries, or our great neighbour to the south. Their flag was adopted out of revolution. The majority of the new flags we see today have been adopted out of the granting of independence which is akin to revolution. In respect to some of them one might also question whether, if the people had been given the opportunity, they would have challenged the design of their flag.

I would have thought this matter could easily have been resolved by a plebiscite, as was suggested in another debate, so that people are not identified and we do not point the finger at this or that region. In this matter I consider that no region is pre-eminent; I consider western Canada just as important as central Canada, the maritimes or any portion of the country. No one has pre-eminence in this regard. Therefore the views of the people from one end of Canada to the other stand on equality. I find it passing strange that in arriving at a design for a national flag a large part of the Canadian people must divest themselves of symbols which they cherish and hold dear.

I am not making a case for any particular flag or any particular design. It is my feeling that the flag of Canada can only be that which is accepted by the people and not that which is accepted by a majority here, because respect for a flag cannot be generated by the iron heel of a dictum. Acceptability on the part of the people of Canada can only result from desire and respect.

I do not think there is any difference in the application of my argument to the Canadian flag and the Canadian national anthem. It could only be ill conceived that the people of Canada would faithfully and conscientiously sing a national anthem which they did not respect in their hearts. Only as an aside, Mr. Speaker, I find it extremely regrettable that we did not deal with the resolution

relating to the national anthem, about which I think there is general agreement, before dealing with the Canadian national flag, so the national anthem would now be settled and not be the subject of a prospective debate in an atmosphere which has now been created by a divisive expression of opinion.

The plebiscite as suggested by the amendment, to be held at the time of the next general election, whenever that may be, to facilitate administrative details, after a cooling-off period, would not generate the divisive atmosphere which some people fear. I believe that if Canadians were given a chance to express their opinions they would accept the flag chosen by the people, even though they did not agree with the choice. A choice made by a generous majority of the people of Canada I am sure would be accepted by the minority favouring a different design.

I do not intend to deal with the nature of the design now before us, though it certainly can be related to the plebiscite advocated by the amendment and is the result of a majority choice by a committee which has considered this question conscientiously. However, what may be one man's meat may be another man's poison, and I am not qualified to say to my neighbour that I am choosing a flag for him. In respect of that sort of thing I feel the people should have the right to express an opinion.

It was announced last week that we in this chamber may have to make a decision on the matter of capital punishment at some time in the future. Surely that is a matter which must be decided as a result of the dictates of one's conscience. It may be a matter that some hon. members feel their constituents should decide. Be that as it may, I think the flag question is one which goes even deeper into considerations of conscience. I think it must be concluded logically that the motives of individuals who enlisted voluntarily for service during the last war, and on other occasions, are the same motives behind the feelings of citizens for their own flag. This feeling is sometimes very inchoate and difficult to define.

I do not wish to attempt to repeat the arguments which have been made by many hon. members in this house on this and on previous occasions, but a plebiscite would provide a tremendous advantage to the members of this house in the choice of a distinctive Canadian flag. I respect the opinions of hon. members who have stated they desire a particular flag, though I have some grave doubts as to whether those members who talk about a distinctive flag know exactly what they mean. Some members in their speeches in this house have gone so far as to suggest that they would be prepared to accept a tic-tac-toe on a dishcloth design, providing there was no vestige of the union jack on it. That is a very regrettable attitude.

It is difficult for me to understand why anyone who has had the opportunity of serving abroad, and who has observed the Canadian flag as it now is, as declared by order in council, would feel that it is not distinctively Canadian and something of which all Canadians can be proud. I certainly have observed this flag flying in foreign countries and must say that I have always looked upon it in those circumstances as the flag of Canada. If parliament—and by parliament I mean this house and the other place—should decide, by the appropriate means, that this flag shall be changed and that something else shall be the flag of Canada, such a decision would not preclude the parliament of Canada from consulting with the people of Canada about the precise design they favour for a distinctively Canadian national flag. I am not referring to a symbol of Canada but a Canadian national flag, and for that reason I say again that a plebiscite is both logical and the proper thing under the circumstances.

In speaking at this time I find it difficult to determine how a vote on the motion to adopt this report, should it carry, could in any way change the present order in council. Great emphasis was placed on this point when the flag question was first introduced because, as stated by the order in council, the red ensign shall be Canada's flag until parliament declares otherwise. This is the first time of which I am aware that there has ever been the slightest suggestion that the House of Commons alone is parliament. One can see that there may be a very difficult procedural argument in relation to legislation being sent to the other place as the result of a committee report. Of course we have not had any disclosure of the government's intention in this regard. The approval of a committee report while there are other matters on the order paper would seem to me to be insufficient to ground any change in that order in council.

I find some difficulty also in communicating the wishes and desires of this house to the other place on the basis of merely a motion for concurrence in a report. This is by way of digression, I realize, in so far as the amend-

ment is concerned, but I believe I should raise the point at this time if others have not done so already. There are many other things I would have liked to mention which this house could have been discussing at this time. I am not going to do so, Mr. Speaker, except by saying that the order paper is chock-a-block with very important matters on which ministers of the crown are anxiously awaiting approval. But it has been their responsibility to introduce these questions in priority to this other matter. It is not a case of the opposition seeking a debate on this matter. The government must accept this responsibility for having advanced this matter and put forward a timetable. Therefore, I say very definitely—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but I am sure he will agree with me that this is a digression, and that he is not really relating his remarks at this time to the matter before us.

Mr. Lambert: If government members accuse the opposition of delay, Mr. Speaker, and also a discussion of the plebiscite, the opposition has offered an alternative to the vote for concurrence. Certainly I would put it to Your Honour that a reference this way to these matters which might be occupying the house is quite as much in order as the speech which preceded me and which was permitted. I do not like to suggest that the Chair is making a differentiation, but there has been a considerable latitude indicated. I do not know that the speech which preceded had any more reference to a plebiscite, except that there was a sort of exercise in Social Credit mathematics of the kind that has been rejected out of hand for many years. It has been rejected because it has never been a matter of government policy at any time in the provinces where this so-called political theory may have held sway. The hon. members down there speak from their seats and that indicates the extent of their contribution.

Now, I would say again in bringing my remarks to a close—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lambert: I hope that hon. members who are interested in speaking on something will be given the liberty of speaking. When it comes to the remarks that preceded mine, I trust that the house will be as forbearing when these hon. gentlemen embark upon their lengthy discourses on monetary theory. I find it very interesting to see the forbearance of the house when these hon. members are speaking on certain bills during private members' hour, at which time we get barrel full after barrel full of nonsense. I suppose it is a question of which foot the shoe is upon. As long as they feel disposed to speak, then their digestion will tell them they have that right; but as long as someone else is speaking their digestion may curdle and tell them that the debate must be brought to an end. However this is a matter of give and take and I trust that they will be able to give as well as take.

Again I say that in my opinion the solution out of this impasse in which we find ourselves is to have a plebiscite, to give the people the opportunity to make a choice. After all, we have had many suggestions from on high. We have seen many newspapers, radio and television comments, each man having the right to express himself. If a news editor has every freedom to write as many times as he wishes in a newspaper column, then I have a right to reply in this house. Why then should hon. members be accused of carrying on an interminable debate? Debate is the exchange of ideas, the putting forward of ideas, sometimes not only once or twice, but three times. If certain people write on a certain subject and put forward the same idea many times over in an effort to convince their readers or their listeners, I think that this is legitimate. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support this amendment and urge upon hon. members that they support it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guay: Would the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. Lambert: Surely.

Mr. Guay: On July 2, 1964, I had an opportunity to speak about the plebiscite; I then asked the opposition why it was that in 1961, when the opposition suggested that the government in office hold a referendum on the flag at the time of the decennial census, the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) rejected this procedure, but today he suggests what seems to him an easier procedure, that is holding the referendum at the same time as a general election.

I put that question and I did not get an answer.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, to begin with I shall answer that I do not know in which circumstances the hon. member asked his question.

I believe that, at that time, I was in the chair just as you are now and that I was not interested then in the contents of the debates.

But, in answer to the question put by the hon. member, I would say—if I understand his question well—that he suggested to hold a referendum on the flag issue at the time of the census. Since he received no answer, I am unable to comment on it, but I wonder whether, in the circumstances, the census legislation allows such a referendum.

Mr. Guay: Through an amendment to the legislation.

Mr. Lambert: Perhaps with an amendment to the act, a referendum might have been possible, but I do not know whether we did something along those lines before. It may be also that the way the hon. member made his suggestion was the right procedure, but I do not think he can say now that he was denied an answer because an answer has never been given to him.

Mr. Dupuis: Would the hon. member allow me another question?

Mr. Lambert: I see that the Minister without Portfolio is back from his trip.

Mr. Dupuis: Would the hon. member not agree that during the six years of Conservative administration, the present Leader of the Opposition had all the time required to propose a referendum or to agree to the request of the Conservative member for St. Boniface who had suggested to his own government a referendum on that issue? Why did the Conservative government, which had the power to do so, not comply with the request of the hon. member for St. Boniface?

We know that that suggestion was rejected or considered of little interest and, besides, the bill I myself introduced in the house proposed an amendment to the census legislation so that the opportunity of the census could be taken to put the question respecting a new distinctive flag and a distinctive national anthem.

Mr. Lambert: Well, in answering the minister's second question, I will reply in part to the hon. member who directed the first question to me, namely that in the case of questions asked at a census, it is extremely difficult to keep secret the identity of the person invited to make his or her choice on such a thing.

Mr. Dupuis: Answer the first part of the question.

Mr. Lambert: As far as the first question is concerned, I will say this. There were so many shortcomings in the business of the country when we came into office that we centered all our energies on farm and other programs in order to improve the national economy.

Mr. Dupuis: That was in 1961, and I asked why—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. May I remind the Minister without Portfolio that we are not in committee and that the hon. member who has the floor should not be interrupted.

Mr. Lambert: I will answer briefly by saying this. At that time—this is a personal opinion—there was less unanimity than today and we have seen considerable changes in the last five years.

The minister knows very well that before he became a minister, he had not travelled much in the country and that I travelled much more than he.

Mr. Dupuis: That is a gratuitous statement.

Mr. Lambert: Perhaps I did not travel as much as he did, since he was absent for long months.

Mr. Dupuis: Do not let jealousy get the better of you, my friend.

Mr. Lambert: On the other hand, I might say that in another four or five years, the atmosphere will be very different indeed. To illustrate the point, I might say that, with regard to the anthem "O Canada", the attitude throughout the country has thoroughly changed in the last ten years, of which fact, there is every evidence. I might say the same thing with regard to bilingual cheques. It took a little time to convince the public.

That is my answer to the hon. member.

Mr. Dupuis: I might just point out that my hon. friend did not answer my question.

Mr. Drouin: Would the hon. member allow a question?

Mr. Lambert: Go ahead.

Mr. Drouin: Inasmuch as a few moments ago the hon. member was in favour of adjourning this debate, did he not indicate in this way that the discussion had lasted long enough, and does he not think it appropriate to put the substance of the matter to the vote, so that all hon. members may express their views?

Mr. Lambert: I should like it to be clearly understood that the adjournment of a discussion is by no means the end of that discussion, as the hon. member knows very well.

It is just a matter of deferring a question in favour of more significant issues.

If the hon. member showed more interest in the legislation on the order paper, he would support the amendment relating to the adjournment of this discussion so that we might consider other matters provided therein.

Mr. Drouin: That is not an answer.

[*Text*]

Mr. Bert Leboe (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment I must at once say that the remarks I shall make are my own and I accept full responsibility for them. Though my colleagues may not agree with what I have to say, there is one thing they do agree with, and that is my right to say it. I intend to present some arguments in favour of sending the report back to the flag committee, and in doing so I hope to deal with the various phases of the whole question. Also I hope to relate my arguments and statements to the question of a plebiscite.

First of all, I would like to refer to the remarks I made on the flag question in the debate on the speech from the throne on February 27 last, which are recorded at page 315 of *Hansard* for that day:

> I should like to make a few remarks about this business of a national flag. We really get into deep water when we start talking about a national flag. I realize that. I think the solution lies in having a committee set up that will choose perhaps four or five designs out of the some 2,500 or 2,900 designs that have been submitted, and put these on a ballot. They should include the red ensign, and should be put to a referendum of the people, with a transferable vote, so that each individual would choose the first, second, third, fourth and fifth in the order he preferred and, by the process of elimination, we will then have over 50 per cent of the people voting in favour of a particular flag. That will take all of us off the hook and put the responsibility where it belongs, on the shoulders of the people.

I should like to enlarge on this suggestion by saying that in addition to holding a plebiscite the votes recorded in it should be sent to a central point, preferably the city of Ottawa, for counting. In this way there would be no way of knowing in which region any particular vote was cast. There would be no way of telling who voted for a particular flag and there would be no evidence of regionalization. If this method were adopted I believe we would get a flag supported by the votes of possibly 85 per cent of the population.

The transferable ballot in a plebiscite is not something new. As a matter of fact for a number of years it was used in general elections in the province of British Columbia.

Mr. Prittie: Until you got in.

Mr. Leboe: Someone says until I got in, but I did not get in; I am down here.

Mr. Prittie: Until your party got in and cancelled it.

Mr. Leboe: There were reasons for that but I do not think they have anything to do with the flag debate.

If we proceed to hold a plebiscite in that way we will get the true feeling of the people, and I am of the opinion that the result of a plebiscite would have much more permanence than the procedure we are following now because a new government could easily change the design again, and that is a point which should not be forgotten. It has been said that the youth of the country want a new flag. If so, 18 year olds and over should be allowed to vote in the plebiscite.

Some people say a new government would not follow the procedure we are following today, but I would remind the house it is the tame bull that kills the farmer. It is not hard to imagine that a new government under new leadership might wish to give the people of Canada the democratic right which is being denied to them under the procedure which is being followed today.

I am of the opinion that the whole approach to the flag question to this date has been negative. This is another reason why a plebiscite should be held. It is my sincere belief that the purpose of bringing about this debate is to eliminate the union jack from the present flag. In my view this is a completely negative approach and I am certainly not in favour of such an approach.

Those who are supporting the stand against a plebiscite may be saying: If we get rid of the union jack we get rid of crosses which stand for Christian principles; we shall eliminate them from our symbols entirely; we shall find ourselves in the position where there are no crosses in our flag, no symbols to represent the Christian principles for which we stand. Those individuals who wish to see the union jack disappear from our flag may well be saying: There will be no symbols to remind us of British justice; we are now building up for ourselves in this house and in the country a new type of justice so we do not need to rely on traditional British justice. There is our democratic origin to be considered. We know that the birthplace of democracy is the place over which the

union jack is flying. This is an emotional and a personal issue. What are we doing when we eliminate the union jack from our flag under the procedure being followed today? We are denying the people of Canada a democratic right in accordance with the traditions they inherited from Britain. Are we setting aside the democracy of old for a new type which denies people the right to say what they want in certain circumstances which involve a personal matter? This, in my view, is exactly what we are doing. We are eliminating the crosses. We are eliminating the memory of British justice; we are eliminating the memory of true democracy.

One of my hon. friends said to me the other day he did not like the idea of a plebiscite because the red ensign would win. Maybe he is right. I do not think any of us know what design would win; we cannot be sure until or unless a vote is taken on this question. I believe everybody has the right to stand up in the House of Commons and give their personal opinions. One would suspect, from reading the newspapers, that there would be many more opinions expressed from speakers on the other side of the house. In refusing to yield to the request for a plebiscite the government, according to polls, is frustrating the will of 68 per cent of the people of Canada.

I could not help recalling a television program the other night in which the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) used some high-sounding phrases about a code of ethics for cleansing the inner sanctum. But I want to say to him as plainly as I can that the procedure which has been followed and the action which has been taken on this flag question will make the spectre in the Department of Justice look like an angel. I am convinced that the procedure being followed today is a deplorable procedure and that the people, if denied a plebiscite, will recognize it as such when the time comes for them to cast their ballots. Of this there is no question in my mind: You cannot deprive the people of this country of the right to express themselves, because there comes a time under the constitution when the people have this right whether we like it or not. Their voices will be heard. But I do not think it is altogether wise to hold a plebiscite on this matter at the time of the election. Why should we not do this at a more appropriate time instead of on an occasion when the issue is confused by the consideration of other issues and when many people, voting as they will vote, will be depriving themselves of the opportunity to vote in favour of some good program which an individual may have in his platform?

I believe a plebiscite is needed to satisfy the promise made to this country that parliament, which is composed of the Senate, the House of Commons and the crown, will deal with this matter. The order in council of 1945 stated it was parliament which would deal with this question. I would remind the house of some statements made by the Prime Minister as recorded on pages 4308 and 4309 of *Hansard* of June 15. Remember, we are about to ask the House of Commons to concur in a report. It is my view that this is where the stumbling block lies as far as parliament is concerned. This hope of settling the question in parliament is associated with the request for a plebiscite. As reported on page 4308, the right hon. gentleman says:

> Until such time as action is taken by parliament for the formal adoption of a national flag . . . the red ensign may be flown.

He is quoting from the order in council of 1945. Later the Prime Minister went on:

> I proposed in that statement on January 27, 1960, the submission by government to parliament of a measure which, if accepted by representatives of the people in parliament, would, I hoped, settle the problem of a national flag by agreement on a distinctive design which, unlike the red ensign—a flag never given formal sanction by parliament—could not be confused with certain United Kingdom or colonial flags and which was easily identifiable as Canadian.

Note, that he said he hoped this would settle the problem. He knew that the procedure which is being followed would not necessarily do so. As for the proposed flag being distinctive, I wonder if he would like to fly the flag of Peru alongside the design we are now considering and see just how distinctive it is. Further, it is not the flag that makes a country; it is the country that makes a flag. Later on, the Prime Minister stated:

> I do feel, however, that there should be a Canadian national flag which could not be mistaken for the emblem of any other country—

He was quoting from a letter he had sent out to various people. What a joke. A flag has been offered to us which is so like the flag of Peru that it is difficult to tell the difference between them. The statement went on:

> —and which, by its acceptance, would be a strong unifying force in our country.

Is this what we have found out in the course of the present debate—that this is a strong unifying force? I say to you, Mr.

Speaker, that it is anything but that. Here is another quotation:

> A Liberal government will establish a distinctive Canadian flag—

He had been saying previously that parliament would establish this flag, but as reported at page 4308 of *Hansard* he said:

> A Liberal government will establish a distinctive Canadian flag within two years of taking office.

Is this what is happening today? Certainly it is what is happening. It is not parliament that is being asked to deal with this problem, in my view. The Prime Minister is carrying out this commitment; but he is not doing what he said previously he would do. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say that we need a plebiscite to get us out of the position we are in. Parliament is the House of Commons, the Senate and the crown. I am confronted with the moral obligation which I have quoted from the pages of *Hansard*, namely that the Prime Minister must allow parliament—that is, the House of Commons, the Senate and the crown—to deal with this matter. I believe that the way we can get out of this dilemma is by holding a plebiscite, with the result of the vote of that plebiscite being given by the chief electoral officer to the Senate of this country so they may introduce a measure in this respect—as spoken of by the Prime Minister himself—a measure that can be concurred in by the Senate, the House of Commons and the crown. Therefore parliament would act on this question. I have heard it suggested that another order in council may be passed to annul the order in council of 1945. I say that if this happens, the whole argument has no foundation; we should not be dealing with the question at all.

I believe the question should be referred to a joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate. In my opinion the Senate of this country ought to be in on these deliberations. Such a committee could choose a number of good designs including the present Canadian flag. I believe that an example of a design that could very well be acceptable under these circumstances and submitted in a plebiscite is the one suggested to me by the hon. member for Halifax. This was a very simple design in which the three maple leaves took the place of the union jack, and the union jack was placed on the shield in the present position of the three maple leaves. Nothing would be taken from the present flag, nothing would be added; only the prominence of the union jack would be changed with that of the three maple leaves. In my view this is one good design that could be submitted in a plebiscite. Instead of that this matter was placed before a committee that was frozen from the very beginning. As many hon. members of this house know, it was a joke around the House of Commons, after the flag committee was formed, that they knew immediately what the end result was going to be. What did we accomplish in that particular committee? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is another reason why we should hold a plebiscite on this matter and submit a number of designs to the Canadian people. The House of Commons and the Senate could provide a committee that would give us those designs, and we would therefore be fulfilling our obligation in passing them on to the people of this country in a plebiscite.

What did we do in this flag committee? We took the three maple leaves and replaced them with one maple leaf. This got the Prime Minister off the hook; it was no longer the Pearson pennant. But then the flag committee was immediately confronted with another problem; they now had the flag suggested by the members of the New Democratic party. So what happened? We folded, like a television camera, the three maple leaves into one and turned the blue bars into red. That is all we did. Basically it was the same design as that with which we started. That is all the flag committee accomplished, Mr. Speaker. In concluding my remarks I want to say that any individual in this country knows as much about what he wants in regard to a flag as does any member of parliament. But this is not true with regard to legislation that comes before this House of Commons. In the case of legislation we are able to carry out a certain amount of research—not as much as we would like to carry out, by any means—and we are able to listen to the speeches of people in the House of Commons who perhaps have more research facilities. In this way we are able to judge the matter from the experience of many members of this house who have a great deal of knowledge of the matter under discussion. But on the question of a flag, any person on the street knows just as much about the flag as you, Mr. Speaker, myself or anyone else; it is a very personal and emotional problem. Therefore I say that we should take advantage of holding a plebiscite on this question. I am also convinced that the backbenchers of the Liberal party would be doing

their leader and the frontbenchers a very good service if they would rise and support a plebiscite and take their leader off the hook.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. H. A. Moore (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I intend to be brief in my remarks but I welcome the chance to make it clear that my views have not changed since I spoke on this matter last summer. The hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) this afternoon gave us a great dissertation on wasting time. He should have said this to the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) who introduced this whole flag question and the debate in the first place. However, the hon. member's harangue to my mind did not make any more sense in Latin or Greek than it would have in French or English. This man has been carrying on a one-man filibuster for days now. For example, I was looking through the first pages of yesterday's *Hansard* and saw that on those few pages he had 21 entries—and he accuses us of filibustering. None of us on this side can tie that record, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Grégoire: Don't make me laugh.

Mr. Winkler: Pay your phone bill.

Mr. Moore: In support of a plebiscite I would like to present what I consider to be the main reason for holding one. In attempting to force certain flag designs on the people the government is completely ignoring those who want to retain the flag we have had for many years, or at least some symbols from it. To be fair I would point out that one man on the government side is attempting to retain the symbols, and I give him full credit for that. We heard a very fine speech from the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Leboe) this afternoon and we realize that some hon. members in other parties are also attempting to do this.

Many speeches have been made in this debate by members from Quebec. Those members are practically all, if not entirely all, in favour of a new or different flag, regardless of the party to which they belong. I respect their views because it is obvious they are trying to present the views of their constituents. Regardless of the views of their party, these members at least have spoken for their people, and no one can quarrel with that; it is political honesty. But what about the members of the government; have they been as honest? In my opinion they definitely have not. Many of them speak, of course, from their seats; but they do not rise—with few exceptions—and tell us what their constituents want. We should certainly like the reasons for the abandonment of the flag which we now have for something else, or for what appears to be anything else. It does not seem to make much difference as long as we abandon the flag we have. I am sure the constituents of hon. members opposite would be very interested to hear what they have to say on this matter. It is natural that some constituents always like to criticize their member, and I do not think they should be robbed of this pleasure. But how can they criticize their member if they do not know what he thinks about an emotional issue?

It is surprising that many young people feel the need for a plebiscite, although I have heard statements to the contrary. The boy scouts magazine polled a number of boy scouts on this issue, and boy scouts are a fine example of young Canadians. The result showed that over 50 per cent of them wanted the red ensign. Over 35 per cent, I must admit, wanted the three maple leaf flag, but everyone has forgotten about it now. Less than 15 per cent wanted a one maple leaf flag.

The need for a plebiscite has been mentioned in various publications throughout the country. I should like to put on the record only those excerpts from these clippings which deal with a plebiscite. For example, the *Rural Co-Op* for May 12, 1964 carries the heading "Does majority or minority rule?", and in connection with the flag question has this to say:

> How many quiet responsible Canadians want a new flag—brand new with no traditions behind it? Or a new national anthem? Until that fact is established all the hollering about a Canadian flag and a Canadian anthem is just that: a lot of hollering by extremely vocal persons who must have something to holler about . . .
>
> Only a referendum can show whether a majority of Canadians want a change—or whether we are subject to rule by the loudest shouters.

Here is another clipping from the *Daily Colonist*, Victoria, B.C., entitled: "It's a label, not a flag". I refer only to the part which deals with a plebiscite. This article says:

> The flag, which traditionally expresses our pride and our freedom, is being taken away without the consent of the majority of the people. Mr. Pearson could resolve this by a national plebiscite . . .
>
> The flag is a basic issue and should be resolved not by an election, not by mere politics, but by a national vote in itself, for itself.

Lastly, this is a clipping from the Toronto *Telegram* for August 2, 1964, an excerpt from an article entitled, "Ask the people":

The voice of the people can be heard, on this issue, only through a national plebiscite.

Then it goes on to mention that the flag issue is different from a political issue.

In my opinion, the idea behind sending this problem to a committee was to obtain a compromise. But we did not get one; what we got was another label similar to the three maple leaves which was suggested at the time the committee was set up. It is my understanding that the committee had the chance to come up with a compromise which contained the symbols of both founding races. This was mentioned this afternoon. One of the three final choices bore the symbols of both founding races, but this was overlooked. That is why I say the committee did not come up with a compromise when it had the chance. I would have accepted this choice because it was a compromise. The Canadian coat of arms contains the symbols of four founding races, but this was ignored.

What do I consider to be a compromise when I speak of compromise? We have, you might say, the two extremes. We have, on the one hand, the strong supporters of the previously recommended three maple leaf flag; on the other hand we have those who support the red ensign. If we are to reach a compromise we must put something of both races on any compromise flag which is recommended by a committee, and I maintain that no symbol of the red ensign is on the flag proposed by this committee. To those who say that a plebiscite would disunite the country, I concede only that it should not show regional results. Only by showing regional results might disunity be caused. But a plebiscite would get this government out of a bad spot.

This Liberal government has shown that it does not care what is the design of a new flag so long as it does away with any symbols of our heritage. That is so obvious that this point does not need enlarging upon. The whole flag idea was brought forward last summer just before a summer recess in the hope that the house would pass it. If that had been so, of course then we would have been given a recess. Once again now, before the Christmas recess, there is the same hope. This is a typical example of the government's political manoeuvring. We are told: "Pass it, or no Christmas recess". Perhaps they have not said that in so many words, but we get the idea. This does not sound to me like real democracy in action.

The other day the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Ormiston) spoke on the question of symbols in connection with his support for a plebiscite. He delivered an interesting and well prepared speech. There has been a tendency lately in this country to do away with symbols. The same tendency exists to do away with pleasing art. A prime example of this is the monstrosities of so-called modern art which we have in our Canadian air terminal buildings. To me this is evidence of a sick society, and this is the sort of thing which seems to get support from this government.

Why should we consult the people through a plebiscite? Who asked for a new flag in the first place? This was not the promise I heard, Mr. Speaker, in the last election campaign in my part of the country at any rate. What I heard were promises of $2 wheat. I even heard the promise of $3 wheat; that is $3 for the first 300 bushels that a farmer produces. Then there were promises of giving the country two ministers of agriculture. But I heard no promise about a flag. We sometimes wonder now how many ministers of agriculture we do have.

Mr. Slogan: Three.

Mr. Moore: Someone says three, but some say none. I did not notice the government being anxious to keep these promises and these were the promises in which the people in my area were most interested.

I mentioned a few minutes ago the members from Quebec, and I do not think I was hard on them. These members obviously want a new flag. But I would ask them, and I would ask others who say a plebiscite is not necessary, to consult their constituents as to whether they would rather have a new flag which perhaps would divide Canada—and I think they are all aware of this—or that we spent our time giving them some much needed assistance in their problems. Have these members asked this of the eastern farmers, whose incomes are so meagre? Strangely enough, we see today the symbols of Christmas on the office doors of many hon. members as well as inside their offices, and this is very fine. But I notice that these are on the office doors of the very members who want to do away with symbols. How do they justify acceptance of traditional Christmas symbols while at the same time rejecting those traditional symbols on the flag? That certainly does not make sense in my opinion.

In conclusion I would urge the government, and particularly the Prime Minister, to give some consideration to those Canadians who

do not agree with the Prime Minister in his desire to remove the Christian crosses from our flag by Christmas.

Mr. Lawrence Watson (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate in order to put forward some of my views about the necessity for holding a plebiscite across Canada to decide this issue for once and for all. I am sure it is the feeling of most people in Canada that a plebiscite is the only means by which this issue can be settled. It is also my belief that the majority of the people in Canada do not have a desire to change our flag.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) is the one man in Canada who, as head of this government, has a feeling that we should have a new flag, and is in a position to at least attempt to push it through the house and force it upon the people. In western Canada we often use the expression "taking the bull by the horns," and I believe that is exactly what the Prime Minister is attempting to do in forcing this change upon the Canadian people who, like the members of this party, will not accept such a change.

There is no urgency for a new flag, as evidenced by events which have taken place since last summer when the flag issue was first introduced. In June, as I remember, there was an attempt to rush the new flag design through by July 1 so that it could be hoisted at that time. I need not remind hon. members that that did not take place. The next urgent deadline was the time of the Queen's visit to Canada. The Prime Minister, and I presume government members, hoped to be able to hoist the new flag when the Queen was visiting Canada, but again that was not possible. The Prime Minister has now set a new date for the hoisting of a new flag, and is in hopes that this can take place before Christmas. I suggest one of the Prime Minister's faults in proposing this flag question lies in his continuous setting of deadlines. It must be very disappointing to him, having set two deadlines within six months, not to have at least met one of them.

It is evident by the events that have taken place in the house as a result of motions to adjourn the debate that the government members, along with the majority of other members, feel the need for greater discussion on this subject. I should like to see some government members stand in their places and tell us why we so urgently need a change in the present flag.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boutin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I am still wondering if the hon. member's remarks are pertinent to the amendment before us, that is whether or not we should have a plebiscite on the flag issue and the reasons for so doing?

I admit the hon. member's remarks are most interesting, but, in my opinion, they are not related to the subject under consideration.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gelber): I am sure the hon. member will address himself to the subject of the amendment.

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I was leading up to that subject, and was about to suggest that we have not heard from more than one government member as to why we need a change in our flag. We in this party suggest that we do not need such a change because the present accepted flag is satisfactory. In view of that fact, and the government's apparent desire to make a change, I believe we should have a plebiscite and let the people of Canada make a decision once and for all on this issue.

The hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Leboe) said this afternoon that the only reason for a change in the flag lies in the fact that some people want to get rid of the union jack. I agree with that hon. member and feel that that is the only reason for a change.

There has been only one member on the other side of the house who has stood up in his place and agreed that that was the only reason for such a change. I do not believe he is the only member of the Liberal party in this house who represents a riding where the majority of constituents feel the same way. It has been very evident from the speeches made by members of other than the government party that we do not agree with them in this regard.

If one refers to a poll carried out by a western newspaper last spring he will find that at that time 82 per cent of the people contacted were in favour of retention of the red ensign. I do not believe that we must always retain the red ensign, but if there is a change I feel that we should change to a modified version of.

If we are to have a change, in order to maintain whatever unity still exists in Canada it must be the result of a plebiscite.

Canadian Flag

Invariably, many people are unhappy about the results of a general election, but they accept those results. I am sure the people of Canada would be happy to accept the feeling of the majority of the people of Canada as expressed by a plebiscite. Surely the people of Canada for the most part desire that this whole mess be cleaned up. I suggest it can be cleaned up appropriately, and in the best way possible, by holding a plebiscite, settling this matter for all time.

I should like to refer to a newspaper clipping in relation to a poll of members of parliament on the flag issue. The date is June 12, and at this time there were 120 Liberals for the proposed flag, 1 against and 2 undecided; there were two Conservatives for the flag, 72 against and 8 undecided. The New Democratic party was split with 10 for the flag, 5 against it and 2 undecided. There was 1 Créditiste for the flag, 6 against it and 4 undecided. I believe the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Horner) pointed out last night that a poll was still being conducted with regard to the question of a plebiscite. At the moment 60 per cent of the people are in favour of a plebiscite, and I believe last June the figure was 62 per cent or 63 per cent. This is evidence of the fact that the feelings of the people have not changed, and that there should be a plebiscite.

I believe that members of parliament were sent here to legislate, to change laws, but when we are dealing with an emotional issue such as the flag everyone in Canada should have an opportunity to make his choice known. I am making it quite clear that I am going to support the amendment for a plebiscite. It is evident from what has happened since this flag debate started, and from the fact that the committee voted almost unanimously against the three maple leaf flag, that that particular flag has been set aside. I am sure the flag committee did a wonderful job of attempting to come up with a design that would appeal to the majority of people.

I have a clipping here, Mr. Speaker, and the heading on it is, "The Great Canadian Debate". I should like to put some of this on the record because I realize that the people of Canada feel this is what has taken place here. This article says that in 1892 the British admiralty created the red ensign by adding the Canadian coat of arms to the fly of the British ensign. This flag has been flown on ships registered in Canada. The article indicates that perhaps this was the start of the great Canadian flag debate, and that was some 70 years ago. I quote from that article:

> In 1918, at the Olympics in Paris, the Canadian team paraded behind a maple leaf flag devised for the occasion. Perhaps that was the first time a distinctive Canadian flag complicated the simple choice between the red ensign and the union jack.

Then, on October 1, 1945—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boutin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. You will no doubt find me obstinate, but all the same, I would ask you to remind the hon. member who has the floor that since the present debate deals with the question as to whether or not a plebiscite should be held, the merits of a flag over another should not be discussed.

I would therefore ask you, Mr. Speaker, to tell the hon. member to deal with the plebiscite instead of the merits of the union jack or of any other flag.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gelber): Yes, I would ask the hon. member for Assiniboia to direct his remarks more specifically to the amendment and the question of a plebiscite, with which we are dealing at the moment.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): On the point of order, may I say that when the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) was speaking he wandered all over the place. He was never once called to order. I am sure that after what he has said the debate is wide open for anyone in this house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boutin: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have just heard, if the simultaneous translation was correct—that the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) was never called to order.

I must point out that the hon. member for Lapointe was called to order at least three or four times.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gelber): I do feel the hon. member for Assiniboia should direct more of his attention to the question of a plebiscite, the subject we are discussing at the moment.

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I was merely trying to bring out the facts in relation to the great flag debate and why we should have a plebiscite to settle it once and for all. As I was saying, in 1892 they were arguing over the flag. This is now 1964 and there are only a few days left until Christmas.

If we are going to make a decision on this matter, then hon. members should decide to hold a plebiscite and eliminate all this argument as to whether we shall have this flag or that, or whether we want a new flag at all. I think this is a question, whether we want a new flag at all. How else can a decision be made except by a plebiscite We can make a decision here, but that is not going to make the people happy. As I said before, we in this great democracy of Canada like to think that a decision involving an issue as emotional as this flag will be made by the people. I do not believe there has been such an emotional issue as the flag since I came to Ottawa. I must admit that some very emotional things occurred during the last two weeks, but they were related to a different topic and I will not become involved with that.

I should like to return to this press clipping, Mr. Speaker, because it does relate to a plebiscite. I quote:

> Finance Minister J. L. Ilsley replied that the red ensign was being flown under authority of order in council P.C. 5888 and tabled a copy of the order. He added: "The red ensign flew from the tower of the houses of parliament from the days of confederation until 1904."
>
> The order in council recalled that a 1924 order had authorized use of the ensign on Canadian buildings outside Canada—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boutin: Mr. Speaker, once again I raise a point of order. I wonder whether the present debate is on the merits of the red ensign and the union jack or on the holding of a plebiscite?

I would like you to call again the hon. member to order and this time abide by your ruling, otherwise this will become a circus.

[*Text*]

Mr. Churchill: On that point of order I respectfully draw the attention of the Acting Speaker to the fact that we have now had three interruptions from a member of the Créditiste party. On Friday the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) interrupted proceedings in the house on 23 occasions during a two hour period. Today the hon. member for Lapointe spoke for 15 minutes on subjects that were irrelevant to the debate taking place.

We cannot have two types of rules in the house, special rules for members of the Créditiste party and more stringent rules for members of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, and I respectfully suggest, sir, that you ignore points of order raised by members of the Créditiste party in view of the special consideration that has been given to the hon. member for Lapointe. All we ask is the same privilege in the House of Commons that is afforded to other members of the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Speaker, that is just like the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) who, in the absence of the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), musters enough courage to bring charges against him—

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gelber): Order. I think we have had enough discussion on this point of order. I would ask the hon. member for Assiniboia to direct more of his attention to the question of a plebiscite. I think there is reasonable latitude given inasmuch as, in his opinion, various aspects of the problem which he has been discussing would be solved by a plebiscite. However, I do not think that is carte blanche to go over the entire field of the Canadian flag. He should be given some latitude but I would ask him to try and direct his attention more specifically to the question of a plebiscite.

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I shall try to relate this to the plebiscite and I thought I had explained that to the hon. member. There is one more paragraph I think I should quote:

> Premier John Smallwood of Newfoundland said, "Even if we're the last people on earth we'll continue to fly the union jack. It is first and foremost our flag in Newfoundland."

I am sure the people in Newfoundland are no different from the people in Vancouver, at the other extreme of Canada, and I am sure that if we have a national plebiscite as true Canadians they will accept the result of it.

Mr. Boutin: Question.

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): The hon. member just sits there. If he would like to get up and make a speech I would gladly sit down to allow him the time; but if he is going to interrupt continually—

Mr. Choquette: He made his speech yesterday.

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): This is an extract from another newspaper clipping:

> There is a growing suspicion in the minds of Canadians that Prime Minister Pearson and his government supporters are now afraid to submit the "flag issue" to the people as a plebiscite or referendum. Having successfully split the country wide open on the issue the Liberals fear the results of a "flag vote" that would publicly record the disunity.

Mr. Byrne: Please identify the source.

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): This is an article from the Sudbury *Daily Star* of August 21, 1964.

An hon. Member: That is a good Tory paper.

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): I am not familiar with the politics of the papers involved, but I have another clipping here from the Kingston *Whig-Standard* and possibly some hon. members could identify its politics.

Mr. Webb: Senator Fraser's—Liberal.

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): Dealing with the argument that a vote in the house would represent the true feelings of the majority of people, the Kingston *Whig-Standard* says:

> It will do no such thing; what it probably will do is reflect the feelings (whether true or not) of members of parliament.

Nobody can tell me that all the people in my riding think the way I do, nor that all the people in the riding of the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) think the same as he does.

Mr. Choquette: He is a Conservative; you know that.

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): That is fine, I am glad to hear it.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): He has seen the light.

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): I could continue giving reasons why I feel we need a plebiscite, but I shall conclude by saying that on the day our gracious Queen left Canada I went up to the flag committee room and saw a flag hanging on the wall which was the choice of the 1946 flag committee—the red ensign with the coat of arms removed and a single maple leaf in the fly—and when I looked at that flag I thought it was a reasonable solution and one I could support. I would say it was a far more sensible flag and more reasonable solution than the one recommended by the present flag committee, and in saying that I am not saying anything against the flag committee members.

However, that flag was not accepted in 1946 and I feel that to settle this sorry mess into which the Prime Minister has got us he must agree to leave the question to a plebiscite so that the people of Canada may have a voice in the choice of what will be our national flag.

[Mr. Watson (Assiniboia).]

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Prince Edward-Lennox): I note, Mr. Speaker, that very frequently during this debate there comes nothing from the other side except senseless repetition of the word "question." Mr. Speaker, there is a question all right. The Canadian people are asking, wherever you go in English Canada: What kind of politics is the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) playing in his nefarious flag policy? I would remind hon. members who keep repeating the word "question" that that is what the question is. It is spreading across the nation and it is a question which will only be answered by the ballot box, whether the Prime Minister and his administration decide to give us a plebiscite or not.

I rise at this time to support the amendment so ably proposed by my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Monteith) and seconded by the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Rapp). The amendment before us has no doubt been placed on record, but perhaps I may be allowed to read it again. It is:

> That the sixth report of the special committee be not now adopted but that it be referred back to the committee with instructions to strike out paragraph 7 of the said report and substitute therefor the following:
>
> "However, as the final vote of the committee did not reveal a sufficient degree of unanimity for the proposed design for a national flag for Canada, your committee therefore recommends that the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to conduct a plebiscite to be held at the next general election in order that the Canadian people may be given their rightful opportunity to declare their choice concerning a national flag".

It concludes:

> And that the committee for such purpose be revived.

This is a most reasonable request; it is a very democratic suggestion. It is a cogent amendment, one which is democratically sound, and it deserves the support of all members of this house. It asks that a plebiscite be held at the time of the next general election in order that the Canadian people may have an opportunity to express their views on a national flag.

This government, in the course of its present nefarious policy, has shown its usual characteristics of Liberal dictatorship and autocracy, making sure that the Canadian people are not given a voice in this matter. The reasons behind the government's refusal to accept the request made by the opposition regarding a plebiscite are deeper than they might appear; they are deeply hidden within the ramifications and machinations of the party opposite, both here on parliament hill and across the

country. The policy followed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) in catering to one racial and geographical section of this country as against all the rest of Canada combined strangles and stultifies the voices which have been raised in support of our worthy emblems. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that I have used the plural and said "worthy emblems". I have done so because there are others which are as worthy to be our national emblems as many which have been mentioned. But they have been utterly ignored. The worthiest of these is, I submit, the Canadian red ensign.

In calling attention to the need for a plebiscite I would certainly join with all other hon. members in commending the committee of 15 which worked so hard and so long in the performance of its duties. The members of that committee worked diligently, I will admit, but I cannot congratulate them on their decision. If I may use a colloquial phrase, the dice were all loaded against there ever being a chance that the Canadian red ensign would become the flag of the committee's choice. The dice were loaded by the Prime Minister against there ever being a chance that the union jack or the fleur-de-lis would be present on any flag presented to us by the committee. After considering the design which the committee finally chose I can only say it underlines the need for a plebiscite so that the wise counsel of the Canadian people can guide us, by a majority vote, in the selection of a flag.

It has been said that after the first long, unproductive debate on the flag, anything we might say now would be repetitive. I am reminded of the story of a coloured minister of the gospel in the south who was asked by an admirer of his preaching how he managed to convey his thoughts to his parishioners on the plantation. He replied: "I tells them about their sins of omission and commission and I tells them again, and then I tells them what I told them." That is just what the opposition in this house has the duty of doing today.

I want to point out that this flag is a bicoloured flag. On the Canadian civic scene today we hear a lot of hyphenated expressions preceded by the syllable "bi". Biculturalism and bilingualism are examples. In my opinion red and white do not form such a good combination, from the point of view of colour, as we had on the first flag which was presented to us. The trifoliate flag was at least a tricolour—red, white and blue. Down through the years this country has sung "Three Cheers for the Red, White and Blue". That song cannot be sung with reference to the flag now offered us because it is only a red and white flag. I have heard the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) attempting to convince us in this house that Canada's colours are red and white. This is another question upon which the people should help make a decision. The hon. member tried to establish that these colours were law, that they were irrevocable. I submit this is not so. I listened to the hon. member for Leeds in the last debate on this subject lauding what he tried to put forward as the sound qualities and impeccable heraldic principles underlying the flag which was first presented to us. I listened to him again on Monday, November 3, as he made his excuses for his new heraldic hallucination while he dropped the red, white and blue trifoliate flag into the political mire in favour of this bicoloured, red-ended table cloth. After all that has been said in favour of the flag put forward by the committee, the flag now espoused so readily by the hon. member for Leeds, I want to ask him one question in this regard: Would it suit the people of his constituency and of the city of Brockville? I submit it would not.

On August 17 last, speaking on this question, I stated that the Liberal party members were brainwashed and gagged when it came to forming and expressing their views on this flag question. I repeat it now. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that I said the herd of trained seals on the government backbenches were living on an iceflow which was becoming uninhabitable and which was rapidly breaking up. The members of the other parties in this parliament as well as the Canadian people generally saw that prophecy come true the week before last in the terrible spectacle witnessed here when the sins of omission and commission on the part of this government were aired. That is all I am permitted to say at the present time in that regard, Mr. Speaker, but I trust that future inquiries and reports will bring out the truth there. I say to the Prime Minister, stop this strife and contention by giving the Canadian people their right to choose by referendum; that inherent right which they have always possessed. That right is built right into the Canadian red ensign in its Christian, democratic crosses and in the insignia contained in the Canadian shield on the flag. I say to the Prime Minister, just tell the people, "Yes, I think it is best that we vote on this. We do not need to go to the bother and expense of calling an election for that purpose, either; but at the next general

election, whenever it is required that it occur, we will attach this plebiscite to the ballot and we can settle this matter peaceably among ourselves". How all hon. members on both sides of this house wish that the Prime Minister would make an announcement along those lines; then he would be doing something for the unity of this country. But no, so far our pleas have been of no avail and, like the coloured minister, I have to tell the Prime Minister again and quote Cowper as I did before:

> The age of virtuous politics is past, and we are deep in that of cold pretence. Those we thought were patriots are grown too shrewd to be sincere and we too wise to trust them.

What a situation this House of Commons has come to. What a situation the affairs of this country have come to. After the opposition motion to adjourn this flag debate the other evening, when the Liberal party voted to continue it, I was talking to a lady who had been in the members gallery that evening. She said, "Poor Canada. What a pity. What a sell-out to one province. What is the purpose of this question?" Then she said, "Are not our emblems, so useful and so well respected down through the centuries, of any use to us any more, that they do not let the people decide this?" She concluded by saying —and this could be ominous, but I sincerely hope it never will be—"You can begin to put the barbed wire up at any time; things will be worse before they are better".

Mr. Byrne: She was in the Tory gallery, obviously.

Mr. Alkenbrack: I have a few quotations that I would like to place before the house, Mr. Speaker, with regard to my argument that the Canadian people should be given their rightful opportunity of declaring their choice of a national flag. I have here "The Canadian Military Journal" of Dominion day, 1963. This was quite a while ago and a great deal of time has been taken up since in this flag debate. With regard to the opportunity that should be afforded our people of racial origins to decide this question, "The Canadian Military Journal" says as follows:

> French speaking Canadians should remember—back through Canada's history to Quebec in 1774. They would find that brave group of men, and women too, French and English speaking, all striving to set a foundation on which a future nation could be built.
>
> The cornerstone had just been laid. It was the Quebec Act which they, especially the English governor, Sir Guy Carleton, had striven to have worded in such a way as to assure that they and their children, and those to follow them, would live in perfect harmony—a country with two languages and the four freedoms, as we know them today, but with one spirit and purpose—to live and work together.

That is what we have to do in this country, if it is to survive. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it will survive if democratic principles are followed and dictatorship and autocracy are discarded here in this chamber. I will continue to read from "The Canadian Military Journal" of Dominion day, 1963. That was a very fitting day for these things to be said, was it not, Mr. Speaker:

> They should also remember that the national defence of Canada was supplied with material and paid for by England right up to the first world war—yes, and 100 years earlier in the war of 1812-14 when English and French speaking Canadians fought and died side by side, as brothers, to keep this Canada of ours. French speaking students, and those who lead them, should reflect on that before they talk separatism. Let's talk unity—sincerely and constructively—not like politicians who change their tunes to suit each audience, then forget it.

I think that is a very fitting and timely quotation. "However as the final vote of the committee did not reveal a sufficient degree of unanimity"—I am quoting the words of the amendment—"for the proposed design for a national flag for Canada", I would like to make reference to what I term, for my own purposes, exhibit No. 2, which is a letter from the Canadian Corps Association dated April 20, 1964, addressed to the Honourable Lester B. Pearson. I should like to correct that title; it should be "The Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson" —Prime Minister of Canada, Ottawa. The letter reads:

> Honourable Sir:
>
> The Canadian Corps Association, dominion command, continues to support firmly, the retention of the Canadian red ensign as Canada's national flag.
>
> It should not be the decision of one person, nor of any political party, to eliminate the Canadian red ensign as Canada's flag, which it has been for almost 100 years.
>
> The government's course of action in this matter should only be determined by a plebiscite.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Mr. Speaker, I hear mutterings of "Order". I contend that this exhibit is in order because it brings to the forefront the need for democratic principles to prevail in the form of a plebiscite, and that is what the amendment is talking about. This letter continues:

> Petitions to the Secretary of State prove now that the Canadian red ensign is the majority choice of Canadians. Has the government no confidence in the citizens of Canada?

It is well that all hon. members should ask themselves that question, because it is a cogent question today:

> Let them decide this question at the polls.

I heartily agree with that sentiment and I am not afraid of it in so far as it is an obligation upon me personally:

> Our veterans organization strongly urge that the question to the qualified voters of Canada should read: Do you favour the retention of the Canadian red ensign as Canada's national flag? The yes or no answers should then determine the final design concerning Canada's national flag.

I have commended the committee and I wish to commend the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming) and his colleagues who found there was no compromise in the minds of the great majority of the members of the committee. Nevertheless they went ahead and did their duty, even though they were outnumbered from the start, and purposely so as a result of the policies pursued by the government in connection with that loaded committee.

I have before me another timely quotation, even though it goes back to June 3, during the first phase of the debate. This is a quotation from one of my home town newspapers, the Napanee *Beaver*. In an editorial headed "Rally round the flag" the *Beaver* says:

> It does seem a simple enough thing to define a flag, at least for dictionary makers. It is not so easy for prime ministers...
>
> As his self-imposed deadline approaches Mr. Pearson may find that the flag—symbol of unity in most lands—will become a symbol of disunity in Canada.

How true is that prophecy today. I also received a communication from the Canadian Corps Association, as did all hon. members, dated November 27. They say in their letter:

> The right hon. Prime Minister Pearson and some of his associates have during the past few days called for British fair play and justice.
>
> The Prime Minister has therefore substantiated the veterans of Canada's demand that our present government must not eliminate from Canada the flag of justice and freedom, the Canadian red ensign...
>
> The Canadian Corps Association, dominion command, at this time reiterates that no change in Canada's present national flag should be made unless the government is so instructed by the citizens of Canada by means of a plebiscite vote held in conjunction with Canada's next general election.
>
> Yours respectfully,
> E. V. Heesaker.

How timely and directly relevant, Mr. Speaker, is that communication to this discussion. As the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Watson) pointed out, there are many well founded articles available, and I have another here. This is an article by Mr. Bruce West in the *Globe and Mail* for December 4 concerning the flag issue. I hear someone laugh.

Mr. Choquette: I am not laughing at you. I am not even listening.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Hon. members opposite might well take into consideration the well chosen words of Mr. Bruce West.

Mr. Moreau: They are already on the record.

Mr. Alkenbrack: He says:

> Let the people speak on this matter and settle it once and for all. Take the question out of politics and into the realm of the heart and soul of Canada, where it belongs. When the people of Canada themselves have spoken, I for one will be willing to abide by the decision.

And so I too will be willing to abide by the decision.

Mr. Byrne: When was Bruce West elected?

Mr. Alkenbrack: He continues:

> Make no mistake about it, there are extremely important principles involved in this question. It is not merely a matter of whose piece of bunting has the most eye-appeal. The flag question is symbolic of several more vastly important ones to this country. Among them is this one: Shall we, in common with the eagerly emerging nations, turn in some strange shame from our great heritage and past or shall we use them as a proud and solid foundation upon which to build our future?

Next I have a letter which I think all hon. members received. It is an open letter to the members of the House of Commons and the Senate from the Christian action movement, Manitoba branch. They say:

> Dear Sir:
>
> We are among those many Canadians who fear the implications of the removal of the union jack from our flag. The union jack signifies our continuing association with the commonwealth. Why are Mr. Pearson and his followers bent on removing it? Is it an initial step in severing this connection?

There, Mr. Speaker, is another point I should like hon. members on your right to cogitate. This letter continues:

> We believe that if Canadians understood this to be the case they would be overwhelmingly opposed to the proposed change. Mr. Diefenbaker, who has often been unfairly called an obstructionist, is defending the right of our people to make a choice.

Hon. members will forgive me if I insert the word "very" before the word "right" in the last sentence there, to try to make it

more emphatic, although it is emphatic enough. The letter goes on:

> Mr. Churchill has given an excellent account of the history behind our flag.
>
> The red ensign probably commands a greater following than any other individual flag submitted to the committee. Though, unfortunately, the flag has been made a party issue, many rank and file Liberals prefer to retain the red ensign but out of party loyalty may avoid overt opposition. The flag should not be a party issue, or the subject of a personal battle.

He is not referring to the ensign, but to the flag, whatever it may be, which is finally adopted by this country. The letter then continues:

> The first and second points in our statement of policy are:
>
> 1. Allegiance to the crown and the preservation of Canada as a constitutional monarchy;
>
> 2. The preservation of national sovereignty and the strengthening of the British commonwealth.
>
> We hereby petition you to take a stand in parliament in favour of retaining the red ensign as our flag. We believe this would help restore Canadian unity. The best step, however, would be to drop the issue; or to let the people decide in a plebiscite in the next election.

We believe that such a course would assist in restoring Canadian unity, and I am sure the majority of hon. members in this house also hold that belief.

I have in my hand a communication from the loyal Orange alliance board dated November 30, 1964, which expresses favour for the retention of the red ensign. In part this communication reads as follows:

> We present for your comfort and consideration the following observations, which appear to us to be right and proper: There has been much said on the flag issue and, we have reason to believe, a lot has been left unsaid. Even that which has been said has not been given due and proper examination.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, the action or the lack thereof on the part of hon. members to the right of Mr. Speaker gives a good example of their failure to give this question due and proper examination.

The communication then continues:

> A profound thought is expressed in the book of Proverbs, chapter 18, verse 13, reading:
>
> "He that answereth a matter before he heareth it,—it is a folly and a shame unto him".

This communication concludes by stating:

> We do sincerely hope and pray that the eyes and ears of all members of the House of Commons may be opened so that God's truth may be made known to them and that they may fervently serve us in peace and righteousness.

The division of the house this afternoon an hour or so ago consequent upon the motion of the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Horner) was timely and indicative of the situation as it now exists here today, and makes the position of the government regarding the flag an untenable one. We have indicated in truth and by our vote that we now have a flag which hon. members have indicated they respect, and that indeed nothing further need be said in this regard. In other words, we do not need further debate on this question. However, the government and its supporters, with the exception of the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan), have by their votes indicated that they are of the opinion this debate should be continued. They have indicated their agreement that more should be said regarding the flag.

Again I point out that the government benches are silent, just as they were silent during earlier stages of this debate. Conspicuous by this silence are most of the Liberal members from Ontario who have not only been brainwashed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and René Lévesque, but gagged by the ponderous and divisive machine that the Liberal party has created, which would destroy and take away from English Canada those emblems which have been ours for more than 160 years in this country.

I use that number of years because it was in 1785 that the United Empire Loyalists landed at Adolphustown in the united counties of Lennox and Addington, where I live. That has always been a time measurement factor in that area. Many memorials are in the memorial cemetery there dating back to 1785. This record pertains not only to Adolphustown, but to many areas across the country from Halifax and Saint John, to the St. Lawrence river and along the great lakes, where British institutions and democratic principles first took a foothold, were born and propagated in this country.

I have attempted to put forward these points in favour of the amendment, and in closing I should like to say that I support the amendment and favour a plebiscite because I feel Canadian people should be given the democratic right to make this momentous choice. Once that right has been given to them we can then return to our consideration of more productive business for the betterment of Canada.

Mr. Albert Horner (The Battlefords): May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate and I make no apologies for doing so. A matter that affects every Canadian now and for generations, the making of a change in the flag design, is of the utmost importance. The government has made such a mess of handling this issue that the only way out is to allow the Canadian people to decide at the next election by means of a plebiscite. Why are members opposite so opposed to a plebiscite if they are so sure the maple leaf design will win? The trouble is, Mr. Speaker, they are not sure at all.

Since we have returned to the flag debate my mail has been increasing and all the letters I have received endorse the stand we are taking on having the matter decided by a plebiscite. The polls that have been conducted in the cities indicate that a majority of the people approached were in favour of a plebiscite. If polls were conducted in the rural areas, they would show a large percentage of the people were in favour of a plebiscite. I received one letter from a man—a very honest man—who stated that even though he had not voted for me at the election he was 100 per cent in favour of having the matter decided by a plebiscite. He was solidly behind the stand of this party for having the question of a flag decided in that way.

The question of the flag is one of vital importance, Mr. Speaker, and its importance is based on two main points. First, it is one of the most emotionally charged issues with which the House of Commons has been asked to deal. If it is not properly handled it could seriously jeopardize the dreams of the fathers of confederation. The matter of choosing a flag is not ordinary legislation. The House of Commons is called upon every year to debate the speech from the throne, supply, the budget and so on. Laws are made and modified every day in this house. However, it is only once in a hundred years or so that parliament is called upon to approve a flag which would then be flown for generations to come. A flag is not something we can change in a day because the majority of the members of the House of Commons so desire. Let us remember that once we have a flag it will always be there. It will be there throughout our lives.

There are Canadians in Canada who say that the very nature of the flag issue imposes upon us the task of solving the problem without endangering the unity of Canada in any way. We hear many members opposite say, "Let us vote". I challenge them to let us have a plebiscite. The trouble is that there is a tendency among some Liberals and some newspapermen to dispose of the flag issue by ignoring certain fundamental facts, and thereby deliberately misleading the people of Canada. The first, and most important—

Mr. Choquette: Who wrote that speech?

An hon. Member: Let us hear from you.

Mr. Winkler: Let us hear you make a speech; you have not got the fortitude.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The hon. member is reading his whole speech, which is absolutely out of order. We are thoroughly fed up with things in this house and with members who read speeches written by somebody else.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; the hon. member has no right to suggest that an hon. member's speech has been written by another.

Mr. Winkler: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I say that the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) always interferes in this particular manner, but never wishes to express his own views. We wish that if he had the intestinal fortitude, he would get up and express his views on this subject.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce is out of order to the same extent and in the same way as the hon. member for Lotbinière was.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

The hon. member says that I do not want to get up in order to express my opinion. This is not so, since my views are clear and definite. I am against the plebiscite and against a member reading a speech in the house.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; may I suggest to hon. members that we return to the subject matter of the discussion and allow the hon. member for The Battlefords to continue his remarks?

Mr. Olson: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

Mr. Olson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We know it is contrary to the rules for members of this house to read their speeches. Since it is obvious the hon. member for The Battlefords is reading his speech we should give our permission, take it as read and have it recorded in *Hansard*. Then we could get on with the business of the house.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, that is one of the most shameful allegations that has ever been made in this House of Commons. The hon. member has indicated that the member for The Battlefords—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; the hon. member has suggested, as has been done on many occasions before, that the hon. member is possibly reading his speech and it should therefore be tabled. I think the remark should be taken in the spirit in which it appeared to be made. I urge hon. members to co-operate with the Chair and co-operate also with the hon. member for The Battlefords by giving him a chance to make his speech. The Chair recognizes, and all hon. members know, that hon. members are not to read speeches, although some members take the liberty of referring to extensive and copious notes. Perhaps this is what the hon. member is doing now.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): Thank you, Mr. Speaker; for a few minutes I will stick fairly closely to my notes, and then I am going to put them down. Perhaps hon. members opposite will wish I was still reading.

Mr. Choquette: Who wrote that speech?

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): I have noticed the absence of Mr. Kent from the house, and perhaps that explains why we have not heard any speeches from hon. members opposite. They have no ghost writer. I wrote this speech myself, if that information is of any help to the hon. member who sits there in his seat and chortles at me. The first and most important fact that many people have ignored since the flag debate began is that the Liberal party stands for two flags whereas the Conservative party stands for one flag.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order and I will stand my ground to the end, because it is obvious that we are now victims of a filibuster that downgrades parliament. The hon. member is reading every word of his speech and he does not have the right to do that, because it is against the rules of the house. Therefore, I would ask you to watch him closely and you will notice that he is unable to take his eyes off his text a single second. Since he refuses to comply with the rules, I would ask you to order him to resume his seat.

[*Text*]

Mr. Winkler: If I might speak to that point, I think the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) should read the Prime Minister's code of ethics and maybe he would be a little more gentle in his approach to this matter.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, about the point of order raised by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Winkler). I would like to know who are those gentlemen in the house; are they those who force this degrading filibuster on us or those who wish to encourage progress?

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. The point raised by the hon. member for Lotbinière is to some extent well taken. There are any number of citations to indicate that it is contrary to the rules to read speeches, but on the other hand a certain degree of leniency has been allowed in the course of this debate and I would suggest that that same leniency and generosity be extended to the hon. member for The Battlefords. At the same time I would ask him to try and make the Chair's task a little easier by not following his notes too closely.

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to make your task difficult. At the same time I want to let it be known to the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) that in spite of all his interruptions I will continue to speak. The Liberal party advocates that those who want to show their respect to the commonwealth can fly the union jack—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. May I ask the co-operation of hon. members who seem to be exchanging remarks that are a little strong, across the aisle. I ask the co-operation of all concerned in order to allow the hon. member to continue his speech.

Mr. Winkler: I would ask you, sir, to ask the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) to contain himself.

Mr. McIlraith: And the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Winkler).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for The Battlefords.

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party is in favour of two flags and are against those who want to keep something of their past and who want to fly the union jack. The Liberal party wants to break away from the past—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Would the hon. member kindly resume his seat. The Chair has to voice an objection in connection with the hon. member's speech, not because he is referring to notes but because he is straying some distance away from the subject which we should be discussing, namely the amendment. I would ask him to restrict his remarks to the particular point mentioned in it, the plebiscite.

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): Mr. Speaker, I am leading up to it but I hope I do not have to mention plebiscite in every sentence or every other sentence.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No, but it should be mentioned once.

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I have not been speaking for many minutes and I think I have mentioned it three times already. The word "distinctive" in the Liberal dictionary sometimes means camouflage of our history, our traditions and the flag which has been honoured by our forefathers who founded this nation. National unity in Canada cannot be achieved by diplomatic methods in which Mr. Pearson is the accomplished professional.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. The hon. member must know he cannot refer to another hon. member by his name, particularly in the case of the Prime Minister or the Leader of the Opposition who should be alluded to by their titles or official positions in the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. Could you suggest to the hon. member to take off his glasses for a minute so that we may know to what extent he is reading his speech?

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) on a point of order.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member for The Battlefords (Mr. Horner) would supply Your Honour with a copy of his notes so that you might be able to determine in advance whether any of his speech is in order or not.

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): Mr. Speaker, I think the government of today is acting in exactly the same manner as an ostrich which puts its head in the sand; what it cannot see it simply ignores. We in this party are opposed to two flags. We believe there is one Canada, one nation, and that there should be only one flag. Some of the Liberal members opposite are very pleased with the idea that a few Conservative members did not go along with our party, but soon they will find out how their colleagues will vote on the second resolution.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Even if the Chair wants to be indulgent and co-operative with the hon. member I do not think he can be allowed to discuss the second resolution at this stage of the proceedings.

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the remarks of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard) who conducted a poll to see what his constituents thought about a plebiscite. I think it probably explains the feelings of the people in Quebec far better than do the hon. members opposite who represent people in Quebec. That poll showed that of the letters he received in answer to it some 216 favoured the plebiscite and 155 were against it. I wish hon. members opposite would get up and tell us why they think there should not be a plebiscite.

Mr. Cardiff: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I object to the interruptions which are coming from the other side of the house. That man over there does not know how much he has to know in order to know how little he knows.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): I could not agree more with the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cardiff) in his comments last night. He is one of the senior members of the house. He told us he has been here for 25 years and this was the worst parliament he had ever seen. I am sure there are many people in the house and throughout the country who agree with him.

When I was home a couple of weeks ago I had a talk with some of the people back

there. I talked with one man in particular, an average, good, solid Canadian citizen who asked me, "Have you fellows nothing better to discuss than the flag?" I told him we had, but that it was the government which introduced legislation which we have to pass or oppose. He said, "Well, in that case you fellows are doing the right thing. I think the Prime Minister is a fairly clever man but I think he should know we would like to have a say on what flag we want." I went to a polling and I overheard a man saying to the returning officer: If they would just let us do this on the flag question we could settle it in a day. The deputy returning officer agreed with him, and I could not agree with him more.

I know that members opposite are annoyed because this debate is continuing. That is because it has aroused the people of this country. I should like to hear members opposite speak up. I should like to hear what the hon. members for the city of Halifax have to say about this. I should like to hear from the members who represent Newfoundland. I should like to hear from some of the members from Ontario, from those who represent Toronto ridings in this house. I should like to hear the views of the members who come from British Columbia, especially the opinions of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Groos). There is only one member on that side who has had the courage of his convictions, the courage to stand up and say what he thinks.

An hon. Member: What about Kootenay East?

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): Oh yes, the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne). He feels very badly because he had aspirations to become minister of labour. But since that failed he has taken to reading Beauchesne.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member knows the question before the house and he should relate his remarks to it.

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): That is right, Mr. Speaker, but hon. members opposite are leading me away from it.

About ten days ago the Prime Minister was speaking to a federal convention in Saskatchewan and he told this convention we were going to have a flag. But I do not think he placed a time limit on it this time, October or Christmas. He said the government had prepared legislation dealing with agriculture.

Mr. Winkler: Where is it?

[Mr. Horner (The Battlefords).]

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): He made it known that we in the opposition were the ones who were obstructing this program. But we are interested in seeing this legislation, particularly if it affects eastern agriculture. If members opposite will agree to drop this subject and let us get on with these other important matters no one would be better pleased than ourselves. I know a flag is a symbol, but you cannot eat it and you cannot educate a family on it.

We are being very reasonable in asking for a plebiscite. We heard about a free vote in this house. What a joke. First, the Prime Minister said: We will have a free vote. But I suppose that after hearing the opinions of their supporters they found that the flag proposal was not likely to carry. So they said: You can still have a free vote, but if the government loses there will be an election. With an election gun at their heads, some of the members had to swallow themselves—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Would the hon. member restrict his remarks to the subject under discussion?

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): I am doing my best and I think I will get there but I believe hon. members opposite must be answered.

Other members, I know, have been reading articles in the course of their speeches. Here is one from the Sudbury *Daily Star*. It concerns a plebiscite and it states this under the heading "Fear Plebiscite on Flag?":

> There is a growing suspicion in the minds of Canadians that Prime Minister Pearson and his government supporters are now afraid to submit the "flag issue" to the people as a plebiscite—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I must interrupt the hon. member. Although he is correct in saying that a number of articles and editorials have been read into the record there is a distinction which has to be made somewhere, and I can assure him it is not easy to make that distinction. But the rules clearly prevent the reading of articles or editorials which comment on a debate which is actually going on in the house or which reflects on such a debate. The editorial which the hon. member has begun to read is, surely, in this category because the very first sentence clearly reflects on this particular debate. I think the hon. member would be out of order in reading it.

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): This editorial was printed before the present debate started.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am afraid the learned author Beauchesne in his fourth edition does not make that distinction.

Mr. Pugh: Before you give a final ruling on that point, may I point out that there has been editorial comment here and there throughout Canada on this subject, and many speakers have read editorial comment into the record. I think the important thing to decide is not whether or not this article can be read into the record at the present time or whether it refers to the necessity for a plebiscite. Obviously the first words in this editorial do refer to a plebiscite, and with respect I feel Your Honour should take this article somewhat out of context and say that it is germane at the present time. In other words, if I may put it in another way, if the hon. member wishes to stand on his two feet and say, not for his own constituency but for other constituencies—if he referred to Sudbury—that as a result of reading an editorial he is led to believe that the people in that constituency do desire a plebiscite, he can do so. If Your Honour rules he cannot read the actual editorial, surely he may paraphrase the editorial and put its views before the house.

Mr. McIntosh: Further to the point of order, I would suggest that the word "plebiscite" coming in is incidental. Surely from time to time, ever since the question came up in this house, there has been talk about a plebiscite and it should not be out of order simply because the editorial has the word "plebiscite" in it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member knows that the Chair is concerned with the rights of all hon. members and that in reaching decisions reference has to be made to the authorities, and some guidance obtained from them. If the hon. member would read May, Bourinot or Beauchesne he would know that this question has been dealt with on many occasions. Beauchesne, in citation 157, says it is out of order to read in a debate any extract which reflects on any proceedings before the house. In other words, if an editorial is directed at the very subject matter of a debate in the house, expressing an opinion, perhaps, for or against the way in which a debate is being carried on, it is the suggestion of the authors that this cannot be read because a debate should be the expression of hon. members' own views. I suggest the hon. member should bear this in mind.

I certainly would have no objection if he were to paraphrase the views of other people and make their views his own. But the rule is there, and it has to be respected.

Mr. McIntosh: Could he not agree with this editorial and then go ahead and read it?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That would be against the rules.

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): In short, then, the government fears a plebiscite because when polls were taken in some of the larger cities it was found that the people wanted a plebiscite. They also found that in nine out of the ten provinces of Canada the large majority favoured the red ensign. The only province where the people favoured this other flag with the dead maple leaf on it was Quebec, and even there people were not 100 per cent in favour of it. I cannot understand why this matter has to take up so much of the time of the house—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): It was not even mentioned in the speech from the throne. It was not mentioned in the election campaign in the province of Quebec. Probably the Liberal party was running four different campaigns—one in Quebec, one in the maritimes, one in British Columbia—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: These remarks are not germane to the subject matter of the debate. Perhaps the hon. member will confine his remarks to the motion which was moved earlier.

Mr. Nasserden: With all due deference, Mr. Speaker, I believe they are germane. This is one of the reasons for advocating a plebiscite. It is because of the duplicity of the party opposite in the—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Perhaps the hon. member for Rosthern would allow the hon. member for The Battlefords to make that argument.

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): Mr. Speaker, I implore the Prime Minister of this country to use his good judgment in this connection and let this question be decided by a plebiscite. I ask him to let the people of this country decide. I for one will accept the flag for which the majority of the people of this country vote. I do not like to say too much against the proposed flag design because it might possibly be our flag some day.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Canadian Flag

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): Hon. members opposite applaud; but they are still afraid of the plebiscite. They have tried to ram this thing through parliament, with the worst possible diplomatic sense. I am surprised at our Prime Minister and hope he will retreat in this connection before it is too late.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Bow River.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Fisher: Glad to see you back.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I hope the spirit that is supposed to govern us at this time of the year governs the debate tonight. I noticed that the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher) welcomed me back. I was in that part of the country—may I say this in an introductory way—where there does not seem to be very much support for the New Democratic party. I think they had 3 per cent of the vote in my riding, and I do not believe it is going to increase next time. But I did not intend to get rude or personal. I had hoped that the spirit of the debate would be like the spirit of Christmas; and when I speak of spirit I do not refer to that which perhaps some people indulged in during the supper hour. I have not yet spoken one word in this debate on the flag.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: Somebody says "Oh", but the record will bear me out. I would like to say, let us make certain that we know the issue that is before the house right now. The question before the house is a motion to adopt the committee report and an amendment thereto as to whether we should have a plebiscite. You may rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that the remarks I have scribbled out on paper will be directed to that issue.

I might say that one reason I have not previously made a speech on the flag—and I trust I will receive the attention of the house—is because I am one of those—and perhaps I need some sympathy in this regard from some of my friends from French Quebec; I do not know—who has been steeped in British tradition. My family came to Alberta four generations ago and I was steeped in British tradition. When one is dealing with any kind of tradition, be it French tradition, British tradition, Ukrainian tradition or German tradition, he sometimes tends to speak with a certain degree of prejudice. It is for that reason that up to now I have refrained from making any remarks in this debate.

My first question is this. Why, as a member of the Conservative party, would I not vote tonight for the adoption of the report? I have given this matter serious thought, the people of my constituency of Bow River have given it serious thought and the people of western Canada have given it some serious thought. The reason I cannot, in all fairness with my conscience, vote for the adoption of the report tonight is the fact, and I say this with all seriousness, that if we are changing the flag we now have, surely the people of this country—and I am going to have something to say about that in a few moments—should be able to make known their views in this regard. We know what the Telepolls and the Gallup polls have said; we know that some 50 per cent of the people of this country would like to have a plebiscite. With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I felt it my duty to speak tonight on a matter I have refrained from speaking on previously.

I would remind the house that we have now been sitting for 206 days. I would also remind the house that the debate on the flag last summer lasted only 20 days. There may be a place—and I am one of those who believe this—for a filibuster; but I do not believe that on such an emotional and important question as the flag itself and its symbols, which stand for liberty and freedom as we know it, or our traditions, 20 days of debate and the few days we have taken on this occasion is a real filibuster, when we have sat in parliament for 206 days. A message has been got across to the people of this country, as I found out when I was absent from the house. The hon. member for Port Arthur brought this to my attention. During the time I was absent from the house for a week I made four or five speeches in the province of Alberta and one in another province. We have been told that the people of this country believe this parliament has become a decadent institution because all we have discussed during the 206 days has been the matter of a flag. I felt, after listening to the message of the people, that it is time somebody set the thing in its proper perspective and pointed out that there has been no filibuster on the flag.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: They laugh, Mr. Speaker. One tenth of the time has been spent on this question. Can we call that a filibuster? I say, and I am not ashamed to say it, that there are great issues in this country and when

they arise there is a place for a filibuster. I am not saying this is not the place.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Woolliams: I believe this is relevant, Mr. Speaker, because we have been charged with filibustering. Let us look for just a few moments at some of the things that have happened in the past. I draw this analogy. I recall that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill)—who is not in his place tonight; and I make nothing of that—said on one occasion in the debate on the question of class or kind that if he had to speak for 50 days, that legislation would never pass, and he was prepared to do it.

There are instances where a filibuster is probably necessary. We have heard the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), who tonight is absent and is generally leaning up against the wall making noises, talking about a filibuster and parliament. This makes me sick, because the house will recall that when his party split up like chickens that had left the sitting hen, and spread all over the place, he said they would filibuster parliament for 100 days until they were recognized as a party. These are the people who have been throwing the spearheads and the charges during the last few weeks. I do not know what I will be called after this speech, but I have been called a hawk, a spearhead and even a piledriver; and Mr. "Leakman" —no, I mean the member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) tonight in the *Telegram* accused me of being a Chinook wind.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has no right to refer to this as a leak, because he knows perfectly well that he was struck by the full force of the hose.

Mr. Woolliams: All I have to say to the hon. member is, what a hose. Coming back to the subject of a plebiscite, I would vote for the adoption of the report now, and so would many other western Canadians, if we were sure this was not a foot in the door for other things. I believe this is relevant, Mr. Speaker. We would vote for it if we were sure in western Canada that we were not going to destroy, first of all a strong central government in Canada, that we were not going to destroy next the Governor General, that we were not going to destroy next the crown and many of the other institutions and traditions for which we stand. I say this is relevant because the people of Canada want a plebiscite. I say that the government of this country have no mandate to implement a flag which the Canadian people do not want. That is why the Conservative party, a national party which has governed Canada equally in time with the Liberal party, demand tonight on the floor of this house a plebiscite. The Conservative party were backed by 59 per cent of the people and they are asking for a plebiscite. Since when are 59 per cent of the people to be ignored?

Mr. Winkler: It is 64 per cent.

Mr. Woolliams: Some hon. member says it is 64 per cent. Since when are they to be ignored? So in other words, not only have we a minority government, but a government which is in a minority on this issue as well.

Let me ask this question. I hear some of my hon. friends starting to holler across the way. They swell out their chests like farm roosters and say to themselves: Let the Liberals and Conservatives kill themselves off and everything will be great for us. We have been hearing that for 25 years, but those hon. members are still sitting in their small little groups making small little speeches.

Mr. Dupuis: Would the hon. member accept a question?

Mr. Woolliams: Certainly.

Mr. Dupuis: How does the hon. member know that the government is in a minority unless he permits the house to take a vote?

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I have never seen genius until tonight. I will answer that now. The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), their leader, went across this country talking about a distinctive flag. Did he ever describe to the people of Ontario or to the people of the maritimes that a distinctive flag would require the removal of the union jack?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Woolliams: I say that that is a minority view.

Mr. Dupuis: Do you want me to answer that question?

Mr. Danforth: Sit down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Make your own speech.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Canadian Flag

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams) has the floor.

Mr. Woolliams: I hear the Liberals yelling "Question", and so are those in the splinter parties, because we know they are working together at the present time; but as long as I have a voice in my body I will express the view of the people I represent. If hon. members opposite think that by asking simple, childish questions they are influencing anybody in the press tonight, they are not. As far as I am concerned they can get up and make their own speeches. I know that some of them are frightened to talk about a plebiscite. I know that the members from Ontario and the maritimes are more frightened of this issue than any which have faced this country for a long time. But it will never be said of this side of the house that the Conservatives do not fight. I am ready to fight as far as this issue is concerned, and I will not be silenced.

My hon. friend asked me a question and I shall ask him a question and answer it in my own way.

Mr. Dupuis: I can answer it too.

Mr. Woolliams: You can make your own speech later and I shall be most interested to hear it. My question is this: Will the vote of parliament speak for the people? My answer is simple. I say tonight that if I sat down and no other member spoke on this issue, whatever the result in this parliament the people of Canada have not spoken. Because of the discipline in their party and the discipline of their whip to get them to vote in a certain way, hon. members opposite are voting against their own constituents in order to keep the Liberal party together.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member should address the Chair.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, because I turn away for a moment to speak to my hon. friends does not mean I have forgotten that you are there, believe me. Let me ask this question again: Will the vote of parliament speak for the people? I say no. There are many Canadians today who want to retain the red ensign.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. On different occasions I have watched the Red Skelton show. Tonight I am seeing the best performance he has ever done.

[Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria).]

Mr. Woolliams: Let me say this. I would rather have the dignity of Red Skelton than the hoodlumism of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette). I have watched him in his seat in this House of Commons and I say he does not do his constituents justice. He is neither dignified nor judicious in his remarks.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) raised a question of privilege which was obviously unacceptable to the Chair. I suggest to the hon. member that he should not retaliate.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that one should probably turn the other cheek but when an hon. member in the house will not stand to sing "God Save the Queen" I say he is not judicious and that he is not dignified.

Mr. Winkler: He is not a Canadian.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I feel I am justified in rising on a question of privilege.

I was just joking earlier and making fun of the hon. member who was ridiculous. Everybody thought he was ridiculous and was laughing at him.

Now, he has just made a rather unpleasant and spiteful remark. He said that I did not have the courage to rise when the "God Save the Queen" was sung. I think he is referring to the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Plourde) who remained seated when the "God Save the Queen" was sung.

Mr. Speaker, when any national anthem is sung, one must be courteous enough to rise. This is what I would have done had I been here on that occasion, even though I hope "O Canada" will officially become our national anthem.

Mr. Plourde: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order—

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Plourde) kindly resume his seat. The hon. member has raised another question of privilege which is perhaps a little more justifiable than his first one. Although I do not think there is a real question of privilege involved perhaps the hon. member was justified to make the correction he did to the assertion made by the hon. member for Bow River. But it seems to me that we are not

going in the right direction when we allow these questions of privilege and points of order to interrupt the hon. member who now has the floor; and I would ask the hon. member for Bow River to limit his remarks to the matter which is specifically before us at this time.

Mr. Woolliams: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Now that the hon. member has had a chance to satisfy his conscience perhaps we can remain at ten o'clock and hear him sing "God Save the Queen" in this house to justify himself.

Now I ask the question: Where did the Prime Minister at any time during the last election define what he meant by distinctive?

Mr. Dupuis: Do you want an answer?

Mr. Woolliams: You listen and you will get one. I ask this question in all seriousness. It is very easy to use the word distinctive. If you use the expression "a distinctive Canadian flag" in Alberta it means one thing. But if you use the word distinctive in the province of Quebec it may mean another thing. Both places have a right to draw their inference in that regard. But when one is electioneering and says: "I promise to bring in a distinctive flag", then I think he owes the public a duty; and particularly when one is leader of a party he must assume responsibility and spell out what is meant by distinctive.

Therein lies the whole problem, Mr. Speaker. If this meaning had been spelled out, perhaps tonight members like me would not be so serious in asking for a plebiscite on this matter. We believe we should have a plebiscite on the matter because this meaning has not been spelled out. I am quite confident that the people in Toronto believed that when the Prime Minister referred to a distinctive flag he meant something of meaning to Canadians, that the symbol to be used was perhaps the fleur-de-lis or the union jack, but certainly something held dear to the hearts of Canadians and has stood for freedom and liberty, as well as Canadian traditions, as we know them. As long as we allow someone to suggest that that which is believed in by one province is the same thing believed in by every other province, we are failing and misleading the public. In this regard the government has no mandate whatsoever.

Other great leaders, most of them Liberals, have spelled out quite adequately what they meant. Right Hon. Mackenzie King, and Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent, both Liberal prime ministers, never envisaged a flag for Canada without also envisaging the inclusion of symbols which led one to believe that we are part of French and British background. Further than that, the majority of Canadians have in their hearts a feeling of brotherhood and friendship for every race. On other occasions in this house I have said that many Canadians originated in Europe and other countries of the world, but came to Canada leaving their prejudices and hatreds in the countries they left. Whether they were Germans who hated the French, French who hated the British, or vice-versa, they came to Canada as a new land and were able to be friends over the back fence with their neighbours, regardless of their ethnic origin.

Many communities in western Canada are made up of Canadians of ethnic origins other than British and French, yet they have the right to speak in reference to the flag of Canada, just as do the French and the English Canadians. I have never been more serious in my life than I am now in suggesting that all Canadians at this time have a right to a voice through a plebiscite. At the risk of repeating something which has been said often during the last several days, I do not believe the government has a mandate in this regard, and should not force a flag, chosen by some means other than by the majority voice of Canadians, down the throats of Canadian citizens.

If the majority of Canadian people through a plebiscite choose the flag which was approved by the flag committee, I shall stand with as much dignity as any other Canadian when that flag is unfurled as the Canadian flag, as I would when any other flag was unfurled, including that flag which has been ours since confederation. However, because of the multiplicity of the effort now being made in respect of a distinctive Canadian flag, members of parliament do not have a mandate to vote here as they might feel they should, or vote because of political expediency, but must speak on behalf of the people they represent.

In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I feel sympathetic toward the people of French Canadian origin, and I must say they appear to have unanimity in what they do. However, I should like to ask them in all sincerity to remember that we can only build a united country by co-operation and unanimity. We can never thrust down each other's throat those things which are unacceptable. We

must exercise tolerance and co-operation toward each other in our differences of opinion in order to unite this country and build a great nation, and we must perform those exercises of co-operation and tolerance in the selection of a flag of which we can all be proud.

Some hon. members will no doubt suggest that already a committee has studied this question and come to decision. That is not quite a completely true statement. I have before me three different flag designs. While I realize I am not permitted by the rules to display these designs in the house, I should like at this time to describe them. One design has a maple leaf with a red band on one side to the left with a union jack, and a red band to the right with a fleur-de-lis. I understand that design was turned down by the committee.

We have another design which embodies three maple leaves with a blue band to the left and right. When the committee voted on this design they decided, rather than turn it down, to retain it until they had made a choice between that design and the design embodying one maple leaf with a red band on the left and on the right. Finally the committee had to make a choice, and this choice was forced by a squeeze play. I do not intend to suggest any motives behind this situation but I do believe that the people in this country question seriously the motives behind this forced choice. In any event, the committee report refers to a design with one maple leaf with a red band to its left and right, as the committee's choice for a distinctive Canadian national flag. That is a false, wrong and completely incorrect statement of what occurred. The committee stated that it preferred that flag to the Pearson pennant which embodied the three maple leaves and the two blue band design. The committee did nothing more than choose the design now before us in favour of the Pearson suggestion.

The people are confused as to what decision the committee made and, if they are confused in that regard, surely they are confused as to any design selected by this parliament. Therefore, they are entitled to express their opinions through a plebiscite. One might ask what problem the committee did solve, and whether it was unanimous in its solution. Had the committee decided that the flag now before this house was the flag for Canada, over all designs submitted to it, that would be a different proposition and we would be out of order now in continuing this debate. That, however, is not the situation.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Let us be frank in our assessment of the decision made by the flag committee. When we were in government there were more Conservative members on committees than Liberal members, C.C.F. members, New Democratic members or Social Credit members. Of course, it is only in the last few years that there have been Social Credit members in this house at all, but that is neither here nor there. Committees are set up with the majority of members being members of the government party. That same situation prevailed in respect of this flag committee set up by this Liberal government. That committee decide by a majority vote exactly what the government intended. They really did not solve the problem with which they were faced.

I realize that some hon. members will say that we on this side asked that a committee be set up, but in answer to that suggestion I say that as long as a committee works in the way that committee did, while it performs a function, it is not performing the kind of function that was expected or asked for. The function we expected that committee to perform is not reflected in its report, which in effect states that the committee rubber-stamped a certain flag design. I am certain that no flag design was even considered until it had been approved, and I suggest that is the fact.

Most Canadians are thinking today of what Liberal spokesmen have said in the past in relation to their right to express an opinion in regard to something of this importance. In this regard I should like to quote—not from an editorial—what Jack Doupe said about this subject. What he has to say is an historical fact and I am sure it will not be disputed by any member. Mr. Doupe said:

> More typically Canadian, and more effective, than these private bills is the sort of event—of which there must have been countless others—that J. W. Pickersgill reports from the 1943 Quebec wartime conference in his account of the Mackenzie King papers:
>
> "Later that same afternoon, while walking in the Citadel grounds with one of his secretaries, Mackenzie King (Pickersgill quotes) 'saw the Canadian flag and the union jack flying side by side in the grounds.' "

This is what happened, and this is the opinion expressed apparently by the Minister of Transport, Mr. Pickersgill, who said he had arranged this the day before. He is supposed to have said:

> "I had been put out when I saw the union jack and Canadian flags flying one beneath the other—the Canadian flag beneath the union jack, the day that Churchill arrived." He had subsequently

spoken to Churchill about flying the three flags side by side and had then given directions that this should be done. "I can now say," he wrote, "that this was done with agreement between the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and the Prime Minister of Canada." He added that both of them agreed that "the Canadian flag should come in the centre".

On that occasion he approved the flag which was approved by order in council. I say that Canadians are entitled to express their viewpoint. When the leader of the Liberals went out electioneering in Ontario he described a distinctive flag, and he described the kind of flag that would contain some of the elements of the Canadian ensign, particularly the union jack. I am sure that to be fair with the French Canadians, and I want to be fair, when he spoke about a distinctive flag in Quebec he left the impression that the union jack would be off that flag. I say that is the kind of impression, that is the kind of attitude which disunites this country and does not unify us.

I suppose we always quote from those people in other parties whom we respect. What about Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent, what did he say? This is what he said when dealing with this subject. He had great influence in Canada and I am sure no one would deny that fact in this house, particularly those who come from Quebec. He was steeped in French culture, understood their problems and understood the province and its relation to the rest of the country. I do not know of any leader in my time who had more respect from the country. This is what he said and these words are as true tonight as they were then when he uttered them.

We hear the uproar when one of us raises his voice with regard to our flag. There is no unity in this parliament on this subject. There is a sham unity in the Liberal party. I say this, if you fellows would get up and speak your mind, you might possibly say something about what goes on in your caucus. This is what right hon. Mr. St. Laurent, a former prime minister said, that as long as a new flag divided Canadians rather than uniting them there should be no change in the flag. I endorse that stand tonight. I would say that 70 per cent of the people in the riding of Bow River and the people of western Canada endorse that stand. I think they are entitled to express their views by means of a plebiscite.

Mr. Choquette: When did he say that?

Mr. Woolliams: My friend does not know when he said anything because all he does is mumble from his seat. He never makes a speech in this house that is worth while, and I am tired of that kind of hoodlumism.

I say that this matter should be put to a vote for another reason. Many of us in parliament are more serious than we have ever been before with regard to national unity and confederation. People in western Canada were asleep on this subject, and perhaps in other parts of Canada as well. They are awake today, and they are worried. I say that the responsibility for the delay in this House of Commons rests with the Liberal government because they are the ones who brought in this problem at a time when there is sensitivity about confederation, when every Canadian—French Canadian, English Canadian and every other Canadian—wanted to unify this country, to keep this country together as it was created in 1867. We realize that French Canada and English Canada were one at the time of confederation and then they brought in one province from the maritimes. Canada then grew to ten provinces. We are only going to keep confederation healthy when we take the kind of responsible action that does not erode confederation, particularly at a time when there appears to be some sensitivity about it. This sensitivity has been aggravated because of the political expediency of those people who would like to put in their pocket one group of votes.

I ask this question: How much can the bosom of a nation stand? This is not unifying this country. How much can we stand at this time?

An hon. Member: Carried.

Mr. Woolliams: Let me just have one word about the committee itself. My friend has said "Carried" again. Again, I say to him that is the kind of nonsense we hear. This is the place where free speech is made possible. When we cease to have free speech—

Mr. McIlraith: Let us have a vote.

Mr. Woolliams: I know the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. McIlraith) will be fair. He knows that when he sat in opposition they debated issues on many occasions to the extent that there appeared to be a filibuster.

Mr. McIlraith: We always let them come to a vote.

Mr. Woolliams: I think he stood on his rights and had a sense of responsibility, and I suggest to him that I stand on my rights tonight with that same sense of responsibility.

Mr. McIlraith: Will the hon. member permit a question? Will he not agree that other

members in parliament have a right, after a full debate, to have the question put to a vote?

Mr. Woolliams: My answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is very simple. I am glad my good friend asked that question. If I thought tonight that the members who sit on the Liberal side of this house spoke for the people of Canada, we should have a vote now. However, they do not speak for the people of Canada. The hon. member for Ottawa West knows as well as I do that when the Prime Minister spoke of a free vote, he put a gun right at their ears. He said look, if you have a free vote we will shoot your brains out because we will have an election. Is that the kind of mandate the Liberals got from the people? I say to him that is not the kind of responsibility which I know the member for Ottawa West believes we should have so far as members of parliament are concerned. I believe that question was only asked to try to put me off the rail.

I have one more point to make. Why do I say the report of the committee should be examined? I say this in all sincerity and with all the good will that can be mustered in this House of Commons; there was a committee set up and that committee was supposed to be working either in camera or in confidence. There are two kinds of committees. If a committee sits in camera, anything that goes on in that committee must not be told while the committee is sitting. Then there is the kind of committee that is confidential. Anything that goes on in that committee cannot be disclosed. One member of the Liberal party gave an article to a newspaper in this country and leaked all the information from this committee. I am not so sure it was not done deliberately, because I am not so sure this member may not have been dancing to the tune of others. I say this to you, if he knew his responsibilities, having leaked information from a committee sitting in camera or a confidential committee, he should stand in his place tonight and resign. He thought I had forgotten this issue, but that is what he should do.

Some hon. Members: Resign, resign.

Mr. Deachman: I rise on a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. On the morning of October 30, which was a Friday morning, I came into this house and at the opening of business I asked if the house wished to send me to the committee on privileges and elections. It was pointed out specifically to the house that if any member had a charge to lay at that time that member should lay a charge. I watched while the hon. member sat in his

seat, just as he is sitting now, with a handful of charges in his hand, ready to rise. However, for some reason or other he could not do so. His pants were nailed to his seat. The opportunity was given to him, but he did not rise, he did not squeak—

Mr. Woolliams: I may squeak but I do not leak.

Mr. Deachman: I am not finished with my point of order and I have the floor.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I do not think this is a question of privilege at all and I do not intend to yield the floor.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. This is one battle that the Speaker is bound to win. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) is entitled to make a statement. He has made a statement and I think we have all heard it. I would hope, in view of the fact that the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams) has only three or four minutes remaining, he would use them very usefully.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any three or four minutes in the past I have used so usefully because I say this man usurped his responsibility. That is my answer in that regard.

Mr. Deachman: On a question of personal privilege—

Mr. Speaker: There is one way to settle the dispute. If any member wishes to charge another and he is quite serious about it, let him move a motion.

Mr. Woolliams: Well, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect to you, if we were to move motions every time we wished to criticize the actions of hon. members opposite we would have nothing but motions in the house. But I would say in this matter that his own secretary was typing that very article days before it was published.

Mr. Deachman: With respect, Mr. Speaker, this matter was ruled upon by Your Honour. Your Honour will no doubt recall that the hon. gentleman had ample time on that occasion to rise and make his speech—

Mr. Speaker: Order. This line of talk is getting nobody anywhere and I have pointed out the proper procedure to follow. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra has made his statement and I think the hon. member for Bow River is entitled to four minutes extra, if he desires them, on account of the interruptions.

Mr. Woolliams: I must confess, Mr. Speaker, you are always more gracious than I appear to be, and I appreciate your courtesy in this regard. In summary I would say there was never a true mandate given so far as the flag is concerned, and the Canadian people are entitled to a plebiscite. When we hear it said, "Let parliament speak" I am afraid of that because it will speak for only a minority of the people, not because this is a minority government but because hon. members opposite will be speaking for a minority of people in their ridings.

I would ask hon. members to give this serious thought because the Conservative party can only fight this so long. The red ensign may come down on every flagpole in Canada. I would like to be standing in some of the ridings with certain hon. members when that happens. Now I want to end with a little poem.

Mr. Knowles: Author?

Mr. Woolliams: The author is Eldon Woolliams. It is only four lines but I wrote it in all seriousness:

God and the soldier all men adore
In time of trouble—and no more,
For when war is over, and all things righted,
God is neglected—and the old soldier slighted.

Remember that under our flag the liberty and freedom of this country were fought for and maintained by men who gave their lives, and by some who are still with us today and who gave their health.

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I want to make a small contribution to the debate. I have been somewhat confused by the use which the official opposition makes of the results of Telepoll in connection with the idea of having a plebiscite. I am rather bothered by it because it was only a week or two ago that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill), their house leader, was raising questions with regard to this particular program and the questions that it asked.

It is quite true that a week ago Sunday this program reported that it had asked some 1,100 people in major cities across the country whether they would like to have a chance to vote on the flag, in other words a plebiscite, and a majority said they would.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fisher: I am very pleased hon. members have that much confidence in Telepoll and its surveys, because I do not have that much. Hon. members may wonder why. Just a week before that Telepoll conducted a survey in which it reviewed parliamentary troubles and the fact that we seem to be having difficulties with parliament. It gave the case for Mr. Pearson and the case for Mr. Diefenbaker and then asked this question, "Whose side are you on, Mr. Pearson's or Mr. Diefenbaker's?" Hon. members on the Conservative side should remember that the results were much stronger for Mr. Pearson than they were for Mr. Diefenbaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fisher: I suggest that the great faith they put in Telepoll indications in favour of a plebiscite should be immensely weakened, unless they are prepared to accept the result of the poll of the previous week which indicated that the Canadian people are overwhelmingly on the side of the Prime Minister and are overwhelmingly against the Leader of the Opposition in so far as their attitude to parliament is concerned. I just felt I should draw this to the attention of hon. members, since so many of them have used this argument in favour of a plebiscite.

The other point I want to talk about is that a number of hon. gentlemen have tended to speak as veterans and legionnaires and the last hon. gentleman who spoke suggested that by voting for a new flag and having the red ensign come down we would in a sense be doing a disservice and acting disgracefully to the memory of legionnaires and veterans. I do not think that those of us who want a new flag should stand up and pound our chests about the fact that we served during the war, but I would like to tell members of the official opposition that a great many people who belong to the Canadian Legion do not accept the Legion's stand for the red ensign. I am one of them. I can tell hon. members of one Legion post in my riding which has 127 members. The secretary tried to get up a petition to support the Legion's stand on the red ensign but he could only get 26 signatures out of a membership of 127.

I want to make it very clear to members of the official opposition that I think they are being extremely unfair in wrapping themselves in a patriotic and chauvinistic sort of label in this whole question about the flag. We happen to feel, whether we are veterans or not, that we owe no apology to anyone in suggesting a new flag.

I want to touch on another point made by the official opposition which says that in

rejecting the red ensign we would somehow be rejecting Christianity. Our friends to the south happen to feel they have a Christian country but I do not think they are going to suggest that the stars and stripes are Christian symbols. I have always felt that stars were the symbol of communist Russia or Mohammedans. If you look at all the national flags in the world, it is remarkable how few Christian countries, or countries which claim to be Christian, have Christian symbols on their flags. I think it is an extremely retrograde argument to suggest that those of us who are in favour of a new flag are willing to turn our backs on our whole Christian heritage.

I should like to suggest that speakers for the opposition have made their point and presented their arguments time and time again. After 29 days, do they not feel they should let us have our chance to vote on this question? We have sat here patiently, the majority of us, listening to them. Now give us an opportunity to vote on the question before the house. If they want to make this stand, they can do so. The previous speaker was proud to point out that he was a member of a major party. Well, I say this to hon. members to my right: You are a major party; this is a decision to be made by parliament; go to the people at the next election on the flag issue; say "If we are elected we shall bring back the red ensign". You can do that. You are a major party. You have a great leader.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fisher: An election will come sooner or later and that is your opportunity. You may come back here with a majority and bring the red ensign back and throw out this un-Christian thing the rest of us want. I suggest you consider that, instead of holding up the majority of the members of this house and so many members of your own party who would like to get on with other things.

Mr. Churchill: Would the hon. member accept a question? I should like to ask him which flag he was willing to accept six months ago?

Mr. Fisher: The flag which was the choice of either the government or the committee which considered it.

Mr. Churchill: There was no parliamentary committee six months ago.

Mr. Fisher: I know, but there was a government which undertook to bring in a distinctive national flag. They brought one in and I would have been in favour of it.

Mr. Churchill: I take it then that the hon. member is prepared to accept any flag which the present government may bring in?

Mr. Fisher: Yes, I am quite prepared to accept any flag which the present government brings in, because the present government has the responsibility; and our responsibility is to vote on their proposal, not to delay endlessly and forever.

Mr. Webb: I should like to ask the hon. member a question. Would he tell the house which flag the Royal Canadian Legion has accepted as its flag?

Mr. Fisher: My understanding is that the Royal Canadian Legion wants the red ensign as the Canadian flag. If the hon. member is referring to the allusion I made to a particular branch of the Legion, the executive of this branch thought it would reinforce the dominion command by getting a petition from all its members. And all it could get was 26 out of 127.

Mr. Webb: I was speaking of the Legion as a whole.

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): After listening to two of the more leather lunged members of the House of Commons I am sure you will think, Mr. Speaker, that anything I have to say is like the calm after the storm.

One of the reasons I am speaking on this question tonight is that I wish to comment on a statement made by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher) when he told us he was willing to accept any flag which the government might introduce. My contention is that this government has no mandate to bring in a flag for Canada, neither has this parliament. I agree the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) promised a new flag for the Canadian people, provided he was elected as head of the government party. It may be this was one of the reasons he was denied the majority he had sought in the last election. However, neither in his talks to the electorate nor in other public statements did he say he intended to remove completely the symbols of our heritage from the flag, or cut out all vestige of our founding races. I do not believe the government is capable of deciding on a flag which will represent this nation until the end of time.

I should like to read from Quebec *L'Action*. This is what it had to say about the government's action in this regard:

The confusion of our era, the complexity of situations and the flood of problems require strong governments everywhere. The confusion of the ordinary citizen can only be handled by governments that know where they are going. For months and months, Canada has had the weakest government since confederation.

There is a great deal more along these lines but I wish to confine myself to the subject before us, so I shall not quote further. The actions of the government so far bear out what this article says. First, the party opposite put forward a flag consisting of three leaves on a white background. Eventually they dropped this because it did not have the support of one of the larger minor parties. This was the flag to end all flags. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) who was one of the designers, I understand, got up and told us what a wonderful flag it was. Now he is just as sure that the white flag with the red borders and the maple leaf in the centre is the flag which will fill the bill. So I do not think there is any doubt the government is incapable of presenting a new flag which will represent this nation.

As a matter of fact, government supporters, and particularly members of the government on the front benches, have never given any satisfactory reason for the adoption of a new flag in the first place. In this regard, the Toronto *Telegram* had this to say:

The Canadian ensign must not be lowered without the consent of the people. The voice of the people can be heard on this issue only through a national plebiscite. Here is a matter which touches the hearts—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member. Perhaps I should have brought this to the attention of one or two of the previous speakers. The hon. member will understand there is nothing personal involved, but it is my duty to call the attention of the house to citation 157 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, subsection (6). Perhaps I should read this.

On the 17th March, 1933, a member quoting a newspaper in debate was ruled out of order by the Deputy Speaker who said: "The rule is quite clear, that the quoting of a newspaper, an author or a book which reflects upon debate before the house, either directly or indirectly is entirely out of order, because members are here to give their own opinion and not to quote the opinion of others. . . .Members may quote an article or a book stating facts, but a commentary on any proceeding or any discussion in the house, with the object of swinging an opinion to one side or the other, is out of order."

In view of what is said in this citation and in several others which could easily be quoted, I conclude it is not in order to quote editorials or articles which would tend to influence a debate one way or the other. Hon. members are called upon to give their own opinions.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. There were only a couple of lines left.

The fact of the matter is that this is far too important a matter to be settled by parliamentary compromise. There might be some sense in having parliament settle the question if there were a possibility of compromise, but this house has shown it is not prepared to compromise in order to settle this matter. No compromise can be reached because the government refuses to make concessions. Compromise means meeting half way or coming to terms by giving up part of a claim. But there is nothing to show that the government was even prepared to give a little, in connection with the stand of the official opposition, in order to reach a compromise on this question. I refer to the situation in the house and in the committee; they were not prepared to compromise. On the other hand, I have not yet heard a supporter of the present proud flag who was not prepared to accept some compromise on it. The only way you can reach a compromise is to have co-operation on both sides, and if one refuses to compromise then compromise is impossible. This, Mr. Speaker, is the situation in this parliament.

The flag was considered by the committee. That committee was chaired by the hon. member for Humber-St. George's (Mr. Batten), a man for whom all members of the house have a great deal of respect, and I share that respect. I wish I could say the same in regard to some of his colleagues on that committee, but unfortunately I cannot do so. I cannot do so because the committee report showed that there was no attempt on the part of the government members on that committee to compromise, to meet half way the views of those representing the official opposition. I would point out to you, sir, that the official opposition, as of the last election, represents 2½ million Canadian people. Are we going to deny the right of 2½ million people to have some say in what is going to be on their flag? I leave that for individual members to think about for themselves.

There were several reasons, of course, why the committee failed. I believe one of the reasons was that it came too late, after positions had hardened in the house. We had asked for a committee at the beginning and I believe that had this been brought about

before all the parties had hardened in their positions we could possibly—and just possibly—have come up with a compromise flag that would have satisfied all Canada. But there were other considerations in the committee. The committee studied over 2,000 new designs. They were given a deadline by the Prime Minister; they were pressed for time. Any hon. member who has sat on a committee faced with a great volume of work coming across the committee desks knows that you cannot do a proper job if you are pressed to get it done by a certain time. I think that had the committee, even this committee, had time to sit until, say, next spring they could even at this late date have brought in some kind of a flag that may have been acceptable.

This brings to mind the question, why this unseemly rush to foist a new flag on the nation? Why is it given the highest priority in government business at this particular time? This is something members of the official opposition just cannot understand, particularly when we should be concentrating on measures to assist our national well-being rather than debating issues that are going to divide our nation. If the Prime Minister had been well advised I think he would have followed the example of another illustrious Liberal prime minister, William Lyon Mackenzie King. Mr. King carefully avoided any attempt to foist a flag on a country that is initially divided not only racially but linguistically and culturally. Mr. King declined to have debate on this sort of issue because he knew how divisive it would be. He knew that bringing such a matter before parliament could only divide the nation. There was another Liberal prime minister who had sense enough not to bring a new flag design into the House of Commons, whether it was going to be decided by a plebiscite or not. He was smart enough to know that if he brought this divisive problem into the House of Commons it would do the nation no good. Unfortunately the present Prime Minister has ignored these gentlemen who so ably led his party for so many years. This is the tragedy of the present Prime Minister.

We hear from government members, particularly members of the cabinet, when they are touring the country that the official opposition are obstructing the work of parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): I get some agreement from over there, Mr. Speaker, which indicates that they have all been deluded into thinking that we are obstructing the country's business. But let me point out to hon. members something they should know already, namely that the government decides the priority of business for parliament.

Mr. Winkler: They are supposed to.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): They initiated this issue of the flag and introduced the debate at this time, in spite of the fact that they had no mandate to do so.

Mr. Winkler: At the expense of the poor eastern farmers, as well.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): They did it at the expense of getting something done for the poor eastern farmers; and that includes the constituency of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) who represents, I understand, a number of those Quebec farmers who would like to have federal assistance.

Mr. Winkler: Where is the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays)?

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): In their stubborn insistence, government members want the flag resolution adopted even before they find out whether the majority of Canadians want a new flag. They want this flag for Christmas. I think it would help the country a great deal if somebody whipped up one of these new flags, hung it on the Christmas tree for the Prime Minister and let him have it for Christmas.

Mr. Winkler: Hang the whole government as well.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): But let us not have people running around this country telling other people that we are obstructing the work of parliament, when the man who can take off the flag priority and bring in legislation for the good of this country is the Prime Minister, who should be sitting over in his seat right now and is not there. I am referring to the leader of the Liberal party.

The government says the flag is more important than the labour code.

Mr. Winkler: No respect for Canada.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): That it is more important than the new pension scheme.

Mr. Winkler: No respect for the old people.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): That it is more important than legislation to help the farmers.

Mr. Winkler: No respect for the farmers; that is true.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): No respect for anyone. Actually there is a growing suspicion, not only in this house but across the country—

Mr. Moreau: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): —that the government is mortally afraid of a referendum on the flag issue. I will let the hon. member speak later; he can make a half hour speech. There is a growing suspicion as I say, particularly in view of the recent poll, that the government is much afraid of a referendum on the flag issue because it knows that a great many people would vote to retain our flag in its present form, or at least some modified version of it. The government is afraid, because it has ignored the Canadian way of settling differences. Because we are of different races does not mean we are a melting pot in the sense that we consider our American cousins are. We must settle our differences by compromise because we have to live together and respect each other's wishes. But the government wants to present the Canadian people with an accomplished fact. The government hopes that by giving the Canadian people an accomplished fact now it will be forgotten when the next election is held. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it is underestimating the great regard in which this flag is held in the hearts of millions of our people.

Mr. Winkler: History will prove that.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): On an earlier occasion when speaking on this issue I asked the Prime Minister to give consideration to withdrawing the resolution until such time as the people of Canada could voice their opinion on the flag issue. I think it is only fair to ask the same question again. Let us bend all our efforts to bring unity to our country before the one hundredth anniversary of its confederation, and having achieved that unity we will have something to symbolize. Perhaps on that momentous occasion we will be able to raise a new Canadian flag brought about by compromise, and the wisdom of the people of our nation.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I must say I have no apologies for entering the debate at this time. The Conservative party represents at least one third of the voters of Canada, as at the last election. There has been no disposition on the part of the government to take into consideration the views of this large segment of the Canadian people. No compromise has been offered. In fact a compromise of the views represented in parliament has been rejected both in the house and in the committee. We in the official opposition feel that it is in direct contradiction to our national concept of democratic rights. Completely ignoring the views of any minority is repugnant to us. To ignore the views of a large segment of our population on a matter as important as the flag is nothing less than scandalous. Once again I ask the Prime Minister to withdraw his flag resolution, in the interests of national unity, until the people of Canada have indicated their wishes in this matter.

Hon. George C. Nowlan (Digby-Annapolis-Kings): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the raucous applause which greets me from the other side of the house and which pays tribute to me. This is only the second time I have risen in a good many months during which the flag debate has been before the committee and the house. Therefore I think I have some reason for speaking on the matter at this time. There are many aspects of the flag question on which I should like to speak, and I think I can speak with some force and perhaps spirit. But having read your rulings, Mr. Speaker, and knowing that we have an amendment before the house which calls for a plebiscite, so far as it lies within one Irishman to follow the rules of relevancy strictly and to deal strictly with the legality of this amendment I intend to speak only about the plebiscite, which I am sure will be a relief to you, sir, and possibly to others as well.

The first suggestion I would make in the few minutes remaining to me tonight is this. If the government or if parliament had decided to hold a plebiscite, the debate which has been going on for a long while now would have been relatively short. Much as many of us may disapprove of the design of the flag, much as many of us, and I particularly, disapprove of any change to a flag which has been recognized as the flag of this country for many years, we would have been prepared to accept the judgment of the Canadian people had the matter been submitted to them, and had there been an affirmative vote one way or the other as to the design of a flag. That of course has not been permitted, which is one of the main grievances of the official opposition, and I think one of the main grievances of the Canadian people. They are disturbed over the way this matter has been dealt with. If the people had been given the chance to speak and the matter had been referred to the Canadian public and a verdict

arrived at, we would not be sitting here tonight debating the flag. Reluctant as some of us may have been to accept that decision, we would have accepted the decision of the majority of the Canadian people.

We are now charged with delay, with filibustering, and so on and so forth. There are two answers regarding whether there has been delay; and undoubtedly there has been a protracted debate. The first answer, which was referred to by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat and I am sure it has also been mentioned many times—one cannot help speaking in this debate without referring to the arguments advanced by other speakers—is that this is an emotional matter, as everyone in this house realizes, and because of the feelings of one's own constituents one has to speak and express one's views.

But this flag issue should never have been brought into parliament at this time. There is no reason in the world why, in the middle of a legislative program which had been outlined to us, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) should throw in this flag issue, just as though he had thrown the overalls into Mrs. Murphy's chowder—and it has created almost as bad a smell. That is one reason for this protracted debate at this time.

Having brought in this issue, disrupted parliament without any authority or mandate and, I say kindly, without any judgment, we have had this issue thrown at us by this government; yet when we ask that the Canadian people be given a chance to express an opinion, we are denied that request, at least up to now. I would judge from the way in which hon. members opposite treat this amendment, that it is their intention to vote it down, so that we will have no plebiscite granted to the Canadian people on this matter.

Those are two reasons for this long debate and delay. If this plebiscite had been accepted I am sure the prolonged debate would not have taken place, but that the issue could have been decided within a few days rather than in as many weeks. Under those circumstances the responsibility for any delay which may have occurred rests squarely on the shoulders of members opposite, and particularly on the shoulders of the right hon. Prime Minister, who has projected this flag debate at this time, disrupting the whole procedure of Canadian parliament. This is a highly emotional issue which has disrupted the nation and created difficulty for each and every one of us in our constituencies and in our own hearts and minds. We have been asked to deal with this issue in short order and produce a flag by Christmas. The people of Canada do not appreciate having a flag rammed down their throats in the way in which this matter has been handled.

We have been given reasons why a plebiscite cannot be held. We have been told that in the first place a plebiscite is contrary to Canadian practice and procedure. Some of us here, and certainly one or two members opposite, yesterday took part in the Ottawa civic elections as ratepayers and voters. What did we vote for at that time? We voted for individuals, and also as to whether there should be fluoridation. Surely that was a referendum, and is a referendum not a form of a plebiscite? We also voted as to whether or not there should be Sunday sports. Was that not a plebiscite? We are told that a plebiscite is contrary to Canadian practice. That is nonsense, when right here in this city gentlemen on that side as well as on this side took part in a referendum or plebiscite—call it what you will. There is no basis for the suggestion that a plebiscite is contrary to Canadian practice.

We are told that we cannot depart from accepted practice; but what is this government doing? It is departing from accepted practice in every piece of legislation it proposes. What is co-operative federalism except departure from an accepted practice? What about the various other matters which have been brought before this house? Certainly to some extent they have been departures from ordinary practice. Surely pension bill No. 1, No. 2, No. 3 and, I suppose, No. 4, if that is a matter still on the back burner, are departures from the accepted practice of this parliament. I suggest there is absolutely no justification for the argument that we cannot hold a plebiscite because it is contrary to the ordinary and conventional practice of this country.

We have also been told that a plebiscite would be disruptive of national unity. National unity is something very near to the minds and hearts I am sure of all members of this house. I wonder whether one promotes national unity by injecting a highly emotional and disruptive issue of this kind at this time and in this manner into the business of parliament, while at the same time suggesting that by holding a plebiscite the national unity would be disrupted. This is being done at a time when members of this house do not have the authority or a mandate to decide that such and such a flag shall be adopted as the national flag of Canada. Surely that method of procedure is not conducive to the attain-

ment of national unity. Any suggestion in that vein is sheer nonsense.

Regardless of the merits of a referendum, no one can tell me that if the Canadian people are consulted and allowed to make a decision on an issue of this kind it is going to be disruptive of national unity. Certainly a decision made by a group of men sitting on the treasury benches, accepted by the majority of a house of minorities, is not the way to achieve national unity. One does not achieve national unity by ramming something such as a flag down the throats of the Canadian public. That is the attitude taken by the government, and that is all that can be said for it.

Since there is to be no plebiscite and the Canadian people are not to be consulted, I wonder where this flag is to be flown. It will be flown over the peace tower, of course, when and if it is authorized by the parliament of Canada. My friends to my left in the N.D.P. section of the house have said that Conservatives are beginning to adopt Mr. Mackenzie King as one of their patron saints. I would not go that far, but it was Mr. Mackenzie King who, by his order in council, said that the flag which is flown today over the peace tower is to be the flag of Canada until it is changed by a decision of the parliament of Canada. The flag to be flown after such a decision is not the flag chosen by this house, but a flag chosen by this house and by the members of that other place. I do not know by what legerdemain this proposed white flag will fly by Christmas. However, when it does fly, if ever, it will fly over public buildings in Canada, but where else? Will it fly in Newfoundland or will the union jack fly there? Will it fly in Quebec?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Nowlan: I hear some hon. members say "yes". I can tell you, sir, that it will not fly universally in the maritime provinces, nor will it fly universally across Canada generally, because it will not be the adopted flag of the Canadian people. We will set back Canadian acceptance of a Canadian flag by at least 25 years as a result of the way in which this government has dealt with the matter, jamming it down the throats of the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I may ask the house leader a question? I am wondering for obvious reasons whether the government will consider asking this house to set aside tomorrow and perhaps the next day to deal with the Canada labour code?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I hope that tomorrow we can proceed to a consideration of the Canada labour code legislation at the conclusion of the flag debate.

At ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, December 9, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. BALCER—REQUEST FOR CLOSURE TO END FLAG DEBATE

[*Translation*]

Hon. Léon Balcer (Three Rivers): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. For weeks, and even months, the House of Commons has been witnessing an unparalleled debate which is completely paralysing the business of this house and transforming it into a debating society where it is impossible to reach any decision whatsoever. Freedom of speech must be respected, but we should not act in such a way that this house be deprived of its main duty, which consists in making decisions.

That is why I deem that in this discussion on the flag the whole gamut of opinions has been heard, and should we extend it any further we would but prejudice the rights of parliament and the higher interests of our country.

Therefore, I believe that it is my duty to rise on a question of privilege and invite the Prime Minister, or one of his ministers, to give notice that he will make use of standing order 33 to have this question settled without further delay by applying the rule of closure.

[*Text*]

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): On the same question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was not speaking with the authority of this party.

MR. DEACHMAN—REMARK IN DEBATE BY MEMBER FOR BOW RIVER

Mr. Grant Deachman (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege. As reported in *Hansard* for Tuesday, December 8, at page 10956 the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams) said these words:

> Well, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect to you, if we were to move motions every time we wished to criticize the actions of hon. members opposite we would have nothing but motions in the house.

Then he went on to make the following specific statement with respect to myself:

> But I would say in this matter that his own secretary—

That is, my secretary:

> —was typing that very article days before it was published.

This refers to the article over my by-line in the *Citizen* of October 29. This is false; there is not a shred of evidence for it. I am quite sure that my secretary, if she had to, would give affidavits to that effect.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Deachman: Sir, I ask that this statement be retracted. It is a false statement and I cannot let it stand on the record. It imputes things to me that I do not want remaining on the record, and it is completely false, without a shred of evidence. I ask that the hon. gentleman in all honesty retract the statement, which he cannot substantiate in this house.

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): Well, Mr. Speaker, all I can say in answer to a phony question of privilege is that there has been another leak.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Speaker. I request a retraction and I appeal to you for a retraction of this statement, which is not a fact but an outright falsehood.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: You had better lay a charge.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would like to call to the attention of hon. members in the house citation 145 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, which says:

> It has been formally ruled by Speakers in the Canadian Commons that a statement by an honourable member respecting himself and peculiarly within his own knowledge must be accepted, but it is not unparliamentary to temperately criticize statements made by a member as being contrary to the facts; but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permissible. A statement made by a member in his place, is considered as made upon honour and cannot be questioned in the house or out of it.

Various references are quoted in that citation. In view of the statement by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra I suggest to hon. members that we follow the direction suggested by Beauchesne, namely that his statement should be accepted. If any hon. member does not care to accept that statement, then another proceeding is open to him. That proceeding is to move a motion on his own responsibility.

Mr. D. V. Pugh (Okanagan Boundary): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Pickersgill: There is no point of order.

Mr. Pugh: Yes, there is. On a point of order, this statement was made yesterday in the House of Commons. The hon. gentleman who rose just now on a question of privilege should have risen at that time. Obviously he was a little confused in his mind as to whether he had done it. He should have risen at that time and protested. A question of privilege certainly cannot arise at this hour, one day later.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the hon. member has a good question of privilege and has risen at the first available opportunity. Any hon. member is entitled to review what has been recorded in *Hansard*.

Mr. Bell: He was here last night.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggest that the matter has been satisfactorily settled.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Deachman: With respect, Mr. Speaker, the statement made in this house is false. I have asked for a retraction of what is a false statement. By affidavit—and I could bring a bushel of affidavits—I could prove that this statement is false. I do not want a false statement standing against my name on the record of the House of Commons, and with all respect I ask the hon. gentleman to retract his statement, as I think any hon. gentleman in this house should, having made a statement of that kind.

Mr. Speaker: Might I suggest this to the hon. member for Bow River. There was much heat in the discussion last evening. I happened to be in the Chair at the time, and perhaps it was because I was in the Chair that we had such a heated discussion; I do not know. But I suggest to the hon. member that in the circumstances he should, as according to the authorities he must, take the word of the hon. member with respect to the sentences complained of.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I have always appreciated the gracious manner in which you have regulated the procedure of this house, but I have no hesitation whatever in staying with the remarks I made last evening.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Speaker, I should like to know what are the courses now open to me respecting this false statement, which stands on the record and for which the hon. gentleman intends to make no apology whatever.

Mr. Speaker: I think I have heard enough from two hon. members at least to pose a question which I should like to study in light of the authorities, so I will take the matter under advisement and try to bring in a decision as quickly as possible.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

CHANGES IN COMMITTEE PERSONNEL—MOTION TO PROCEED TO ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. J. E. Walker (York Centre) moved:

That the names of Messrs. Woolliams, Fairweather, Nugent, Rhéaume, Simpson, Hales, Munro, Rideout, Byrne, Brewin and Martin (Timmins) be substituted for those of Messrs. Grafftey, Irvine, Millar, Muir (Lisgar), Noble, Stenson, Foy, Laverdière, Habel, Orlikow and Knowles on the standing committee on industrial relations.

That the names of Messrs. Howe (Wellington-Huron), Rideout and Leboe be substituted for those of Messrs. Paul, Klein, and Marcoux on the special joint committee on the Canada pension plan.

That the names of Messrs. Leduc and Cyr be substituted for those of Messrs. Laniel and Lessard (St. Henry) on the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.

That the name of Mr. Kelly be substituted for that of Mr. Munro on the standing committee on banking and commerce.

That the names of Messrs. More and Walker be substituted for those of Messrs. Chatterton and Cameron (High Park) on the standing committee on external affairs.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of standing order 44 to move what is known as a superseding motion. Perhaps I should read standing order 44, which is as follows:

When a question is under debate no motion is received unless to amend it; to postpone it to a day certain; for the previous question; for reading the orders of the day; for proceeding to another order; to adjourn the debate; or for the adjournment of the house.

Beauchesne's fourth edition, citation 195, gives us direction with regard to the moving of such motions and states that motions of this kind are as follows:

"That consideration of the question be postponed to—(date)." "That the orders of the day be read." "That the house proceed to (name another order); or that the house proceed to the next business."

I would also draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that on May 14, 1956 a motion of the kind I propose to move was moved in this house. On that occasion the then government whip, Mr. W. G. Weir, had moved a motion for the substitution of a number of names on committees. Hon. Walter Harris, seconded by the present Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) moved, under standing order 44, the following motion:

That we do now proceed to the orders of the day.

That was an undebatable motion which was carried, and we jumped over all the intervening items and went straight into government business. It is therefore my contention that one has the right today, on this motion moved by the government whip, to present a similar motion.

My motion could read exactly as Mr. Harris' motion read, that the house do now proceed to the orders of the day, but I point out that last night at ten o'clock the government house leader indicated that if we did finish the flag debate today the item of government business to be called would be order No. 77, having to do with the Canada labour code. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, believing that this motion is in order, believing that it has precision in that it directs precisely what we would go to rather than just that we move to something else or that we adjourn, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas):

That the house do now proceed to government order No. 77, namely "House again in committee of the whole on Bill C-126".

Mr. Speaker: I listened with a great deal of attention to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, especially when he was reading standing order 44. Perhaps I might respectfully suggest, and I think I am right in this procedure, that the Chair would feel better about the motion if it did not seem to conflict with standing order 18, and if it were changed to read that this house now proceed to the orders of the day. I do not think it is necessary at this time to read standing order 18, but I make that suggestion to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I was aware of standing order 18 (2) when I drafted my motion, and in a sense I alluded to it when I pointed out that the government house leader indicated last night that the first item of government business to be called after the flag debate would be government order No. 77. For that reason I felt it appropriate to name in my motion the precise item, but if Your Honour feels that it trespasses on order 18 (2), which gives the government the authority to call government items in the sequence it thinks fit, I would be willing to accept the change in my motion which the Chair has suggested. In view of the announcement made by the government house leader last night it would have the same effect if my motion were worded as Your Honour suggests and we were to proceed immediately to government orders.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, the government will reserve its right under rule 18 (2) to call government orders in such sequence as the government may think fit.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I must remind the President of the Privy Council that this is not a debatable motion at this time. It is my duty to put this motion, which I believe to be in order, before the house. Then the house will dispose of it as it desires. It is moved by Mr. Knowles, seconded by Mr. Douglas, that the house do now proceed to orders of the day. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: Those against will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Knowles) which was negatived on the following division:

Division

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alkenbrack
Barnett
Bell
Bigg
Brewin
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Cantelon
Cardiff
Chatterton
Churchill
Clancy
Coates
Cooper
Cowan
Crouse
Danforth
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Doucett
Douglas
Enns
Fairweather
Fane
Fisher
Flemming (Victoria-Carleton)
Forbes
Gundlock
Hales
Hamilton
Harkness
Herridge
Horner (Acadia)
Horner (Jasper-Edson)
Horner (The Battlefords)
Howe (Hamilton South)
Howe (Wellington-Huron)
Irvine
Jones, Mrs.
Jorgenson
Kennedy
Kindt
Knowles
Korchinski
Lambert
Leboe
Loney
MacEwan
MacLean (Queens)
Macquarrie
MacRae
McBain
McIntosh
Madill
Mandziuk
Martin (Timmins)
Mather
Millar
Monteith
Moore
More
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nasserden
Nesbitt
Nielsen
Noble
Nowlan
Nugent
Ormiston
Pascoe
Peters
Prittie
Pugh
Rapp
Rhéaume
Ricard
Rynard
Saltsman
Scott
Simpson
Skoreyko
Slogan
Smallwood
Smith
Southam
Starr
Stefanson
Stenson
Thomas
Wadds, Mrs.
Watson (Assiniboia)
Webb
Webster
Willoughby
Winch
Winkler
Woolliams—99.

NAYS

Messrs:

Addison
Armstrong
Asselin (Notre Dame de Grâce)
Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)
Balcer
Basford
Batten
Beaulé
Béchard
Beer
Bélanger
Benson
Blouin
Boulanger
Boutin
Brown
Byrne
Cadieux (Terrebonne)
Cameron (High Park)
Cantin
Caouette
Cardin
Caron
Carter
Cashin
Chapdelaine
Choquette
Côté (Chicoutimi)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Cyr
Davis
Deachman
Deschatelets
Dionne
Drouin
Drury
Dubé
Dupuis
Émard
Eudes
Forest
Francis
Gauthier
Gelber
Girouard
Godin
Gordon
Granger
Gray
Greene
Grégoire
Groos
Guay
Hahn
Harley
Hays
Hellyer
Jewett, Miss
Klein
Konantz, Mrs.
Lachance
Laing
LaMarsh, Miss
Lamontagne
Lamoureux
Langlois
Laniel
Laverdière
Leblanc
Leduc
Legault
Lessard (Lake St. John)
Lessard (St. Henry)
Lloyd
Loiselle
Macaluso
Macdonald
Mackasey
McIlraith
McLean (Charlotte)
McMillan
McNulty
McWilliam
Marcoux
Martin (Essex East)
Martineau
Matheson
Matte
Moreau
Morison
Mullally
Munro
Nicholson
Nixon
O'Keefe
Olson
Otto
Patterson
Paul
Pearson
Pennell
Pepin
Perron
Pickersgill
Pilon
Plourde
Prud'homme
Richard
Rideout, Mrs.
Rinfret
Robichaud
Rochon
Rock
Rondeau
Rouleau
Roxburgh
Ryan
Sauvé
Sharp
Stewart
Tardif
Teillet
Temple
Thompson
Tremblay
Tucker
Turner
Wahn
Walker
Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Whelan—132.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I was paired and did not vote. Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. Speaker: The house has heard the motion moved by the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Walker). Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion (Mr. Walker) agreed to.

CANADIAN FLAG

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SIXTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Tuesday, December 8, consideration of the motion of Mr.

Batten that the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, be now concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Monteith.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

At the beginning of this afternoon's sitting the deputy leader of the Conservative party, the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer), suggested and asked that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), who was not at his seat then, should move some kind of motion to apply definitely the rule of closure in the case of the flag debate. I strongly support what the deputy leader of the official opposition suggested this afternoon, to the effect that a member of the government or the Prime Minister himself should move immediately a motion to apply the rule of closure so that the matter of the flag can be dealt with once and for all.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I understand the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan) has the floor.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Hon. George C. Nowlan (Digby-Annapolis-Kings): Mr. Speaker, are these Christmas carols which we are having from the lower end of the chamber, or are these hon. members motivated by Christmas spirits or otherwise in engaging in this performance at the moment?

Mr. Mandziuk: Christmas nuts.

Mr. Nowlan: Yes. At ten o'clock last night, Mr. Speaker, when I discontinued the remarks I was making on the amendment which is before us I had suggested that a decision on this matter had to be made by parliament because that is set forth in the order in council which established our flag. I refer to the order in council passed under a preceding Liberal government under the aegis of Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King, which stated that this flag would be the flag of Canada until the parliament of Canada decided otherwise.

I am a little intrigued as to just what the mechanics are to be whereby the parliament of Canada defines and fixes the flag of this nation. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, we have before us at the moment a motion for concurrence in the report of a committee, and it is that motion which we are debating today and have been debating for the last few days. Is this motion going to be construed as a definitive action on the part of the House of Commons to establish the flag of Canada, or is there going to be some other motion following this or some other legislative process brought in which will help establish this flag?

After all, this motion deals only with the report of a committee of the House of Commons. The parliament of Canada consists, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, of Her Majesty the Queen, the Senate and the House of Commons. I am wondering what action will be required in this matter on the part of the Senate. Are they going to have a concurring resolution, or just what will be done to establish a legislative decision of the parliament of Canada.

As I have said, all we have before us at the moment is a motion for concurrence in the report of a committee of the House of Commons. Surely that is not going to be the end of this matter. I think before we have a vote and finalize this debate the government should take the House of Commons into its confidence as to the legislative processes to be taken to establish this flag once we have adopted, if we do adopt concurrence in the report of this committee.

Certainly as far as I know the hon. gentlemen in the other place have not had a committee dealing with this matter. Are we going to ask them to concur in the report of a committee on which they had no representation and of which they have no knowledge? Are they going to set up a committee to study this matter? What are to be the mechanics to establish this as an action of the parliament of Canada? This is something on which I think we have the right to be informed, because this matter involves more than just passing a motion.

The hon. member for Port Arthur, who I am sorry to see is not in his seat now, said last night "After all, the government will change. A Conservative government might be back in office", as I am sure it will be following the next election. Then, he said, that government could bring in another resolution on another flag, or another legislative enactment, re-establishing the red ensign as the flag of Canada.

In the opinion of this party we cannot change flags in the way some hon. members would apparently change shirts. We think there is something more important than

that in a flag. If parliament decides on a flag I think that flag is binding on the people of Canada, and we certainly do not want to be put in the disgraceful position of shifting flags every time there is a change of government. So there is no substance whatever in the fact that because, generally speaking, we are individually in support of the red ensign or some modification thereof—a design showing our historic traditions—if the government changes and this party comes back into office the flag of Canada will also be changed according to our will at the time.

A flag is a much more important matter than that. We are legislating not only for the people of today but for Canadians of the future. I think this question must be treated much more seriously than it has been treated heretofore. Therefore we are particularly interested in knowing by what legislative process the parliament of Canada is going to express its judgment regarding what should be done.

The flag proposed in the report of the committee has had removed from it all the emblems, the traditions and the heritages of which I think all Canadians are proud. We resent that. We do not think we should have a flag of that nature. If this flag with all the tradition and history of a century or more is going to be hauled down simply because the House of Commons passes a resolution, and perhaps the Senate passes another resolution, then that is a very undignified and improper way to change a flag bearing the traditional emblems of a century or more.

I just now recall a few lines from the poem by Charles Wolfe, "The Burial of Sir John Moore after Corunna" as follows:

> We buried him darkly at dead of night,
> The sods with our bayonets turning,
> By the struggling moonbeam's misty light
> And the lanthorn dimly burning.

This government wants to bury this flag by the dark shades of night without any more action than a resolution in the House of Commons. That, sir, is not good enough. In the old days of imperialism when one nation won a war, defeating another, and the flag of the defeated nations was taken down a guard of honour was supplied by those who had won the battle, and they saluted the old flag as it was taken from the mast and a new one was hoisted. We are going to have nothing of that kind apparently, but instead a resolution passed by a possible majority in a minority House of Commons. The resolution if passed by hon. members would then be sent to the other place where somehow or other these things are all going to be cooked together and we are going to have a new national flag.

That is one of the main reasons we have been anxious in this party to have a plebiscite. If a plebiscite is held and we obtain the concurrence of the majority of Canadian people, as strongly as any one of us feels individually on this matter, the people of Canada having had an opportunity of speaking, we will be prepared to accept their choice. However, without that opportunity, and particularly because of the vague and indefinite procedure before us, and I do not think even government members know what is to be the procedure, we are not prepared to accept a change in this way.

We as Canadians I think should learn something more of our past, and we as Canadians have been lacking in our appreciation and recollection of history and tradition. We have been poor in maintaining our traditions, historical sites and monuments, as well as about other matters which contribute to the tradition of a nation. I remember that a few years ago we had here in the city of Ottawa the old Supreme Court of Canada building. It was a blacksmith's shop or a stonecutter's hut which became the Supreme Court of Canada building. It was a rather poor and meagre building, but in that building was enacted a great deal of the constitutional history of this country. A few years ago we tore that building down because we wanted to make parking spaces for 12 or 14 automobiles, and one of the great historical sites of this country disappeared.

I also remember a strange debate that took place in this chamber, and I am sure the President of the Privy Council (Mr. McIlraith) will also remember it, because he and I crossed swords emphatically on that occasion, regarding the demolition of the west block. The government at that time was determined to have it destroyed and some of us kept the debate on those estimates going so long, parliament was dissolved before the estimates were passed and the building was not destroyed. That is why today we still have that beautiful building rather than one of those ghastly monstrosities of yellow, black, purple and red sheets of plastic overlooking Wellington street.

I have mentioned those things as examples of the fact that we have been very derelict in our attempts to preserve tradition. I suppose it is in keeping with that practice and

philosophy, or the lack thereof, that we propose now to go ahead and tear down our flag, erecting a new one without any tradition, sentiment or regard for our history. I think that a large number of people are not prepared to do that at this moment. I am not suggesting for a moment that our flag should be the red ensign, per se. As I said last night, and on other occasions, I personally prefer the red ensign but I do not care whether our new flag is the red ensign or some modification thereof, but I do believe that a great majority of Canadians, regardless of race, want to see something of our traditions and history emblazoned or recorded on that flag.

While this is not the place to discuss designs I should like to mention that I saw a flag several days ago in a picture appearing in the Dartmouth *Free Press* of Nova Scotia which was proposed by a naval officer. It was a distinctive flag with a large maple leaf on it. I think it was printed in black and white, as the Dartmouth *Free Press* I do not believe has a colour press. The flag had a large maple leaf and superimposed thereon a small union jack, and superimposed on the union jack a large fleur-de-lis which maintained at least some reference to the two great founding races of this country. Somebody has suggested that to adopt this kind of flag would evidence traces of feudalism or subservience. I wonder how many Canadians believe that to be the case. I do not believe there is one in 10,000 who would believe that, because if this is subservience I should remind the members of this house of the flag of South Africa, where the bitter memories of the Boer war are more alive than any bitter memories we have in this country. On that flag they have the flag of the Capetown colony and the Orange free state, with a small union jack as well.

Those are some of the things which I think warrant this matter being referred to the people in the form of a plebiscite, so that a decision can be made without haste but carefully, and after due consideration. Those are some of the reasons we in this party have urged that there should not be haste, but rather a referral of the question to the Canadian people. This is a highly emotional issue.

Sometimes I become irritated by people who assume that we who speak in this house on this issue do so for some political purpose. Politics do enter into discussions in this chamber whatever is being considered, but I suggest that there has not been politics, in the political sense of the word, behind the reaction taken by most of us on this flag issue. This issue means a great deal to us individually, and a great deal to our constituents. It means a great deal not only to Canadians of today but Canadians of the future, and that is why we have urged time and time again that there be a plebiscite.

If there is not to be a plebiscite, Mr. Speaker, I guess we have to accept that verdict, but certainly we cannot be accused of being poor Canadians or obstructionists because of the attitude we have taken up to this time. I have attempted last night and today to put my own views forward on this issue because personally I believe that hundreds of thousands of people feel very strongly about this issue, and I think their opinions should be voiced in this house.

Mr. H. M. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to the amendment to the motion to concur in the committee report I feel that I should first of all place on record my intention. I intend to vote against the committee report, as a result of which I feel responsible for setting forth some of the reasons for my decision in this regard.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. May I bring to the attention of the hon. member that the debate at this stage is not on whether the hon. member should vote for or against the report of the committee but how he is going to vote on the question of the amendment to the motion for concurrence in the report.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): I was coming to that immediately, Mr. Speaker. I was about to follow up by saying that I intend to vote for the amendment put forward by the official opposition asking that the whole question be referred back to the committee and that a plebiscite be held to determine Canada's national flag.

There are a number of things I want to put forward with regard to why there should be a plebiscite. I want to refer first of all to something that was said last night by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher). All of us, of course, cannot be television personalities or newspaper columnists. For a long time I have not had very much faith in newspaper columnists, including the hon. member for Port Arthur. He makes the suggestion that we should go ahead and get this thing over with, and when the Conservatives come back into power they can bring

in another flag resolution. This matter touches the emotions of all Canadians but he would toss it off very lightly. We expect this kind of attitude from the Liberal party but I always thought that the New Democratic party was a little more sincere.

Miss LaMarsh: Ha, ha.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): The hon. lady says "ha, ha".

Miss LaMarsh: I sure do—ha, ha, ha.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): I should like to direct some remarks particularly to her in regard to the question of a plebiscite. We in western Canada are under the handicap of having no news media that will bother to print the truth. I refer to the Southam chain of newspapers. The people of Alberta, more particularly of northern Alberta, do not receive a proper interpretation of what goes on here in Ottawa. The Edmonton *Journal* absolutely refuses—I am talking about a plebiscite.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member says what he has been saying is pertinent to the subject, but the Chair has some doubts about it. I would ask him to relate the remarks he is making now to the particular amendment before the house.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, I was about to say that the situation we are faced with in northern Alberta because of the attitude of the Edmonton *Journal* is that many people do not appreciate what the stand of our party has been in regard to the flag question. They do not appreciate that we are asking for a plebiscite. This is my entire point when I am talking about the attitude of this chain of newspapers in Alberta. They are so biased that it is really pathetic. They are nothing but apologists for the Liberal party and they really have not got very much to apologize for, Mr. Speaker, have they?

In that part of the country we have this situation, when the fact of the matter is we have been telling our constituents that we want a plebiscite because this issue is an emotional one and one that should be decided upon by the people as a whole. We have been arguing off and on for a number of months about redistribution and its effect on representation in the house, and this has a very direct relationship to the whole question of whether or not we should have a plebiscite on the emotional issue of the flag. The whole question is whether or not we in Alberta are entitled to two more seats and two more members to vote against what the government is now trying to put forward as a national flag.

The strange thing is that we have asked the government time and time again for a plebiscite to decide Canada's flag. We have said that this is an emotional issue, that it means a lot to the people of Canada, that it cannot be decided in the heat of what I call the Ottawa fever, in the biased political hotbed that is Ottawa. This matter should be above politics and it has not been. Let us put the blame where it properly lies. The government introduced this divisive issue into the house and they have carried on with it because in my opinion they do not have any legislation ready to put before the house. They charge us with being obstructionists and filibustering on the question of the flag, and whether or not there should be a plebiscite. I charge them with having no legislation available, no plans available—

Mr. McIlraith: Give us a chance to call our legislation—

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): —to help our people.

Mr. McIlraith: —by voting on the flag.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Why did the President of the Privy Council (Mr. McIlraith) not stand up and answer the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan) when he wanted to know how the government was going to go about implementing this thing? Why does he not take us into his confidence and tell us how he is going to do all these things?

An hon. Member: He does not know.

Mr. McIlraith: Because it is irrelevant to the debate before the house.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): I bow to the hon. gentleman's greater knowledge.

Mr. McIlraith: You should follow the rules occasionally.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): If we could get back to the question period there are some interesting questions we would like to ask the hon. gentleman, too.

An hon. Member: Who else got furniture?

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): My hon. friend says "Who else got furniture". That would be a nice question.

Mr. McIlraith: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question. If his party wanted to have a question period over the past week why

did his party not agree to the proposition for a question period put forward by the Prime Minister?

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): The hon. gentleman, of course, is in charge of the business of the house and he could have arranged this very easily.

Mr. McIlraith: I asked why your party would not agree to the proposition put forward by the Prime Minister.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. May I suggest to both hon. members that the subject matter the house is supposed to be considering now is not the order of business but the question of an amendment to a motion having reference to the holding of a plebiscite.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): I agree with that, Mr. Speaker. I want to deal with the other aspect of why the Liberal government refuses to give the people of Canada the opportunity to decide on their flag by a plebiscite. Over the years the Liberals have ruled this country by dividing it. In my opinion the basic principle of Liberalism is that the country has to be divided and in political chaos and then they can rule. This arrogant bunch think that only they have any ability or should be allowed to rule in Canada. I suggest that these people have deliberately created some of the political chaos in Canada by perpetuating the flag debate and refusing to accede to our request for a plebiscite. They have done this deliberately because they think they can get away with the same old Liberal tactics of dividing the country. "Divide and rule; keep the people upset and we will rule." This has been the Liberal attitude for a long, long time. But I think that the people of Canada will have another decision to make about what the government has been doing over the past 18 months, about their many failures.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me that the hon. member's speech is not relevant in any way to the question before the house.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): With respect, Your Honour, what I am saying, and I can put it in very simple language, is that the Liberals have refused our request for a plebiscite because they would like to create political chaos in this country and portray us as obstructionists, as the people who are filibustering the flag debate. I say that we need a plebiscite on the flag to take the issue out of parliament so that the people of Canada can decide on what their national emblem shall be, without any of these side issues coming into the picture. I say to you very respectfully, sir, that this has an important bearing on the whole question of a national flag and whether or not we should have a plebiscite. I say this is the meat of the problem. Why do they refuse us a plebiscite? They have no answer other than to say, "You are the elected representatives and you should decide."

I disagree with that on a number of counts. The first is that this House of Commons is not truly representative. Redistribution has not taken place and therefore it is not a question we should decide, but one that should be decided by a plebiscite. My second reason for disagreeing is that the Liberal party has created so much political chaos that the people of Canada have no idea what the true situation is. A situation which is so highly emotionally charged should not be decided here.

This is a minority government. This is a government of regionalization. This is a government which does not have a mandate to make this kind of decision. They have not made any other decisions—why should they make this one?

The roving Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays) is not in his place at the moment.

Miss LaMarsh: You have not been here for a month.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) keeps interrupting. Perhaps we should see about some of the things that the truth squad should have been investigating. The first point I am making is that this is a minority government, and the second concerns the political chaos which has been stirred up by the Liberal party and the Liberal press.

An hon. Member: Order.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Somebody says order. I am suggesting the people of Canada do not have a true appreciation of what is going on or of why we want a plebiscite. All this is relevant to the question now before us. I suggest one of the things we should endeavour to accept in public life is responsibility, and I suggest the press has lain down on its responsibility in reporting the flag debate. I suggest further that the press is a bought press, that there is not any freedom in it any more. There certainly is not any freedom in the press which serves my area, especially on this particular question of

whether or not we would be better off to have a plebiscite. The press in my area publishes articles which it thinks are favourable to the Liberal party, but will not publish anything that is unfavourable.

Earlier this year we talked about a plebiscite on a different flag which had three maple leaves on it. I think the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) will recall the three maple leaves. We hold a similar position in respect to this flag which has one maple leaf, but I do not know whether that minister has ordered a number of these new flags. Perhaps having been once burned he is going to wait and see. However, I am sure he will keep his eye on the business part of the transaction and see the flags are got when they are needed. The question is whether it should be up to him and his colleagues to decide the flag, rather than the people of Canada.

Mr. Godin: What about parliament?

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): I suggest this is an emotional issue which parliament should not be asked to solve. It is not a question that should come before parliament.

Mr. Grégoire: Are you afraid to take your responsibility?

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): It is not a question that should come before parliament because it is one—

Mr. Grégoire: Are you afraid?

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): —that crosses party lines. It is an emotional one.

Mr. Dupuis: May I ask a question?

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Surely.

Mr. Dupuis: Why is it that when your party was in power for six years it did not hold a referendum? Why did it not give the Conservative member from St. Boniface the chance to pass his resolution dealing with a plebiscite on the flag and the national anthem? Why didn't you support the bill I introduced in 1961 asking the Conservative Tory government to use the national census to ask the feelings of each Canadian on those national symbols? You could have asked a few questions from door to door and it would not have cost a cent. You were in power then and you had six years in which to do that. You didn't do anything when in power, and now in opposition, you want our Liberal government to do what your Conservative government refused to do.

[Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson).]

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): I did not know whether the Minister without Portfolio was going to make a speech or not. There is a very simple answer—

Mr. Dupuis: Answer my question.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): If you will allow me. There is a very simple answer, that we had a flag passed by a Liberal government in 1945, under order in council, and about which we were quite happy. We had—

Mr. Dupuis: That is not the truth.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): —a national flag—

Mr. Dupuis: That is not the truth.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): —a flag which represented our history, a flag which did not allow various entrepreneurs to make a profit on it, a flag which suited Canada.

Mr. Dupuis: Answer my question.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): I did.

Mr. Godin: The hon. member has just said the Conservative government was very willing to go along with the 1945 order in council. Why should he feel his party should choose the flag of this country?

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): I did not say our party was going to choose anything. I said we were quite happy with the flag we had and still have.

Mr. Dupuis: What about your Tory convention asking for a distinctive flag?

An hon. Member: Why don't you go back to Africa?

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Go to the jungle.

Mr. Dupuis: Answer that question.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): The minister, of course, is in the flag business and should know all about these things. I do not know whether he is in the furniture business or not. We have not heard that.

Mr. Dupuis: You were my best publicity agent.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): But I do know that I can fight under the red ensign, that this is a flag which I can live under.

Mr. Grégoire: That is a British flag. That is the British naval flag; it is not a distinctive flag.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): So far as I am concerned—

Mr. Smallwood: A lot of us fought under it, which is more than you guys did.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. I would like to point out to all hon. members, including those sitting close to the hon. member who has the floor, that he should be allowed to continue his remarks uninterrupted.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Do you not think that there are many repetitions? To my knowledge, it has been repeated at least 50 times that the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) sold stickers, and at least 200 times that, formerly, there were three maple leaves and now there is only one. If they have nothing new to say, it seems to me you should call them to order and demand that they put an end to these repetitions which are against the rules.

[*Text*]

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): This is the same hon. gentleman who stood up in his place and said, "Unless our little party is recognized we will filibuster for 100 days."

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

I did not say that; the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) did, and said at that time: I shall fight to the death to ensure that their rights are not recognized. Unfortunately, he did not die and our rights have been recognized.

[*Text*]

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): I see my hon. friends are a little touchy on that subject. They are a little touchy on the question of whether or not they should break away from that great and noble party we know so well in Alberta, which the leader of the Créditistes said set them back 10 years. He said other things as well. He said that Social Credit nationally was a fizzle and they should have a new party. My hon. friend keeps talking. He likes to interrupt but he does not like being interrupted.

Mr. Grégoire: You did not dare to interrupt me yesterday.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Jasper-Edson (Mr. Horner) has the floor and I again ask hon. members not to interrupt him.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): If I may go on, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Grégoire: We have heard it about 25 times.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): We have seen this flag debate used as a political football by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson). We have seen him trekking around the country with a flag kit and new words to "O' Canada" when he should have been here looking after his ministers. But we have not seen any major legislation put before us. We have not seen any major policy changes.

An hon. Member: You have not been here.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): I have been getting some furniture ready.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): We have seen a government which has wallowed through 18 months of administration like a bull moose in some of the swamps in Jasper-Edson, not making any decision except for this one petulant decision that we must debate this flag issue. This is the essence of the argument. Should we as a country be content to follow the lead of a minority government which has not proven itself, which has not done anything at all for the nation? Should we accept its word on the subject of a national symbol, or should we ask the people? That is the essence of the argument. We say—

Mr. Grégoire: Let's vote.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Ah, the parrots in the corner are getting lively again. They say "Let's vote". I say, let the people vote on it. They are the ones who will have to live under this flag for years to come. We do not believe a flag should be changed every time the government changes. After all, if that were the practice we would need to change the flag fairly soon. That would not be a good practice to follow at all. Let us hold a plebiscite at the time of the next election and allow the people to decide what our national symbol should be. Let us put forward three or four distinctive designs, preferably designs which have something to do with our heritage, something to do with the history of Canada. If hon. members opposite do not like the history of Canada, I am sorry for them. We in western Canada come from people who fought for their country by hard work and toil. We come from a pioneering stock. The people of Canada feel very strongly about this question of a plebiscite. They are in favour of deciding it in the way this amend-

ment proposes. Speaking for myself, I have no confidence whatever that this government is able to handle a matter so important as the choosing of a flag. The government has been unable to handle anything else.

There are no specialists when it comes to deciding upon a flag. Each one of us has to decide for himself on this particular emotional question. I will say this to the house: If people were to come in from outside Canada and try to tear down our red ensign and trample it in the mud we would resist them, we would fight them. But here we find the Liberal party doing the same thing from inside Canada, yet they want us to accept it lying down.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): We have no confidence in this government. The people of Canada generally have no confidence in this government. We are getting less confident every day. As new revelations come out we are more sure than ever that this government should not be allowed to decide what our flag should be, but that we should put the question to the people and let them decide the issue.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the hon. member.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member wish to receive and answer a question from the minister?

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Certainly.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said a moment ago that the Liberal party had chosen a flag in 1945. Is he not aware that, when making this decision the government said that the red ensign could be used until parliament decided to select a new flag? Why did the hon. member conceal this fact, when he is or should be aware of it?

[*Text*]

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): I am not hiding any facts. Of course, the very terms of the order in council were "until parliament should decide otherwise".

Mr. Dupuis: You should have said that.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): I am saying it now for your benefit. I am also saying to the hon. member that it was his parliament and his Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) who brought this flag debate before the House of Commons, in place of legislation which would be of benefit to this country. It is his Prime Minister who is running around the country with a flag kit. It is his party which has made parliament the shambles it is today.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): The seals laugh. This country is governed by an executive council or the cabinet. For heaven's sake let us have some leadership out of them, something more than a complete shambles on the treasury benches.

Mr. R. E. Forbes (Dauphin): I am taking part in this flag debate because I think this is one of the most important issues to be decided in this country in a long time and I believe it should be decided by the people of Canada by a plebiscite and not by the members of a minority government.

Naturally, as a descendant of United Empire Loyalist stock, I feel that I should participate because my forebears played an important part in the history and development of this country. Further, I think it is important that any design chosen as a flag for Canada should embody a symbol of our sovereignty and I believe the Canadian red ensign is a symbol of the united effort of the English and French settlers which made Canada the great country it is today. I have a right to express my own beliefs and I feel it is only fair that the Canadian people should have a right to express theirs through a plebiscite.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) has stated that he introduced the flag resolution in fulfilment of an election promise. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that no mention of a flag was made in the federal constituency of Dauphin during the election campaigns of either 1962 or 1963. However, I can point out that the Liberal candidate in the Dauphin constituency and others who spoke on behalf of the Liberal party promised, among other things, a two price system for wheat, and a support price for beef, hogs, eggs and other farm products to be based on regional averages, and calculated quarterly; they promised also they would study the rough fish problems of commercial fishermen and that they would launch a program to provide free milk to school children across the country.

I can assure the Prime Minister that if he would bring forward this legislation which would mean something to the farmers of Canada and to our economy, we in the official opposition would give our full support without a prolonged debate. Since this legislation has

all been put aside and a new flag for Christmas is all that apparently matters, we in the Conservative opposition have a right to register our protests on behalf of the Canadian people who do want the matter decided by a plebiscite, the only fair way. Instead of the promised legislation the Prime Minister introduced the flag resolution and I ask, why? At one time the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) took part in the flag debate. I wish to refer hon. members to page 6959 of *Hansard*, where he expressed concern about the leadership of the Progressive Conservative party. Let me assure the hon. minister that we on this side of the house have every confidence in the leadership of Right Hon. John Diefenbaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Forbes: But, as one who is an ardent believer in the two party system, I personally am deeply concerned about the leadership of the Liberal party at this time. When I think of the able leaders of that once great Liberal party, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Mackenzie King and that great statesman whom all Canadians loved, Mr. St. Laurent—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have listened with great interest to the hon. member for the last few minutes and I would think that the remarks he has been making until now will lead him eventually to the consideration of the amendment before the house at the present time. I would entreat the hon. member to keep that in mind and get to the core of his subject as quickly as possible.

Mr. Forbes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just coming to that, but I was prefacing my main argument with a few incidentals. I made reference to the great leaders of the Liberal party in the past and I have just one or two more sentences on that subject. The opinions of these great leaders of the Liberal party in the past on the subject of a flag have been placed on the record many times, and their contribution to the history and development of our country. I fear for the future of the Liberal party under the present leadership, if the flag resolution is any indication of his ability as a leader. I am at a loss to understand why a man with a reputation as a great diplomat would introduce such a divisive and controversial issue.

Mr. Speaker, the number of letters and telegrams that I have been receiving from my constituency indicates that the majority want the red ensign retained as Canada's flag. I need not mention the various organizations such as the Canadian Legion, the I.O.D.E. and the L.O.L. who are requesting my support for the red ensign. Mr. Speaker, the maple tree is a thing of beauty, but I am sorry that I cannot say the same thing about the proposed maple leaf flag. As one man said to me recently, it is more of a banner than a flag. Although he did not indicate his politics to me in any way, I feel he may have been a Liberal. In any case I was happy to have him in my office. He is a retired air force chap and said he felt the present Liberal minority government has no right to impose its will on a whole people, as it is doing with the flag, because it is a minority government. I say again, if the government is determined to have a new flag this should only be decided upon by a majority of all the people voting upon it in a referendum or at another election.

The flag which the committee has asked us to accept, Mr. Speaker, has no tradition behind it, except perhaps the colours red and white which are taken from the red ensign. At the risk of being repetitious I am just adding my voice to the others raised in protest throughout Canada and here in this House of Commons against this red and white maple leaf flag replacing the Canadian red ensign which has flown so proudly in Canada and abroad all these years, and has been honoured by all. Immigrants coming to Canada have been swearing allegiance to this Canadian red ensign of ours. To me the red ensign is more than a bit of bunting; it stands for and exemplifies the hopes and aspirations of many generations of every ethnic group who have sought, and found, security and happiness beneath its folds.

I am sure no one wants to think that next year or the year after, or indeed even in 50 or 100 years from now, there should be any necessity for changing our flag. This is why we must decide right now. This matter has already caused so much disunity in this country, and this could easily happen again if at some future time any group was successful in putting enough political pressure on another weak and vacillating government. We in the Conservative party believe that this flag question has been handled in the worst possible way and we feel that the only way the people in our nation will be satisfied with any settlement of the question is to have a plebiscite. We should remember that we are settling this matter for all time

and we should not hesitate to take all the time necessary to do it right.

Many people have spoken of symbols and what the symbols on the flag are supposed to represent. It is the emotions and memories the flag evokes which make this such a serious matter to so many people. There is no doubt that many people in this country believe that a flag symbolizes not only the greatness of this nation, but certain facts about Canada and its history that we are proud of and that we hope will remain a permanent part of our future. To these people the removal of known symbols from our flag is a declaration of intention to destroy that part of our Canadian way of life.

Mr. Speaker, the controversy over the flag really boils down to one simple question: Do we have on our national flag any symbols of our history and traditions, or do we not? This is the one question on which we think there should be a national referendum. Some people may be opposed to a referendum or plebiscite because they feel there are too many practical difficulties in the way of permitting a decisive expression of opinion on the flag design. To my mind this is not necessary at all. The question need simply be asked: Should our flag have symbols and traditions? A simple "yes" or "no" is all that would be required, and I suggest that the work of the flag committee would then become relatively simple. I believe that an overwhelming majority of Canadians are in favour of retaining some symbols on our flag and I also believe they have a right to stand up and be counted on this important question.

I believe there is a great deal of misunderstanding in this country about the meaning of symbols. I am aware that many people believe that the presence of the union jack on our flag symbolizes some sort of subservience to Great Britain. I am aware that this feeling is strongly held in the province of Quebec and even to some extent in other parts of the country. We in this house know there is no question of subservience, and therefore that feeling is just plain nonsense. I am surprised that some members of this house continue to foster such notions and use such arguments. To me this is like the argument that there should be no statues in churches because some people say this suggests idolatry. Just because some people use this silly argument it has never stopped churches from having statues, because they know very well they are not their idols.

In exactly the same way I want to see the union jack kept on our flag as a proud declaration and reminder of our democracy, passing on the British heritage of the parliamentary system and type of justice. This symbol is very precious and meaningful to most Canadians. No one can say that it mars the beauty of the flag design and the only argument for its removal is the silly one that some people foster a false interpretation of what it stands for.

The argument I might make to my French Canadian colleagues to enlist their support for this symbol is to remind them that it is not just the people of Quebec who are anxious that their right to their religion and language should be maintained. Western Canadians are every bit as devoted to the preservation of French Canadian rights as they are to their own. When there is misunderstanding of the French devotion to their language, responsible people in western Canada do not add strength to superstitions or ill-informed and harmful remarks. The one thing that is uppermost in the minds of responsible Canadians is that the right of individuals must be protected. In our democracy we take pride in the fact that Canadians have a right to be different. We conform to the rule of law but we do not ask the conformity of our neighbour to our particular brand of behaviour. The French Canadian's right to speak his language and retain his customs is cherished by the western Canadian and understood by him, just as he cherishes his own right to have his own language and customs. Once one right is taken away, all rights might soon slip away.

Western Canadians wish to have a fleur-de-lis on the national flag. It is a symbol and a reminder that Canada does have a history that we are proud of and that both races have made great history in building up this great Canada of ours. To me the decision of the flag committee would be acceptable if they had taken a flag with these two symbols on it. The symbols are small while the maple leaf is large, appropriate I would say to the philosophy that while we are proud of our history and traditions and intend to build on them, Canada's greatness lies ahead of us and the large maple leaf symbolizes the forward look of optimism of all our people. The two symbols are not just a reminder of our past; their position on the flag is also an indication of the future. They are placed wide apart, a symbol of their determination that both languages have a place and each culture is necessary and part of our strength. This could show the determination that each will survive and be respected and cherished as a separate entity in a united country.

I suppose that every symbol can be misunderstood. People can say the wrong things about anything. The choice of responsible people is to take the path of courage, and one does not deviate from the right because the weak or the ill-informed may criticize. It is my belief that our flag needs these symbols as a reminder to every citizen, from whatever part of the country he comes, that his way of life is cherished and respected by other Canadians who have a different culture and who ask of him only that he gives the same respect to their way of life.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let the Canadian people vote on the flag in another election or by a referendum as suggested in the amendment by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith). Why all the rush about a new flag before Christmas? Is this the only way the Prime Minister could bring about an election, or was this what he had in mind when he suddenly introduced the flag resolution, which had not been included in the speech from the throne last February?

The Prime Minister has been known to change his mind. I suggest that if he would change his mind on this issue, it would be to the advantage of his party and himself to submit this matter to the electors of Canada and they could make the decision at the next federal election. I hope that the Prime Minister will reconsider and withdraw his motion even at this late date, and submit the issue to the electors.

Mr. C. F. Kennedy (Colchester-Hants): Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting for some time to have an opportunity to put forward a few views on this important question and on this amendment to refer the matter back to a committee in order that the people of Canada might have the chance to express their opinion on the subject. I have waited because there are so many members in this house who have not yet risen to speak in this debate, and I would think that this question should be as important to them as it is to me. I have already expressed myself briefly previously, and I intend to be brief again today. I still contend that the people of Canada should have the opportunity of expressing their opinion on this question, and I put forward these reasons for feeling in this way.

During this debate an inference has been drawn by some government members, the very few who have spoken, that a new flag was an election promise. If it was, it was a very indefinite one and must certainly have been regional, because there was no mention made of a flag in the last election campaign in which I participated. I would be glad to oppose anybody from my area who would come forward and say that it was his intention to vote in favour of destroying our present flag.

In my opinion, the action which is being taken is not a creative move at all. It is simply a move to destroy what we have. It is simply a move to remove a symbol, of which many people of this country are very proud, from our national flag. This is proven by the willingness of the government to accept almost anything, provided it has no connection with the red ensign. I am referring to the union jack part of the red ensign when I say that. Hon. members opposite should—and I challenge them to do so—stand up and say why they do not like the union jack portion of our present flag and why it should not be represented on a new flag. I have yet to meet anybody who could put up an argument as to why it should be obliterated from a new flag.

Among the loyal Canadians in this country are the veterans who stood and fought for our country, and they have been most adamant that our national symbols should be preserved. A symbol means, or should mean, something to a person. If it were not for symbols—and symbols include literature or anything representing the past—our coming generation would learn nothing of the past. Under the symbols we have had thus far this nation has progressed. We may not have reached the highest goals over the years, but we have stood for the principles which underlie the British and French traditions handed down to us. Why then, without permission from the people, has parliament the right to vote on this question and throw away these things which mean so much to so many people?

How many people in this country have participated in several wars in order to defend the principles to which I have referred, the basic principle of which is freedom? When I speak of those who participated in the wars I am referring not only to those who actually took up the sword and fought on the battlefields, but also to the vast number of people who supported our soldiers and made it possible for them to be effective and to put forth everything they had, many of them giving their lives. Surely the opinions of these people, our veterans should have some direct bearing in this regard; and as far as I am aware they are adamant that we should not lose our present flag which bears the symbols for which they have stood over

the years. If we as a group remove these symbols, I am afraid we will only leave bitterness, dissension and possibly division among our people which will last for many years.

Some people say we should forget the past and look only to the future. I would say that anyone who makes such a statement is only deluding himself. History is a recording of the past, and history is a part, and an important part, of any person, race or nation. Man's personal and intellectual history begins when he is born and ends when he dies. A nation continues to make history, and I hope Canada's future history will be as glorious as it has been in the past.

No doubt there are many things in our past history which we should like to forget, but on the other hand there are also many achievements of which we are proud. If we did not accept and remember the lessons of history we would still be a primitive people. As a matter of fact, our very survival, even militarily, is based on lessons learned from previous struggles. "The past is a fact, the present is fleeting and the future is unknown."

Mr. Speaker, I conclude these brief remarks regarding this question which has been before this house for so long by stating that I regret that we have had so much discussion about the flag issue and that the important business of this house has been put aside. I have no idea how much more discussion there will be on this question, so I urge the government with all my heart to again consider taking this question out of this house, and bring before us some of those things now on the order paper for which the people of this country have been waiting. These matters are important, and should be dealt with as quickly as possible. I am sure the majority of Canadians feel that these things should be done in priority to any discussion about something which is in effect a change in our symbolic past, and which means so much to us that it should be preserved and taught to future generations.

Mr. Joseph Slogan (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I think I am considered as one of the less vocal members of this house, and that I usually try to speak with some common sense. I hope that the people on the other side of this house who interrupted my speech some months ago so consistently will refrain from doing so today.

I speak at this time because I feel obliged to put on record some of the wishes of my constituents. I am obliged also to present some of the views held in my constituency.

At the outset I should state that these views about a design or the necessity for a plebiscite are not universal. There are some differences in the opinions of the people in this country, as there often are in this house, and I think we must put those differing points of view in proper perspective. Because of these facts I support our position in asking for a plebiscite.

On June 24 I received a letter from one of my constituents who said:

> I feel that this is not a matter to be settled by a handful of members but that it should be put to the people, and it will be with concern and great interest that your defence of this issue will be observed.

I hope I will not be accused of filibustering or of delay. I hope that I am living up to my responsibilities as a member of this house. After listening to the speeches of other members during this debate I feel that they also are living up to their responsibilities. I do not agree with all of them, and certainly they have not agreed with one another, but I respect their courage in standing up to present their views and to reflect the views of their constituents.

At the same time I regard the members on the other side of the house as not living up to their responsibilities. Perhaps they have been gagged by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), or some curtain of silence has been dropped around them. In honesty I feel that on the question of a plebiscite, or on any other question associated with the flag, the members on the government side of this house have not lived up to their responsibilities by maintaining a silence. Surely their constituents would like to know their views and how they are being represented. These members are not accepting their responsibilities. I should like to refer to an article which appeared in the Aurora *Banner* of July 29 under the heading "Liberal M.P.s should take wheel". The article reads as follows:

> We have had poor drivers in Ottawa before. We have even had governments with engines missing, and we have had governments with no engines at all. Now we have a government with a poor driver at the wheel. We suggest that it is time for some of his own party members riding in the Liberal backseat—including our own member, Mr. John Addison—to reach over and try to put the old bus back on the road.

It is obvious that many members in this house are not speaking for the people they represent. Therefore the people should be allowed to speak for themselves. I have no argument with members on the other side of this house as to whether they are in favour

of the adoption of a distinctive Canadian flag or with the retention of the red ensign, but I do think they should have the courage to get up on their feet and express in no uncertain terms their feelings on this issue. One member of the government party did stand up and voice his opinion. I think he has carried out a service on behalf of his constituents.

I do not believe the members of this house do express a composite view of the people of this country. I wonder whether members on the opposite side of this house are so devoted to the stand taken by the Prime Minister that they do not now have the courage to stand up and express their views.

In asking for this plebiscite I should like to emphasize that we in this party who have taken part in the debate on this amendment have not attempted to delay passage of this resolution or the passage of the business of the house. It has been almost on the insistence of the opposition that the government has passed what little legislation it has passed. I can only laugh when I hear some hon. members from the government side, while speaking in other parts of the country, talk about the obstruction the Conservative party has perpetrated on parliament, while in the same breath they list all the legislative items that have been passed during this session. Those members cannot have it both ways; we are either obstructing or you are not doing your jobs as legislators, I think you are misleading the public in this regard.

As far as a plebiscite is concerned, our position has not changed. We have always advocated a plebiscite on this matter. I should like to refer to a speech made by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) on July 22, over the national television network of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, in which he stated:

> We have endeavoured to stop this headstrong and stubborn rush of the government. We want the people of Canada to have a chance to have a say in the matter and suggested that a plebiscite be granted to the Canadian people in order that they could determine their wishes. Such a plebiscite could take place at the next general election. Among the questions to be asked might be such as: Are you in favour of the red ensign? Are you in favour of the red ensign with changes made thereon to show both heritages? Are you in favour of the three maple leaves joined together? Are you in favour of the one maple leaf?

Our position has been consistent in calling for a plebiscite right from the beginning of the flag debate, and we are still being consistent in calling for one now. I spoke earlier in the debate and at that time said that I favoured this matter being taken out of the House of Commons by referring it to a committee of the house. If the government wanted this question removed from the house, why did they not refer the matter to a committee originally? They wasted the taxpayers' money by their obstinacy. They wasted the time of the house by keeping the debate going in this chamber when the matter should have been referred to a committee in the beginning. Finally they did agree to that suggestion and I said at that time that, should the committee report indicate disagreement, and it has, then we should have a national referendum. I am of the same view today. My view has not changed in this regard. If members will refer to my speech in August they will see that I said exactly the same thing. If they did not listen to it the first time I would certainly recommend that they listen this time. I suggested that this committee, although it might not be unanimous, could do a great service for this country.

Mr. Godin: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Slogan: I will permit it at the end of my remarks. I have only 40 minutes and I have a two hour speech prepared. I will try to cut it a little shorter to leave the hon. member a couple of minutes in which to ask me a question. I suggested at that time that this committee would render a great service to the country by bringing in a report which would narrow down the designs exactly in the manner in which it has reported, but because of the fact that a small group of people could not agree I could not see that in this larger house we could have any greater agreement. So my suggestion was that we should take the recommendation—

Mr. Godin: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is suggesting that the committee could not agree on a design. I would appreciate it if he would refer to the 14 to nothing vote for the design now before the house.

Mr. Slogan: Obviously the hon. member, as he did in my last speech, is trying to trap me and get me off the rails, but I will answer that question.

Mr. Godin: Why did you say the committee did not agree?

Mr. Slogan: Obviously the hon. member did not understand the vote in the committee. The vote of the committee was not to

adopt that design but to adopt that design in preference to two other designs.

Mr. Godin: As the best design.

Mr. Slogan: Therefore he is under a very grave misapprehension if he thinks the committee was unanimous. The hon. member says that the vote of 14 to nothing was a unanimous vote by that committee approving that design as the flag of Canada, but that is not so. It was a preferential vote in which the members of the committee were expressing their preference with regard to three designs. That was the basis of the unanimous vote which the hon. member is now trying to use to mislead the people of Canada.

In further answer to the hon. member may I say I have here one of his fine campaign advertisements and I see nothing here about a Canadian flag. The hon. member says that the solution of the eastern farmers' number one problem, the cost-price squeeze—

Mr. Godin: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Is the hon. member raising a point of order or a question of privilege?

Mr. Lambert: Make sure it is privilege.

Mr. Godin: On a question of privilege, the hon. member has just read from an advertisement pertaining to my campaign in the last election. He said there was nothing in my platform about a distinctive Canadian flag. I request that the hon. member read the relevant paragraph in my publicity, which is in both English and French and which he has in his hands, in which I advocated a distinctive Canadian flag as part of my program.

Mr. Slogan: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member's point is very well taken. In fact, he got me so off guard that I never did get the last sentence. At the bottom of his list of priorities that he was suggesting—he did not put it in the top line but in the bottom line—he did refer to a distinctive Canadian flag. He did not say one without the union jack. In any event, I think we are getting away from the point. I should like to debate this matter if Mr. Speaker would permit me, but I am sure he would rule I should not. If the hon. member had remained quiet I could have continued with my speech with the result that the time of the house would not have been wasted and we could have proceeded a little farther with the debate.

To come back to the question of a plebiscite, Mr. Speaker, as has been suggested in many newspaper articles I think that the debate in the House of Commons has often laid the house open to ridicule. It has resulted not only in ridicule in Canada, in fact, but Canada is being held up to ridicule abroad. For this reason I think this question should be removed from the house by the government approving our amendment and holding a national plebiscite at the next general election.

In support of this view may I say I had the privilege recently of being a member of the NATO delegation which visited Germany and France. We visited our air division and army brigade at Soest and Zweibrücken and it was interesting to note the reactions of our servicemen to what is going on in the House of Commons regarding the flag. Those of us who made that trip recall meeting Mr. Bernard Kaplan at a reception held by our NATO ambassador in Paris, and I should like to refer to an editorial in the Edmonton *Journal* of June 26 last in which Mr. Bernard Kaplan, Paris correspondent for the North American newspaper alliance, is quoted as referring to the flag question in this way:

> He says the affair is regarded by western Europeans as "a kind of political curiosity in the middle of the twentieth century."

The editorial quotes the Paris newspaper, *Liberation,* as saying:

> It is a fortunate nation that is able to quarrel over such an issue.

The editorial is entitled "Laugh or Cry?" This shows how the ridiculous stubbornness of the Prime Minister is regarded. He has forced the house to debate an issue that would be far better removed from the house. I might also refer to another newspaper dispatch from Washington in which there is the following:

> But Americans continue to view our predicament with a certain amount of inner amusement. "Canada is considering a maple leaf flag design," reports the Washington *Daily News.* "Now how about the 'Maple Leaf Rag' as a national anthem?"

This is the type of reaction abroad and I think it certainly adds nothing to the prestige of Canada that our neighbours in Europe and the United States are looking at us in this light. If we were to remove this question from the house and leave it until the next general election when tempers and emotions would have cooled down, the people of Canada could then be asked to determine the matter by a plebiscite, which is the proper way to bring this question to a logical conclusion.

As I have said previously, as one who is neither Anglo-Saxon nor French, as a Canadian it grieves me to see how this flag issue has divided the country. If we are going to adopt a distinctive national flag the time to do it is when the country is united. Certainly the divisive tactics employed by the government in this issue cannot hope to unite the country.

First of all we had the commission on biculturalism which did a great deal to divide and crystallize the positions of the two founding races. Now we have the flag debate which is doing the same thing. The government should accept a referendum, get the matter out of the House of Commons and proceed with the legislation which it says it wants to present.

Mr. Grégoire: Then let us vote.

Mr. Slogan: We had a vote.

Mr. Grégoire: When?

Mr. Slogan: We had one this afternoon.

Mr. Grégoire: That wasn't a vote on the flag.

Mr. Slogan: Speaking from behind the curtains they are very vociferous, but when challenged they run away with their tails between their legs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member should not be interrupted, particularly by someone who is not speaking from his seat in the house. I would ask hon. members to keep that in mind and allow the hon. member to continue without being interrupted.

Mr. Slogan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your graciousness in rising to reprimand the hon. member—

Mr. Grégoire: I deserved it.

Mr. Slogan: —who is speaking from behind the curtain and who admits he deserved it. I think many hon. members privately would prefer a plebiscite. The Ottawa *Citizen* of May 13 had an article headed "Put flag issue to voters."

Barry Mather (NDP—New Westminster) has called for a national plebiscite on this question.

If it could not achieve unanimity I think the best the committee should have done was to have narrowed the choice down to two designs. I think both sides were willing to accept a certain degree of compromise. On one side were the proponents of the three maple leaf flag, and on the other the proponents of the red ensign. It is perfectly obvious, because of the amount of emotion engendered in this debate, that neither of these designs would have been acceptable to the other group. For that reason my original suggestion was that the committee would do a great job by narrowing the choice to two designs, one of which would be acceptable to the proponents of the red ensign, with its main ingredient being the retention of the union jack and the fleur-de-lis, and the other the single maple leaf design.

Mr. Matheson: May I ask the hon. member a question? If he is suggesting that a plebiscite be restricted to two designs would it not make sense that the two designs be those which received the most votes in the committee, namely the three maple leaf flag and the one maple leaf flag?

Mr. Slogan: You want to have your cake and eat it too. I said I thought that in the spirit of compromise there should have been two designs, one that would satisfy the opposition to the three maple leaf design and the other which would satisfy the opposition to the red ensign. I would have been much happier had the committee recommended two designs instead of one. Both designs could then be put on a ballot in a plebiscite at the next general election.

There is a large section of people in the country which has strong emotional ties to the union jack. I do not believe the wishes of these people should have been overridden. I believe they should be taken into consideration in a plebiscite.

Back on July 21 the Montreal *Star* printed a small article headed, "Red Ensign Advocated by 149,465." I quote from that article, which said that the office of the Secretary of State had received 149,465 signatures on letters and petitions since July 1945 favouring the retention of the red ensign as Canada's national flag. This shows there is some sentiment in the country.

What about some of the polls that were conducted? If we are talking about a plebiscite perhaps we may conjecture a little on the outcome of it. There was the Gruneau survey which showed that in nine provinces the red ensign was leading and that in the province of Quebec the three maple leaf flag was leading, but because of the preponderance of opinion in Quebec, on a national basis there were more votes for the new design than for the red ensign.

In view of this, what has the government to fear from a plebiscite? If these polls are accurate to any degree—and I am not saying

they are—surely a plebiscite would solve the question for the government.

A large number of regional polls were conducted showing that the red ensign led the new flag by varying majorities. There was one held in Winnipeg and one in Newfoundland. The one in Winnipeg showed that 41 per cent liked the ensign as compared with 32 per cent for the three maple leaves. I could quote these articles at length. Norman Campbell in the Ottawa *Citizen* went to the trouble of dividing the letters received by the Prime Minister into five categories, one category calling for a referendum on the flag issue. The Ottawa *Journal* reported a 350 foot petition presented to the Prime Minister, advocating the ensign, sent from communities in Toronto and southern Ontario.

It is not just the Conservative party which is calling for a referendum. The Toronto *Telegram* of August 22 printed an editorial saying the voice of the people could be heard on this issue only through a national plebiscite. It said this was a matter which touched the hearts, emotions and loyalties of virtually all Canadians, and a parliamentary vote which would destroy the country's flag would foster strong feelings for years to come.

If that is not enough proof let us look back to 1961 when the Prime Minister was leader of the opposition. He was being interviewed on the radio, I believe. I am reading an excerpt from the Amherst *Daily News* of December 29, 1961. He was asked the question: "How would you poll the people on this?" The right hon. gentleman, who was then leader of the opposition, replied:

> We would poll the people when they have a general election and if they don't like the idea of a distinctive Canadian flag which cannot be mistaken for that of any other country they will let us know in no uncertain terms.

What has happened to the opinion the right hon. gentleman held in 1961? I realize hon. members opposite are in a precarious situation. They cannot say anything because if they back the Prime Minister today he may change his mind tomorrow and perhaps they do not all want to be as inconsistent as he has been.

Then there was another question addressed to the Prime Minister. He was asked whether he thought the country needed this symbol to hold us together. And the right hon. gentleman—he was then the leader of the opposition—replied:

> Yes, I think it would be a good idea to have a flag, a distinctive Canadian flag, in the interest of national unity.

[Mr. Slogan.]

He went on to say:

> We should try to solve this problem in a manner which would create the minimum of division and the maximum of unity.

We agree with all those sentiments and ideas put forward by the right hon. gentleman at that time and I, for one, can say I had a much greater regard for the Prime Minister when he was leader of the opposition than I have had for him since I have seen the way he holds the reins of government today.

Indeed, one reason for the desirability of holding a plebiscite on this issue is the inconsistency shown by the Prime Minister. The hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) indicated in the course of one of his speeches that the first flag chosen was the personal design of the Prime Minister and that it had not been placed before the caucus of Liberal members. The Prime Minister also indicated when this matter arose that parliament either had to choose this design or face a general election. I call that political blackmail. As a result of the views subsequently expressed on behalf of this party the Prime Minister backed away from that suggestion. There might have been other reasons. In support of this contention I will quote a headline from the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of June 18. It refers to the Prime Minister as regarding both flag votes as a confidence test. If we go on to July 20 we see that in the Toronto *Telegram* there is another headline: "Accept My Flag or Else, Warns a Defiant Pearson". The article says:

> Mr. Pearson is laying down the law with fire and fury after a breakdown of all-party talks on a firm agenda for the next month.

Well, the fire and the fury have turned into smoke which has camouflaged the real intention of the Liberal government. A month later we read the following headline in the Montreal *Gazette*: "Free Flag Vote—Pearson Calls Off the Whips". What was the reason for this? Let us consider another headline which appeared in the *Chronicle-Telegraph* on August 12—"Election on Flag Could Kill Liberals". So perhaps there are various political reasons why the Prime Minister has been vacillating and changing his mind. But those reasons are not based on principles; they are not based on the interest of national unity. They are based directly on the political advantages the right hon. gentleman had hoped to gain by being the one who would bring in a distinctive national flag. He was leader of the opposition when the former prime minister, the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) brought in the bill

of rights. That is a great monument to my hon. friend. But there is no monument to the right hon. gentleman, the present Prime Minister, and there is not likely to be one if we can judge from the performance of the party opposite.

At the beginning of my remarks I spoke about unity. I referred to the position taken then by the right hon. gentleman when he said that if elected prime minister he would ask the people of Canada to express their views on this matter and leave it up to them.

Mr. Winkler: That is all we are asking.

Mr. Slogan: Even if this issue were completely removed from the House of Commons I do not think it would be any great loss to the country. In fact, *Le Devoir* on August 22 had something to say in this regard. I quote from a translation:

> Let us not deplore the possible death of the Pearson project. The adoption of this project is not a matter of life or death for this country.
>
> Let us rather deplore the inconsistencies of a chief of government who in May last drew premature praise from us though events now force us to realize that in a matter of principle he is somewhat lost in a fog.

I wish the Prime Minister were in his place. He is very seldom there. I do not think he really likes the House of Commons.

Mr. Grégoire: What about you?

Mr. Slogan: You are not in your seat, either.

Mr. Grégoire: I am here, though.

Mr. Slogan: Not all there.

Mr. Winch: The Prime Minister has work to do, though.

Mr. Slogan: I have said it is difficult to achieve a unifying symbol in a country which itself is not unified. I claim that the country today is not united. It does not take a magnifying glass to see that. This confederation of ours seems to be bursting at every seam. The Prime Minister, in bringing forward this issue, has sown the seeds of discord across this country.

Mr. Grégoire: That has been said at least 600 times before.

Mr. Slogan: I deplore the fact that this issue has become an issue between the French speaking and the Anglo-Saxon Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Slogan: It is obvious and I could prove my contention if some hon. members would contain themselves.

Mr. Winkler: Who is saying "no"? Ask yourselves that question.

Mr. Dupuis: That issue divided your party, not Canada.

Mr. Winkler: I simply asked: who is saying "no"?

An hon. Member: It is dividing the Liberal party.

Mr. Dupuis: Your party is divided, not Canada.

Mr. Slogan: If the federal members from Quebec who believe in democracy would allow me to speak I will finish what I have to say.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Slogan: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) has always demonstrated that he has more brains in his seat than on his feet, and I ask him to contain himself.

Mr. Grégoire: Now you are right. Now I agree with you.

Mr. Slogan: Canada is made up of several groups of people—the Anglo-Saxons, the French and those of the third element. One of the reasons I am in favour of a referendum is that I think the Anglo-Saxon and the French fact has been played up out of all proportion. In my riding the Slavic and the German people are twice as numerous as are the Anglo-Saxons and the French. In this debate I am trying to portray some of their views. We have no antipathy toward either of those other groups. In fact we consider ourselves good Canadians and we consider our French neighbours and our Anglo-Saxon neighbours to be good Canadians, too. I grew up in a community where we began the morning in school by singing "O Canada" and ended it by singing "God Save the Queen".

We had no antipathy to either of those anthems. For a while we had the union jack flying over us; then we had the red ensign. We had as much devotion for one as for the other. I hope that as good Canadians, if any other design is voted for, we would show the same devotion to it. But, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the views of all Canadians could be presented in this house without their being called down, because I as a gentleman object to that type of behaviour in this house.

Mr. Grégoire: Be serious. Ready for the question.

Mr. Slogan: It is quite true that the Liberal party has modified its stand on this question a number of times and—

Mr. Grégoire: You said that two minutes ago.

Mr. Leboe: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think this has gone on long enough and it is not contributing anything to the debate. This hon. member, who is now sitting at the back here, is piping away and piping away, and I am getting fed up with it.

Mr. Churchill: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want to reinforce what has just been said. Special privileges in this house are being allowed the member for Lapointe and I think it is high time standing order 12(1) was applied in order that we may have the maintenance of order and decorum in this house. The member for Lapointe is the worst offender and yet he has not been called to order by the Speaker. He should be named and put out of the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Starr: Nobody would miss him.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Actually, I believe that the worst offenders against the rules of the house are the Conservatives who rehash continuously the same things, and we cannot help but bring it to their attention. They have reached the point of stupidity, and we show them they are being ridiculous. They should be expelled from the house.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The point raised by hon. members is well taken, but I believe I should bring to the attention of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre that the hon. member who interrupted was brought to order on a number of occasions in the course of the speech now being made by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Slogan).

Mr. Churchill: No, not once.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would ask the co-operation of the hon. member for Lapointe in allowing the hon. member who has the floor to continue and conclude his speech without interruption.

Mr. Grégoire: Yes, Mr. Speaker; but he does not have to repeat himself.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Mr. Slogan: Mr. Speaker, if anybody has repeated himself for the umpteenth time in this house, it is the hon. member.

Mr. Starr: And he has said nothing.

Mr. Slogan: I would hope he would bear the same good will toward me as a member of a minority group from the prairies as I bear toward him as a member of French Canadian origin from Quebec.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, on that point I would like to take—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Springfield has the floor. If the hon. member for Lapointe wants to raise a question of privilege or a point of order he will have to be recognized by the Chair; but I would suggest it might be more appropriate to extend to the hon. member the courtesy of concluding his remarks.

Mr. Grégoire: On a question of privilege, then, I would like to say to the hon. member for Springfield that I have nothing personal against him, that I admire him very much; but I cannot approve of the way that whole group is acting.

Mr. Churchill: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Springfield.

Mr. Slogan: Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks very shortly because I think my time is just about up. As I said at the very beginning, I am not here to fan any fires of racial hatred or anything else. I am speaking as a Canadian who loves his country, wants to see his country united, wants to see his country prosper in the world, and wants to see Canadians able to hold their heads high when they talk about their country. I believe I am expressing some of the views which should be taken to heart by all members of parliament. I think that in a spirit of good will we can thrash this question out, but it is perfectly obvious that this House of Commons cannot reach a decision on this matter without creating a great deal more disunity, without creating a great deal more animosity and bitterness and without opening many more wounds in the flesh of this country. I do not want to see this happen. I think we should have unity. I believe we as a parliament have failed our country by not being more unanimous in our views on this subject; but those views, though they are not unanimous, are strongly and loyally held in the interests of Canada. For this

reason I believe this question should be referred to Canadians themselves who should have the opportunity of reaching a final decision on the matter.

It would be easy for me, perhaps, to cast more ridicule, to fan more fires, and perhaps this would win me a few votes from one side or the other; but it would really do very little toward solving the problem before us. After all, a man must indeed be very small if he would sell his convictions for a few votes which might re-elect him to a House of Commons that is bitter and rudderless. To serve in such a house would indeed be a very empty prize. I do not believe we should allow that type of disunity to be the result of the question before us, and because of this I sincerely recommend to the Prime Minister and the house that they support our call for a national plebiscite.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Middlesex East (Mr. Millar).

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. C. E. Millar (Middlesex East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate for the second time I cannot help making a comment regarding our friends in the other parties who are continually saying, "Question, question". I cannot help feeling that this indicates the type of consideration we would get from those people if by any unfortunate chance they ever formed the government of this country. I think the fact that I have only spoken in this house on only two occasions indicates that I have been somewhat reluctant to express my views with regard to the flag issue.

I am well aware that this parliament is subject to considerable criticism because of the extended debate on the question of a new flag for this country. However, whenever I have an opportunity to speak to these same critics I generally try and pin them down by asking this question, "Do you accept the present design for a new flag for the Dominion of Canada as proposed by the Prime Minister of this country?" The immediate answer, of course, is "No". It is true that many of them believe we should have a new flag, but those who accept the present proposed design are very few. I then go on to indicate to these same people that in so far as the official opposition in this house are concerned, we are faced with one alternative and one alternative only. We are in the position where we either accept this flag or continue to debate it. I think I can safely speak for this party when I say that we choose to continue the debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. There are conversations across the aisle, passing between hon. members. I took the liberty yesterday to bring this to the attention of the house and I do so again. It is rather unbecoming and certainly offends the dignity of the house. I would ask hon. members to desist from this practice.

Mr. Millar: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is possible that these hon. members cannot hear me. The present Conservative amendment suggests that the people of Canada are entitled to the opportunity of indicating their feelings regarding a new flag for this country. I do not think this is unreasonable. I do not think it is undemocratic. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the present government is in a very delicate position; I repeat, a very delicate position.

Mr. Choquette: Your party is in a disastrous position.

Mr. Millar: Should the privilege of asking questions be restored this house, that position would be made quite apparent and some of our friends across the way who are now laughing might possibly consider the matter not quite so humorous. This government does not command the support of the majority of the voters of Canada. It is a minority government and I question its right to attempt to force upon the people of Canada, and the correctness of its attempting to force upon the people of Canada, a flag design which is not acceptable.

The present Prime Minister during the last election campaign—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I should like to call your attention especially to subsection 2 of standing order 34 which reads as follows:

> Mr. Speaker or the chairman, after having called the attention of the house, or of the committee, to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance, or repetition, may direct him to discontinue his speech—

Mr. Speaker, do you not feel that the remarks made the hon. member have been repeated over and over again?

In fact, those statements have been constantly repeated in the house and I would ask you, under standing order 34 (2) to direct the hon. member to discontinue his speech because he is constantly repeating himself.

Canadian Flag

Mr. Caouette: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that, with his knowledge, the hon. member for Lapointe could translate without too much trouble from French to Greek, so that Conservative members would understand precisely what he is doing at present.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Middlesex East.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to give a ruling on this matter.

Do you not feel that what the hon. member is repeating has already been said?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has listened to the point of order of the hon. member for Lapointe.

The remarks that the hon. member for Middlesex East (Mr. Millar) is making now seem pertinent to me. Besides, I have noted that his speech, up to this stage, had the character of an introduction, and I presume that in due time he will come to the amendment now before us.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order and your ruling—

Mr. Lambert: There is no appeal from the ruling, no comments to be made.

Mr. Caouette: No, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I can make comments, to say that there is no need to make repetitions at this stage.

When the hon. member for Winnipeg North South—

An hon. Member: Winnipeg South Centre.

Mr. Caouette: —or South Centre rises over and over again to ask you to call to order hon. members who repeat what other members have said, I think that it is time now for you to decide whether the hon. member who has the floor is in order or not. Personally, I feel that he is not, because he repeats what others have already said.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has already made its decision to the effect that it is satisfied, for the time being at least, that the hon. member who has the floor is in order.

[*Text*]

Mr. Millar: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If there is any member in this house who, to the disgust of us all, repeats himself more than anyone it is the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire).

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Perhaps the hon. member who has the floor will want to co-operate with the Chair and try to limit his remarks to the subject matter of the debate.

Mr. Millar: With all respect, Mr. Speaker, I think I had just stated—and I will repeat it for the benefit of the hon. member for Lapointe—that the present Conservative amendment proposes that the people of Canada shall have the opportunity of indicating in a democratic way whether or not they want a new flag for Canada. If that is not pertinent to the present amendment then I am prepared to apologize to the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, in paragraph 2 of standing order 34 it is also indicated that a member may not repeat things already said. That was the basis for my point of order and what the hon. member just said has been repeated at least 200 times in this house.

Indeed, you are aware of it yourself because listening to it seems to be boring you.

Therefore, you should endeavour to see to it that the same thing is not repeated too often. Indeed, those things were not repeated two, three, five or six times, but at least 200 times to date, and it is on that point that I am asking you to call the hon. member to order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has made a ruling on that.

I think that the hon. member for Lapointe is giving a somewhat too strict interpretation of the standing order he is referring to. In fact, during a debate I think it is obvious that hon. members making contributions must necessarily repeat to a certain extent arguments put forward by other hon. members taking part in the same debate.

The hon. member who has the floor now is referring to the motion itself and it seems to me that he cannot be accused of repetition, and it is on that point that the hon. member for Lapointe based his point of order.

The Chair's ruling is that the hon. member for Middlesex East is entitled to repetition and that he should be allowed to proceed with his remarks.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I rise once again on a point of order.

Even though, according to your ruling, the hon. member has the right to repeat himself, I must point out that we are considering an amendment concerning the flag issue, namely whether a plebiscite should or should not be held.

Well, the hon. member does not speak to the point at all. He has been speaking of everything except the plebiscite. Now, this afternoon—

[*Text*]

Mr. Winkler: There are all kinds of other things involved.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: —the Conservative deputy leader suggested that closure be applied and that the vote be taken immediately—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I do not feel there is any point of order in the remarks just made by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette).

I followed as closely as possible the remarks of the hon. member for Middlesex East (Mr. Millar). They seem entirely relevant to the amendment now before the house and I ask the hon. member for Villeneuve to co-operate in allowing the hon. member who has the floor to proceed with his speech.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I do not object to the hon. member for Middlesex East—

Mr. Dupuis: Est-milieu.

Mr. Caouette: —being heard. I simply abide by the standing order which requires—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Villeneuve is only repeating the argument he put forward a moment ago.

The Chair is perfectly aware of the standing order the hon. member is referring to and will see to it that it is respected should it feel the hon. member for Middlesex East is violating it.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, again on a point of order. The hon. member does not keep at all—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

The hon. member for Villeneuve is raising for the third time the same point of order on which the Chair gave a ruling.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to appeal your ruling, I just want to say that the hon. member who has the floor must respect the rules of the house.

Mr. Lambert: You too.

Mr. Caouette: I hear the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) tell me that I too—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member who has the floor must, of course, follow the rules of the house, and the hon. member for Villeneuve must do so also.

Since there was a ruling on that point, I shall ask the latter to abide by it so that the hon. member who has the floor may proceed with his remarks.

[*Text*]

Mr. Millar: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There seems to be some difference of opinion as to whom I must satisfy in this house—you, Your Honour, or the self-appointed speaker we have in the Créditiste party. I have no difficulty in making a decision in this regard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. This is not a point of order, but a question of privilege.

Is the hon. member entitled to mention my interventions concerning the nature of his remarks, the speech he is delivering, which is entirely irrelevant to the matter we are discussing at this moment, that is the amendment to decide whether or not we should hold a plebiscite in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to give a ruling on this point.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I recognize the hon. member for Middlesex East.

Mr. Millar: Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. I was about to suggest that the present Prime Minister came to the city of London during the election campaign and spoke to some 5,000 people, all good Canadians, though not my supporters, yet he made no mention of a new flag for Canada at that time.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Millar: That is true.

Mr. Caouette: Talk about the plebiscite. Order.

Mr. Millar: What I have said is the fact.

Some hon. Members: Resign.

Mr. Millar: Perhaps I should resign. If the hon. member will keep quiet I will repeat what I have said.

Mr. Caouette: Oh, no, do not repeat.

Mr. Millar: The present Conservative amendment proposes that the people of Canada shall have the opportunity of indicating in a democratic way whether or not they want a new flag for Canada. Does that satisfy the hon. member?

An hon. Member: You read very well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Canadian Flag

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member for Villeneuve raising a point of order?

Mr. Caouette: Yes, I am raising a point of order.

What has this vote to do with the amendment we are now discussing, namely: Are we in favour of a plebiscite or not?

The hon. member should confine his remarks to that question.

The flag issue, the design of the flag are irrelevant.

The fact that we should have a distinctive national flag is completely irrelevant to the Conservative amendment which calls for the holding of a plebiscite.

Let the hon. member tell us why he is in favour of a plebiscite or against it.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps that will satisfy the hon. member but it does not satisfy the Chair. The hon. member at this moment is obviously inviting trouble, and I would ask him to co-operate with the Chair, because the rules of this house apply also to him. Will he please limit his remarks to the subject we have before us.

Mr. Millar: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Am I allowed to indicate that I appreciate the extension of my time provided by the interjections of hon. members.

Last Monday in the city of London I had the opportunity of speaking to some 160 school children. It was suggested that I speak on the flag issue. I submit that this subject is relevant. I was hesitant in speaking about this matter in view of the controversial nature of the debate now taking place in this house. However, I attempted to give the history of the flag debate up to this time, including an outline of the method of selection used by the flag committee. At that time I had three photographs of the proposed designs. The suggestion was made that these pupils from grades 6, 7 and 8 be given the opportunity of voting on the various designs. I indicated my agreement with this proposal, but unfortunately I had forgotten to bring a copy of the red ensign, which is presently Canada's flag.

Mr. Caouette: It is not.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

Mr. Millar: However, that was soon remedied.

An hon. Member: It is so.

Mr. Plourde: It is not.

Mr. Millar: I think it is relevant and pertinent that I indicate the results of this vote.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Millar: The Pearson pennant, which has been rejected, received 55 votes. The composite design received 18 votes. The single maple leaf design, which is the current proposal, received three votes, and the red ensign received 85 votes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Plourde: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the point of order.

I notice that for a quarter of an hour the present speaker has been scratching his back against the desk behind him; he falters, the words fail him, he says nothing, he does not know what to say. In that case, he should sit down and let us vote.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I recognize the hon. member for Greenwood.

Mr. Brewin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I suggest to hon. members that even if the member for Middlesex East is being slightly repetitive and irrelevant this is not new, so we might as well be patient and listen to what he has to say without further interruptions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Villeneuve has suggested that the remarks of the hon. member who has the floor are not relevant. It is the opinion of the Chair that the argument he advanced is, to a considerable extent, irrelevant to the matter of the amendment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It seems to me that the argument he has advanced would indicate that he is proceeding by induction in the same way the hon. member for Lapointe did yesterday.

Mr. Millar: I thank you again, Mr. Speaker. In self-defence I should like to say to the member who has just suggested I do not know what I am talking about, that if he will give me an opportunity to do so, I will show him that I do know what has been happening.

I am speaking about the plebiscite, Mr. Speaker, and that seems to be a pertinent subject. I had just finished indicating the results of a plebiscite held in a classroom in the city of London. The point I should like to make at this time is that if the results of this vote are any indication of the feelings of the people in my riding then I have every right to be standing in this house and speaking in the manner in which I am speaking.

Mr. Grégoire: No.

Mr. Winkler: Certainly.

Mr. Caouette: Why not vote on the amendment?

Mr. Millar: Why don't you fellows go outside and settle the argument and let me talk?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. May I suggest to the hon. member that he direct his remarks to the Chair. The Chair is listening very attentively to them.

Mr. Millar: I apologize, Mr. Speaker. You are absolutely right. I suggest that other people in the house should do likewise rather than addressing their remarks to me. Following the ballot held in this schoolroom I gave the children the opportunity of asking questions which I answered to the best of my ability in a strictly non-political way.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Millar: Well, I was at least fair enough to suggest to that class that the next member of parliament who addressed them might be of a different political faith than that represented by myself. To get back to the questions, there was one question I could not answer. A young lad about 10 years of age spoke up and said: "Mr. Millar, why do the people of Canada not have the opportunity to vote on the new flag?" What I should have done was suggest that he direct that question to the Prime Minister of the country.

The present government has tried to justify the introduction of this controversial issue on the ground that it will unite Canada. I suggest that if the division throughout Canada is indicated by the division in this house and the present controversy, the Prime Minister of the country has done the greatest disservice he could possibly do, and that the only way the situation can be remedied is to take this issue out of the House of Commons.

I for one, Mr. Speaker, question the design of the present flag. I question the sincerity of the present leader of the government. Where is the Prime Minister who stood up and said: "I support the tri-maple leaf flag and I am prepared to have my government stand or fall on that design"?

An hon. Member: He did not say that.

Mr. Millar: Where are those few members on the government side who stood up and took up the time of the house trying to justify that design as having historical significance, and as being the only flag design acceptable in this situation? Where are they today? Where are those members of the government who blindly support the government and refuse to stand up in the House of Commons and justify their position? Are those the people who continually say "question, question", and are prepared to vote blindly?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Millar: Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I question the design of this flag.

Mr. Grégoire: Dispense.

Mr. Millar: In support of my stand I should like to read a letter into the record. I think all members should listen to this, particularly those French Canadian members who are so interested in interrupting me. This letter is written by one, Lord Elgin, at Quebec. The date of the letter is September, 1847.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I am wondering whether that letter is relevant to the amendment before us.

Mr. Millar: If it is not relevant I am prepared to have it struck from the record. It is dated Quebec, September 27, 1847 and is written by one, Lord Elgin.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Plourde: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Reading letters dating from 1845 or 1847 is really too much. Do you think the hon. member for Middlesex East (Mr. Millar) abides by the rules? We of the Ralliement Créditistes, as well as some members of other parties have both feet on the ground. People ask why the Tories are filibustering; it is precisely because they are up in the clouds, they balk. We expressly object to this letter being read, and we request that the hon. member be called to order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I see that the hon. member for Quebec West shares the apprehension of the Chair as to whether this

letter is relevant to the debate or not. However, it is not easy to give a ruling before the letter has been read, at least in part.

Mr. Plourde: Mr. Speaker, as this letter goes back to 1847, that is over a century ago, it is exactly the reason why I object to its being read.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Middlesex East has the floor. As part of his argument he proposes to read a letter which may be perfectly relevant, or which may possibly be relevant to the debate. It is impossible for the Chair to determine that until the letter has been read, or referred to to some extent. I would invite the hon. member to continue his remarks and perhaps as he proceeds to read the letter it may be easier for the Chair to make a decision.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understand that the hon. member for Middlesex East is reading to us a letter dating back to 1847. Does he imply that we in the House of Commons are Indians? What does he mean by his letter?

Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Mr. Speaker will have the privilege of rendering a decision on this interesting point tomorrow.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, December 10, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

CANADIAN FLAG

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SIXTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Wednesday, December 9, consideration of the motion of Mr. Batten that the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, be now concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Monteith.

Mr. C. E. Millar (Middlesex East): Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the debate at six o'clock last night I was questioning the authority of this minority government to impose a new flag on the people of Canada without giving them the opportunity of indicating their feelings in this regard. Further to that and in support of this position I would like to read into the record a letter dated Quebec, September 27, 1847.

Mr. Grégoire: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I ask the hon. member whether the letter is relevant to the question of a plebiscite that we are discussing at the present time.

Mr. Millar: I consider it so, Mr. Speaker. Should you rule that it should be stricken from the record, I am prepared to accept your decision. This is an authentic copy of a letter taken from the public archives of Canada reproduced as one of a series appearing weekly in the London *Free Press*. It is from one James Bruce, Earl of Elgin and Kincardine, to Earl Grey, dated Quebec, September 27, 1847, and reads as follows:

My Dear Grey:

I write from Quebec and shall not trouble you with a long letter. We have been well received here. The St. Georges and St. Jean Baptiste societies turning out together for the first time and the president of the former wearing the maple leaf, the Canadian French emblem...

I repeat, Mr. Speaker:

—wearing the maple leaf, the Canadian French emblem...

My question, Mr. Speaker, is this. Is it the intention of the Prime Minister, the leader of a minority government, to destroy a Canadian flag bearing the heraldic symbols of all the founding races of this country and substitute a flag bearing the traditional symbol of only one of these founding races? The Prime Minister has suggested that the prime purpose of the introduction of this flag in the House of Commons at this time is that a new flag will serve to unite all of Canada. With this principle I think all Canadians agree, but with the method adopted and with this suggested design many of us disagree.

Again I ask, Mr. Speaker: surely the Prime Minister of this country does not seek unity under a distinctive Canadian flag in a design such as now proposed, which in effect destroys all reference to the Anglo-Saxon traditions, substituting for this present flag a new flag design bearing only a single maple leaf which was recognized 120 years ago as the Canadian French emblem. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that our French Canadian members in this House of Commons would not support this position. They themselves have stated on many previous occasions that they are not anxious to have the fleur-de-lis, the traditional emblem of France, as a part of a new Canadian flag, similar to the flag design presently used in the province of Quebec.

Mr. Grégoire: Question.

Mr. Millar: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is more than just a debate on a new flag for Canada. The way this house is divided at present indicates that there is a basic principle at stake. Those members who support the government on every division indicate that they would be prepared to support any design as a new flag for Canada. Their attitude seems to indicate the feeling "Who cares about a new flag for Canada or what the design shall be? Let us vote and get the issue over with". I suggest that there is a much deeper issue involved and that those members who so freely call "Question, question", indicating that they are prepared to vote, are by the same token indicating that they are prepared to deny that same right to the people of Canada.

Mr. Caouette: No, sir, that is not right. That is stupid.

Mr. Millar: The hon. member for Lapointe has had someone tabulate the number of times the word "plebiscite" has been used in this debate. He further quotes statistics in this regard as to the possible waste of time in this house. I should like to suggest to him that if a similar tabulation was kept of the number of times the word "Quebec" had been used in this house he would not find the comparison quite so humorous.

In this same regard, I deplore the remarks that follow when one of the French Canadian members of this party stands to indicate his support for this party in a division. Surely any hon. member who has the courage of his convictions and is prepared to stand up and be counted for or against his party is entitled to that same decency and courtesy which is due to any hon. member of this house. I for one respect the right of any member in this regard, and I do not feel that a member deserves the boos and catcalls of his fellow members.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say this.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Millar: I am pleased to hear that some of the hon. gentlemen opposite are satisfied. I feel the same way, I can assure you.

It would appear that the government is determined to follow this course of destruction, or should I say desecration, of the red ensign. If such is the case; if this government is prepared to ignore the people of Canada and their basic democratic right to indicate their feelings in this matter, may I make one final plea to the Prime Minister. When the Canadian red ensign is finally taken down from the peace tower of the House of Commons, could that red ensign be placed in a position of honour in the memorial chamber of the same peace tower, to indicate that those Canadians who served in Canada's armed forces have not died in vain and that they have not been entirely forgotten by the grateful people of Canada.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we have before us a motion for concurrence in a report of a committee moved by the chairman, the hon. member for Humber-St. George's (Mr. Batten), and an amendment moved by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith). I should like immediately to ask the government what is its position in this regard. The Prime Minister has not made the government's position clear. Does the government accept the recommendation of the committee, and will the flag recommended be the flag of Canada? If the report is concurred in, will the government take action to make this new flag the flag of Canada? Those are some of the things about which the house has a right to know.

What action will be taken by the government to carry out the terms of the order in council of 1945 which clearly set out that the red ensign shall be flown as the distinctive flag of Canada until parliament otherwise directs? These are things we would like to know, for in the intervening months since the Prime Minister made his speech in the house, at which time he said it was a solemn and historic moment in the history of Canada, these questions have not been answered.

Naturally there are a number of other questions that come to mind. What of the three leaf flag? Has it been dropped by the government? Does the Prime Minister now reject the three leaf flag that was the cornerstone of his argument then? These are things we want to know. However, all we have found out as yet is that the government and those associated with them seem agreed on only one thing, namely that whatever the national flag of Canada may be they are almost unanimous in the view that under no circumstances shall it in any way reveal or show or exemplify the symbols of our British or French sovereignty, or the heritage of our past. The Prime Minister has said that the flag to be determined on will be one that will bring about unity within this country. The experience of the last few months has been that while unity was promised, division has been the offspring.

I commence with that general challenge to the Prime Minister to answer these questions that are in the hearts and minds of the Canadian people. The house will agree, I am sure, when I say that while the debate has gone on for some weeks the viewpoint of the government has never been given since the declaration made by the Prime Minister in June, at which time he made it clear that the three maple leaf design with the two blue bars was the only flag for Canada. It had history, heritage, dedication, as well as a declaration behind it of His Majesty George V. None of these things is apparent today in the recommendation of the committee.

I refer for a moment to the report of the committee to lay the foundation for my argument in connection with the need for a plebiscite for Canada and for Canadians,

believing that a plebiscite should encompass not only those who ordinarily would be permitted to vote on the occasion of a general election but as well all Canadians 18 years and over; for the younger Canadians will be the ones who will live the longest under whatever flag is determined upon.

Now, it is of interest that in the committee a motion for a national plebiscite was defeated by a vote of 9 to 5. It is of even greater interest that the adoption of only one national flag was carried by a vote of 14 to 0, only to be altered later apparently following further discussion and deliberation; that the red ensign was not to be the national flag of Canada was determined by a vote of the committee of 10 to 4. Those four were the Conservative members of that committee.

Then, finally, an elimination took place. All this is necessary if one is to understand fully the need for a plebiscite. An elimination took place, and I should like to quote from the committee report so there will be no misunderstanding. There were two classes of flags; class B, those containing one maple leaf, and class C, those containing the union jack and/or the fleur-de-lis. I quote from the report:

> Elimination by an agreed procedure left only one design in each category. A vote for the retention of each finalist was then taken with the following results:
>
> A—The three maple leaf design was retained by a vote of 8 to 6;
>
> B—The single maple leaf design was retained by a vote of 13 to 1;
>
> C—The design containing the union jack and/or the fleur-de-lis was rejected by a vote of 9 to 5.
>
> A vote was then taken to determine the committee's preference between the design containing three maple leaves and the design containing one maple leaf. The single maple leaf design was retained by a vote of 14 to 0.

It is made perfectly clear by that vote that it was a preference as between two designs that were before the committee. This is the committee report in part, most of which will have to be, as we say, placed before the Canadian people. It was then moved:

> That the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to provide that the Canadian red ensign may continue to be flown as a symbol of Canada's membership in the commonwealth of nations and of her allegiance to the crown. An amendment was moved to substitute the words "royal union flag, generally known as the union jack" for the words "Canadian red ensign."
>
> The amendment carried by a vote of 7 yeas, 2 nays and 5 abstentions.

There is the background of the matter set out objectively and fairly by quotations from the committee report. What actually happened was that the committee expressed a preference, as I said a moment ago, for the single leaf in an elimination process over the three leaf flag that the government had advanced as its design the first time.

Now, sir, I want to refer to the stand we took on November 9 as to the course that might be adopted, following the report of the committee. I am quoting from page 9877 of *Hansard* of November 9, 1964:

> We were unable to agree with the suggestion that we should apply to ourselves a self imposed closure, but my own feeling is this. In so far as the flag debate is concerned, this represents the views of my caucus, the caucus of the Conservative party—
>
> I think quite a number wish to express themselves on this matter. That does not mean they will be repeating themselves more than once, but they have their views to express and they do not intend to have imposed on them anything in the nature of closure, other than, of course, if the government chooses in its wisdom to bring about that measure; and we will come to that matter if it arises. We do feel however, that in order to expedite the business of the house Canadians as a whole would expect us to vote on the question whether there should be a plebiscite.

Then I went on to ask consideration for that view. Now I want to summarize our position on the report. We cannot accept the recommendation contained therein. The Social Credit party, with one or two exceptions, accept it. The socialist party—they have a maple leaf on their literature—will accept it with one or two exceptions. The Créditistes embrace it because they do not want anything connected with the British tradition on the flag of this nation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: During the progress of that committee we made alternative suggestions with which I shall deal later on. We wanted to bring about in a spirit of compromise the assurance that what would be arrived at would meet with general support across Canada. What was advanced in the committee by the Conservative representatives after the red ensign had been turned down was a design I did not know of and of which I was never informed; I had no information about it until I read a report which a member of that committee gave to the press before that committee reported.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What was advanced by our members, after first standing on the red ensign, was a flag consisting of two red bars, one bearing the union jack and in the other the fleur-de-lis and in the centre a maple

leaf on a white background, in other words representing the two original races of our nation unified with all the other races by the maple leaf. That is what they tried to bring about, again without success.

I would emphasize this fact; that during the entire progress of the committee I refrained from discussing this question with members of that committee so they would not feel in any way that the course they were to follow was dictated in any manner, shape or form. Now we have before us a flag—

Mr. Deachman: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and it is a serious one. Mention has been made of an article I wrote and of the fact that there was no communication on the part of the right hon. gentleman with anybody before the decision of the committee was brought down. I have in my hand the *Globe and Mail* for Friday, October 3 and I wish to read the following—

Mr. Diefenbaker: This is not a question of privilege. I never mentioned the hon. member. Has he a guilty conscience?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Yesterday when the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra rose on a question of privilege I referred him to Beauchesne, citation 145, which is to the effect that when a member makes a statement it should be accepted by the house. If other members are not prepared to accept such a statement they have to bring a motion and take responsibility for it.

No charge has been made against the hon. member so far in the address of the Leader of the Opposition, and if citation 145 protects the hon. member to my right surely it would operate in this case, too.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is perfectly and patently clear that the Conservative members of the committee in introducing their alternative, after the refusal of the committee to accept the red ensign, changed or altered their submission in order to show not only the British tradition of our country but the French as well. They did that to indicate the degree of entire objectivity which characterized the Conservative representation on that committee.

That is the background to the question. I now ask the house—and I intend to answer the question—why do we want a plebiscite? Sir, it is because there is division within our country—

Mr. Grégoire: You have made it.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, the prattlers prattle, but we had nothing to do with introducing the flag question. Did we bring this matter before the house? Has it become a divisive action for a party in the House of Commons to stand against a proposal which a government advances when that proposal does not represent the views of millions of Canadians?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We are calling for a plebiscite because we trust the people of Canada to arrive at some decision which will be generally acceptable. I believe this with all my heart, that if this matter were allowed by the government to stand in abeyance, no one suggesting any retreat or departure or deviation from the parliamentary course; if it were allowed to stand and if at the next general election a number of questions were asked in a plebiscite, then whatever was believed by a majority in this country as shown by such a plebiscite would be acceptable to all Canadians, because we are all desirous of bringing about unity in the national purpose and for national ends.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Grégoire: Not true.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I cannot translate into understandable words those interruptions, but no doubt they are intelligible to the hon. gentleman who is making them.

Sir, there are many people in this country who want the red ensign. There are many others who want a red ensign with a change therein so as to recognize the contribution made by the two original races. Some there are who, convinced by months of propaganda, now want the three maple leaf design. After all, it was a concept which was widely advertised, and it was placed on stamps by coincidence. There are Canadians who like that design. Certainly the Post Office Department, though I admit the Postmaster General did not know anything about this—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —had that stamp issued. It was just what some call the purest of coincidence, in keeping with the fact that ministers opposite apparently do not communicate with one another or pass on information.

My correspondence shows there are fewer people who want the one maple leaf design, the recommendation of the committee. You can understand that. You cannot expect the Canadian people to be able to follow the

peregrinations of a government which started out with a three maple leaf flag, said it was the only true Canadian design, that it was based on history, heraldry and structure, and then changed its mind. One hon. member said it was a flag design that was sanctified as well; he stated that it was full of historic meaning, symbolic validity and national appeal. It was, he said, the only flag that could be accepted.

I point out that we asked for a plebiscite as far back as May 20. When I asked for a plebiscite and it was suggested there should be a submission of the question to the people by way of referendum, the Prime Minister said that course would not be followed. All the way along we took the stand that, after all, it is the people who are going to live under this flag who should have a say as to the nature and design of that flag.

So that the record will be complete, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that on July 22, when speaking on the national television network, I said we wanted the people of Canada to have a say in the matter. I suggested that a plebiscite be granted to the Canadian people in order that we could determine their wishes. I said that such a plebiscite could take place at the next general election. Among the questions to be asked—and I set them out—I suggested: Are you in favour of the red ensign? Are you in favour of the red ensign with changes made thereon to show both heritages? Are you in favour of the three maple leaves joined together?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Grégoire: No.

Mr. Woolliams: Listen to the conscientious objectors.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, a few short weeks ago those who now prate and interrupt were in favour of that which today they condemn.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I also suggested the question: Are you in favour of one maple leaf? Since then I would also add: Are you in favour of that which was presented as an alternative and a compromise by the Conservative members of the flag committee?

Mr. Grégoire: No, no.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether it is just an echo I am hearing, but it certainly is not intelligible.

Mr. Grégoire: No.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): It is a reflection on Quebec, I'll tell you that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hold to the opinion that order and decorum in this House of Commons is extremely important. It is in the tradition of our two races, and it should be maintained. It is incorporated in our standing orders. I would refer to standing order 35:

> No member shall speak disrespectfully of Her Majesty, nor of any of the royal family, nor of His Excellency or the person administering the government of Canada; nor use offensive words against either house, or against any member thereof.

May I appeal to hon. members that when an officer of the house in the person of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition is making a speech, which no doubt is quite a physical effort, he should be given due respect and attention.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I do not mind questions at all, but it is difficult to speak against a cacophony. It is like a symphony continuing while one speaks.

Mr. Nowlan: One of the broken ones.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege—

An hon. Member: Sit down, little squirt.

Mr. Grégoire: —may I ask a question—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I had come to the point where I said that included in the plebiscite should be the design submitted by Conservative members as an alternative in order to bring members together, namely the one to which I referred earlier. There are some who say if we had a plebiscite we would divide this nation. Plebiscites have been held in the past that did not have that effect. Plebiscites are held on matters which have an emotional effect. Plebiscites have been recommended by such prime ministers as Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Mr. Robert Borden—when he was in opposition—and Mr. Mackenzie King on matters that touch the heart and the sentiment of a people. No one can successfully argue that members of this parliament on either side have ever let the Canadian people know that, standing as they did for a distinctive flag—and I think each and every one did—what the Liberal party had in mind was a flag devoid of anything suggesting our British heritage or indeed our French heritage.

The arguments have changed in connection with the holding of a plebiscite. Your Honour will recall that the Prime Minister, when speaking in June, said it would take time; that was an argument against it. He said, speaking of the plebiscite of 1942 on conscription, that it required many months from the introduction of legislation on February 13, 1942 to the announcement of the result on May 11, 1942. That was the excuse in June, that it would take time. I do not think anyone will say any more that this excuse is tenable. On more than one occasion we advanced this idea. Some will say this would create discord in the nation; that elections, as the Prime Minister said, are by constituencies and that the cleavages would be highlighted in a plebiscite in the same manner as in an election. Well, Mr. Speaker, if there is any danger of dividing the country, that could be met by the votes being counted not by provinces but by a central committee, so there would be no indication as to how any one province voted but they would vote one and all as Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The next objection was that it would cost millions of dollars, $10 million and more. Nothing of the kind, if held at the time of a general election; and with all the billions of dollars that are being spent, if it did cost $10 million that would be a cheap expenditure to bring about within this nation a feeling of unity in this regard.

Would it be divisive? Is Ottawa divided as a result of the fluoridation and Sunday sport plebiscite of the other day? Every argument advanced is dissipated by the facts of life. We in this party trust the people. We want the people to have the right to speak. We want to know that whatever flag is chosen is the flag Canadians want, not one imposed by concealing from the Canadian people the true facts about the kind of distinctive flag they intended to advance. Now they are supported by their allies in this house.

That there is uncertainty about this is revealed by the fact that the government itself has changed its view. I do not want to recall in detail the change of viewpoint, but is it not a strange thing that a few months ago the government said "Three maple leaves or disunity in Canada"? Only Her Majesty's loyal opposition stood against that statement, and hon. gentlemen opposite called it obstruction. They said they had a design which would unite the Canadian people. Then when the committee met they swallowed their views and went contrary to that which they said was the only design for Canada.

The Prime Minister said that a one maple leaf design was not acceptable, that it would not be suitable, and I will refer to that in a moment. What happened? Why the change? During the months of May, June, July and August these hon. members opposite, with their allies, were talking in favour of the three maple leaf flag, describing it as the only one. Then suddenly, overnight as it were, they changed their attitude. Were they right when they tried to push down the throats of Canadians the three maple leaf flag? Were they consistent when they abdicated from their previous position? I would be glad to hear the answers to those questions.

I said a moment ago that they educated the people into believing that the three maple leaf flag was the only flag. Let us just review events for a moment, because this shows that these hon. members opposite did not know themselves where they stood. They were united in support of something they jettisoned at the first opportunity. They tell me that a plebiscite is not necessary. If, Mr. Speaker, a plebiscite had been taken of the views of government members in May, June, July and August they would all have voted in favour of the three maple leaf flag. But what do they say of it now? They have changed their views, a not unusual course on the part of this government.

Hon. gentlemen opposite started out on this education process on April 17 when, as I said a moment ago, the stamps were issued by the department of the Postmaster General. On April 17, when the Prime Minister was asked in the House of Commons whether this was the chosen design, the design elect, he said it was pure speculation. Yet all across Canada, on that day and on following days, a picture of the three maple leaf flag was printed in the newspapers.

Then on May 14 the Prime Minister unveiled his flag to newsmen, tastefully draped on the mantelpiece at Sussex drive. On May 14, when asked in the House of Commons whether this was going to be Canada's flag, he said that no decision had been made. On May 16 the Postmaster General explained in an interview the symbolism of the three maple leaf design, stating that one leaf represented the English, one represented the French and the third represented those of other origins. That was the view of someone in his department and was not the fact. It had no basis in fact, for one has only to—

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Diefenbaker: No, the hon. gentleman cannot interrupt me now.

Mr. Speaker: The Postmaster General is rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, this matter was raised during the last speech made by the right hon. gentleman. At that time I rose and stated that when his government were in power they issued a press release stating what the three maple leaves stood for. It was not this government which initiated that particular explanation.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, that statement came from the same department. All I have to say in that connection is that that was unadulterated nonsense. In 1868, when the coat of arms of Quebec bore three maple leaves on one stem, was anybody thinking at that time of other racial origins? In 1868 in the province of Ontario, when that design appeared on a memorial plate of Ontario, was anybody thinking then about this? They could have been thinking of those of German or Dutch origin, because there were some 220,000 of them in Canada; but this had no basis in fact. It was simply part of the softening process of this government to bring about a flag which the Prime Minister desired.

On May 17 the three maple leaf flag was unveiled before the Royal Canadian Legion. The Prime Minister disavowed the ensign and talked about his maple leaf flag. On May 18 he revealed the design to the press at Winnipeg. Then he denied in parliament that a decision had been made. On May 29 he brought the design before parliament, and then placed on the order paper a resolution containing two parts. This is a resolution which should be placed on the record because it indicates, Mr. Speaker, that the government did not know where it was going. One of the reasons we want to bring back a sense of reason is to give the Canadian people the opportunity of saying what in fact they want. The resolution then read:

> That the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to establish officially as the flag of Canada a flag embodying the emblem proclaimed by His Majesty King George V on November 21, 1921—three maple leaves conjoined on one stem—in the colours red and white then designated for Canada, the red leaves occupying a field of white between vertical sections of blue on the edges of the flag—

The resolution also provided:

> —that the royal union flag, generally known as the union jack, may continue to be flown as a symbol of Canadian membership in the commonwealth of nations and of our allegiance to the crown.

Then, sir, on the basis of the authorities and by virtue of the power possessed by Your Honour, you divided that resolution into two resolutions.

During the progress of the debate—and this shows how uncertain the government has been of its stand—the members of the government marshalled all the arguments of heraldry. The Minister without Portfolio went into the flag business. He had 100,000 of them made. I do not know, in the bankruptcy proceedings in connection with these flag designs, who is responsible for them or whether they will be designated as plain ordinary furniture; all I know is that they said our opposition to the three maple leaf flag was disruptive of Canadian unity. They tried to bludgeon us. They tried to threaten us. First of all they said there would be an election. Then they talked of closure. But Her Majesty's loyal opposition stood for what it believed in; a matter of principle, not an expedient to be adopted to meet every changing wind of public opinion.

Hon. gentlemen opposite said that because they had a majority in parliament, with the help of their complacent supporters and the complacent support of third parties, therefore indeed they were infallible in their viewpoint. They could not help but be right. Walter Lippmann once said in this connection the idea that because you could command a majority, therefore you were right, is heresy. He said it was heresy to think a majority could do no wrong; that there is no higher truth than the transient opinion of contemporary majorities, and there is no higher law than the ambitions and manoeuvres of the persons the people are persuaded to elect. He said that was also heresy.

When the government found they could not push us around they changed their viewpoint from that which they held at the beginning, that unless this resolution was passed and everybody voted in the right way the vote would be regarded as a vote of nonconfidence. When the opposition took a strong stand they then said no, it will be a free vote. The freedom of that vote will be indicated by the attitude the members on that side have taken toward the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) who is treated almost as a pariah.

Why deny our historic past? Why say that we should not have on our national emblem something of the greatness of our past, and something of the French contribution? History tells the reason. In 1776 what could one expect of the French colonists in Canada of that day, who only had a few years under British rule, but that they would rebel? That is what the leaders of the army of the 13 colonies thought, but the French stood firm.

What happened in 1812 when the United States commander, General Hull, said to Canadians "You people surrender or things will be terrible because we will overrun you and destroy you"? The answer given by the French Canadians was "We shall not surrender. We stand behind those institutions which have given us freedom."

When I hear hon. members sitting opposite in this house, and some of those to my left, ridiculing the possession of British citizenship by Canadians, I am reminded of the words of Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, who occupied the position you occupy, Mr. Speaker, and who gave his 17 year old son on the field of sacrifice in the first world war. He said:

> If you ask me why I am a British subject, and why I wish to remain one, I reply...that I prize most those institutions that secure me most strongly in our rights and liberties; and am proud to be a sharer in that great work of advancing peace and progress throughout the world, for which the British empire stands.

That is the view of French Canada today among those who are being responsible in their positions.

Mr. Grégoire: Who said that?

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am not speaking about that hon. gentleman; I am speaking about the great heart of French Canada. Is it not time that we recall something of the change of thinking on the part of the Prime Minister? On June 15 as recorded at page 4322 of *Hansard* he said this:

> Indeed, the three joined red maple leaves have for us a historic and heraldic significance which, in my view, make them preferable on a flag, to a single maple leaf which has not the same significance and has not, in fact, any formal emblematic authority—

What happened, Mr. Speaker? Do you expect the Canadian people led by ideas such as that not to be able to determine that they have been misled?

The Prime Minister then said in summary that heraldically and historically that was the only suitable flag, and I want to make this clear because this shows the political attitude of this government and their willingness to change their viewpoint. It is very much like the position of Mr. Dooley, who said "This is what I think, but if you do not agree with me I am prepared to change my view." One cannot run a government that way.

This is what the Prime Minister said when dealing again with the three maple leaves design:

> It is because this design has such a history and because, with the blue sea to sea border it makes a striking and beautiful flag, that the government is putting it before parliament in this resolution. The single maple leaf, I repeat, has not the same historical and heraldic significance even though it also, with the blue borders, I am told makes a very attractive flag.

That was what the Prime Minister said in June, that the blue borders indicating Canada from sea to sea in fact make the flag more attractive. Where are the blue borders on the flag proposed today that were so attractive in June? Then dealing with the argument about history the Prime Minister said:

> It is argued, Mr. Speaker, and I can appreciate the strength of the argument, that the flag of this resolution ignores our past. In my view it does not.

Then he said:

> In light of this, Mr. Speaker, can there be any doubt that the design recommended in the resolution is a proper one; with Canadian history, Canadian tradition and official sanction on the highest levels behind it?

The members on that side of the house do not themselves know what they want. What they argued in June they have repudiated in September. Yet had it not been for the Conservative party, as Her Majesty's loyal opposition, we would now have the flag of the three maple leaves design; and we might have had it on July 1, the original deadline. The government then thought it would be good to have that flag for the visit of the Queen in October, but again there was a postponement until Christmas.

Is it not clear from reading what was said by the Prime Minister that the arguments which we advanced had some basis in fact? If that is not so, why did the members of the Liberal party on that committee, without direction, without suggestion and without even telepathic consideration, suddenly see the light and decide that the views of the Prime Minister in June were entirely without basis in fact? Perhaps we are to interpret what took place as an indication that the Liberal members on that committee revolted against the Prime Minister's flag—perish the thought. Did they act with such unanimity because they had been given instructions? I suggest that was not the case.

They have now suggested that a plebiscite would be disruptive. I should like to refer to the criticism of the Progressive Conservative party for taking a stand on a plebiscite. We have been condemned and reviled, and called obstructionists.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, one can take a donkey and give him arguments, but one cannot give him the sense to understand.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I immediately assure you, Mr. Speaker, that had no reference to anyone. It was just a philosophical observation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I think this is justified on my part, because we have heard enough falsehoods and lies this afternoon concerning what happened in the House of Commons during the last three or four months.

I think the leader of the official opposition is listening to me. When he said, a few moments ago, that, with the complacent support of the third parties in the house—he did mention us, if not by name, by implication—the three maple leaf flag was changed to a design with a single maple leaf, and that everybody had complied with the wishes of the government—

[*Text*]

Some hon. Members: Order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: I can understand the Conservatives not enjoying having the facts thrown in their face, but they will get them nevertheless.

Mr. Speaker, the setting up of the parliamentary committee to consider the choice of a distinctive flag was suggested by the Leader of the Opposition and nobody else.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, there is no point of privilege. I have sat here and listened to this—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —and all I say is that a speech is in order if the hon. gentleman wants to make it.

Mr. Speaker: I am quite sure that if the hon. member for Villeneuve wishes to take part in the debate he will have an opportunity in due course, but I do not see a point of privilege. No particular label or name of any particular party was used. The term could be applied to anyone in the chamber.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I entirely agree with you, Mr. Speaker, but I think you went a little wide there.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Villeneuve is really engaging in an argument, not a point of privilege. An opportunity will be provided in due course for the hon. member to take part in the debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I do not intend to participate in this debate—

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I am asking you whether one raises a question of privilege when one tries to prevent someone from lying in this house?

[*Text*]

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, there was no such word used. I do not want to interpolate anything in my speech that might cause exacerbated feelings on the part of the hon. gentleman but if he is interested he might refer to what he said about various Liberal members now sitting in the government during the last election campaign. I will use those statements whenever the opportunity demands; I have them here. The hon. member speaks of words that shock his finer sensibilities. He referred to the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis), who certainly made the hon. member's life miserable during the last election campaign—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —as an imbecile, fool, animal, bloodsucker, and dishonest leader.

An hon. Member: For once he was right.

Mr. Diefenbaker: With a flow of non-vituperative language like that I can understand that the hon. member would be shocked to associate himself with any animal. I could go into that at length but I really do not want to. It has been said that because we dared to take this stand we have therefore been obstructive. Because we have taken a stand on behalf of the Canadian people and their rights it has been said that we have held up parliament.

Canadian Flag

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: All I have to say in that connection is that the Prime Minister spoke in Hamilton, and that was not the view he expressed there. In fact he said that the 22 days that had been spent on the flag debate before the committee was set up were not lost. He boasted at that time of what his government had achieved. He said that nothing was really lost because we would have had a vacation at the time if the house had not been sitting.

Again, there is the argument that it is costing Canada millions of dollars for the sitting of parliament. Sir, the members of this house receive their pay whether or not the house is sitting, and the total cost per week does not run into millions of dollars. I have mentioned the cost and the results. The Prime Minister made the situation perfectly clear when he set out in detail the tremendous record of achievement. So there will be no mistake, so that all may read, in his interview with Mr. Berton he said:

> We have spent 23 days in the House of Commons debating the flag, which I think is too long, but those 23 days were at a time when normally we would have been having a holiday so while we may have spent a long time we have not sacrificed parliamentary business in doing that.

I want to thank the Prime Minister for that clear and unequivocal statement, which clears up the situation. I have already dealt with what happened in the committee and I am not going to repeat what I have already said in that connection. However, I want to point out now that we in this party believe, with all Canadians, in a distinctive Canadian flag, but we say that such a flag should have thereon the union jack and we also say it should have thereon the fleur-de-lis. You say to me that the Conservative party is trying to impose its viewpoint on one province. Not at all. We are not trying to tell any province or any group of people what they should do. We are Canadians who put the nation first, and we ask that the Canadian people as a whole shall make the decision.

Let me tell you that I speak as one of mixed origin. I can look at both sides of the question. On one side I am of German and Dutch origin. My people came to Canada 150 years ago. The German people made their contribution to this country in the area of Nova Scotia around what is now Lunenburg when they came there in 1750. In western Ontario and eastern Ontario many of the United Empire Loyalists were of German or Dutch origin. We are not separating people by origins in that way. We are building Canada.

It is said that the union jack is a foreign flag. I saw an argument advanced the other day that any flag with a union jack on it would be a sign of subservience because it is foreign. I do not answer that except to say that Right Hon. Mackenzie King never had that view, and Mr. St. Laurent never had that view. Yet we are to erase the whole of our past; that is what we are asked to do. We are asked to forget the legacy of the missionaries, explorers, nation builders and statesmen of the French race, to wipe out the legacy of Champlain, Frontenac, Lafontaine and Cartier, to wipe out the contribution of the British to Canada.

No other race has that viewpoint. The British and the French came here because of freedom in this country. They founded here a country that was the first in any part of what is the commonwealth today to have religious freedom, the first in which slavery was abolished, and the first country in which representative government was developed. These are our traditions, and we are asked to wipe them out.

We are asked to sanctify disunity by supporting a flag that will bring about greater division. As a matter of fact the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), whose views receive frequent reference in the house, speaking at Quebec city on February 2, 1962, realized what the divisive effect would be of not having a union jack on any distinctive flag when he used these words:

> Mr. Pickersgill said the union jack was too intimately associated with Canadian history to be completely abandoned for the sake of other designs. He warned that if the union jack is dropped completely from the Canadian flag this might cause a deep rift among Canadians.

Those were wise words.

Mr. Pickersgill: Whether those were wise words or whether they were not, they were not my words.

An hon. Member: Misquoted again.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have just quoted from the Canadian Press dispatch, and this is not the first time the hon. gentleman has had to repudiate a statement he has made. I can understand that he may have some objection to the fact that I characterized his views as being wise.

The stand we have taken has been a stand for unity within the country. I recall an hon. member speaking on June 30, at which time he waxed poetic in regard to the three maple

leaves. He said this was a flag on which our young men would see visions and our old men would dream dreams. This was the hon. member for Leeds dreaming in June, and forsaking in September the principles for which he then stood. This shows the fast change in thinking of those who dream dreams in June and have nightmares in July and August.

I say to the hon. gentleman opposite and those associated with him that we believe this matter should be submitted to the people. I believe the Prime Minister would take the greatest step forward if, knowing the division within the country, he were to announce that this matter should be given what is sometimes described as a hoist. It should be given time. Place it before the Canadian people at an election and let the people decide. I say to them, to the majority, you may trample on our viewpoint; you may ridicule the stand we take; you may decry; you may, when you vote on the question of a plebiscite, possibly boast that you have triumphed if our request is turned down. However, it will be no triumph for Canadian unity. I am not interested in party triumphs on this question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am interested in my fellow Canadians. I hope this applies to those sitting on the opposite side of the house, and I am not speaking for those who would tear the flag down, as they have said over and over again.

An hon. Member: That is a lie.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think I heard a word, but in fact I am not at all sure. In fact I might say that I did not hear it and I hope I will not hear it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am one of those, Mr. Speaker, who are fortunate in that I cannot hear all interruptions.

I should like to see action taken that would bring about unity. However, we have stood, we have fought, we have upheld what we believe to be an important matter of principle. There is another report of the committee, No. 7. I should like to ask the Prime Minister, in that connection, whether in the event this question is voted upon by this house, the other resolution will come up immediately; with this proviso, that we should have our question period restored by the consent of the house. Many questions have arisen in the last ten days which demand answers and which I know the government is desirous of answering. What does the government intend to do? Does it intend to proceed with the motion to concur in that other report? I hope the Prime Minister, when he replies, will let the house know.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, if the right hon. gentleman would like a reply at once—because it may be that we will have a vote after his statement and I might not have an opportunity then—I should like to tell him that it is the intention of the government to ask the chairman of the flag committee to move concurrence in the final report as soon as this debate concludes. Whether that can be done immediately after the conclusion of this debate will depend, of course, on the time of day this debate ends.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Will the Prime Minister say whether it is the intention of the government to have the second motion for concurrence passed by the house?

Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think there should be provision made between the two debates for a question period. We have already made a proposal to that effect, and I hope we can get unanimous agreement to provide for a question period between the two debates. If that can be done, we have no other item of business to put before the house, to give precedence to that order over the one I have just mentioned, the seventh report of the committee. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman would allow me to ask him a question at this moment; that is, if he is agreeable now that we should have a vote immediately on the amendment and on the main motion for concurrence.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I recognize the desire of the right hon. gentleman to be fully advised, but the course we will take will be determined in the light of the circumstances.

Mr. Knowles: That sounds like Mackenzie King.

Mr. Diefenbaker: There are two or three matters of legislation upon which we have been pressing for the consideration of the house. Indeed, we have moved the adjournment of the debate in order to permit of these matters being considered. We also joined with our colleagues to the left in the house in the vote in favour of calling orders of the day so that all these matters should receive the consideration of parliament.

Now, sir, I summarize my views and those of the party I have the honour to lead. I know that what I say will have no effect on the thinking of hon. members opposite or of

those who support the report of the committee. I think a grave error will be committed and Canadian unity will suffer if this flag design is adopted. It is just another step, many Canadians feel, along the road. Within the last few days a Liberal member has prophesied that within 15 years Canada will be a republic. We in this party do not accept that belief. During the past months great harm has been done to the unity of the nation, greater than during any other period of my lifetime. I say that after measured consideration.

We are not going to build a nation with two flags; we will not make Canada into a nation by building states within a state. These things are the antitheses of everything for which in the past all our prime ministers have stood. Our view is that a new flag is not this nation's greatest need. Our responsibility is to build a nation, for no flag will bring about unity of a nation; the unity of a nation will bring about a flag which is acceptable to all.

The beliefs we have advanced have been deeply felt. I know there are some who say we are too emotional on this question. Mr. Speaker, the things of the spirit bring about those feelings. We have spoken for a flag which would bring with it a spirit of remembrance and honour for those who discovered this land; a flag which would have on it an exemplification of the richness of Canada's past. We have spoken for an emblem, the union jack, which has never on this North American continent been an emblem of oppression or dishonour. We have spoken for an emblem under whose folds our churches, our schools, our religions, all the precious things of our lives, have been protected and guaranteed. We have spoken for the millions in this land who cherish that emblem and whose voices are stilled. Some say we should apologize for that stand. God forbid that in this country we should apologize for standing for those things which made this nation great.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yesterday an American sent me a calendar showing the United States flag, the original one which Washington carried at Valley Forge, and the first Betsy Ross flag. On that calendar were these words of Woodrow Wilson, great philosopher president of the United States:

> The flag is the embodiment...of history. It represents the experiences made by men and women, the experiences of those who do and live under that flag.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

I am about through. I ask this house: In what way does the design now proposed embody our history? It denies Cardinal Newman's saying that all greatness rests upon the shoulders of past generations. In what way does it represent the sacrifices, the experiences, the achievements of the past? Are we to eradicate the past, to remove all vestige of the things which brought my forefathers here on both sides, and the forefathers of hon. gentlemen everywhere in this house? Edmund Burke said all human society was a partnership between the living and the dead. This design denies that partnership. There is nothing in this design for memoried sorrow or old renown. There is nothing for those who with sword and crucifix went into the wilderness where they left their names and often their bones as a sacred heritage for us all. There is nothing for those who came in the glorious days of French Canada as explorers and navigators and builders. There is nothing of the heroic and legendary pioneers, tales of whose courage are our common glory.

The reading of history proves that a nation which forgets its past condemns its future. This design forgets our past. Individuals and nations cannot ignore the fact of a nation's past when determining the shape of its future. Are we as Canadians to have a flag which treats our memories, our past sacrifices, all the milestones of greatness as irrelevancies? Let Canadians have an opportunity of saying what they want. That is the fight we fought. It is the fight we are continuing to fight. Had it not been for us, you would have the design which is now disavowed. If viewpoints change so much in three or four months, is it beyond the realm of possibility that, should this new design become our flag in a few months hence, Canadians as a whole will feel their past has been forgotten? Once done, I can see no change for the future. I make this last appeal: Do not tear down in this nation the whole history of our past.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Monteith) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken	Chatterton
Alkenbrack	Churchill
Bell	Clancy
Bigg	Coates
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)	Crouse
Cantelon	Danforth
Cardiff	Diefenbaker

Division

Dinsdale
Doucett
Enns
Fairweather
Fane
Flemming (Victoria-Carleton)
Forbes
Gundlock
Hales
Hamilton
Harkness
Herridge
Horner (Acadia)
Horner (Jasper-Edson)
Horner (The Battlefords)
Howe (Wellington-Huron)
Irvine
Jones, Mrs.
Jorgenson
Kennedy
Kindt
Korchinski
Lambert
Leboe
Loney
MacEwan
MacLean (Queens)
MacRae
McBain
McIntosh
Madill
Mandziuk
Mather
Millar
Monteith
Moore
More
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nasserden
Nesbitt
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nugent
Ormiston
Pascoe
Patterson
Pugh
Rapp
Rhéaume
Ricard
Rynard
Simpson
Skoreyko
Slogan
Smallwood
Smith
Southam
Starr
Stefanson
Stenson
Thomas
Wadds, Mrs.
Watson (Assiniboia)
Webb
Willoughby
Winkler
Woolliams—82.

NAYS

Messrs:

Addison
Armstrong
Asselin (Notre Dame de Grâce)
Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)
Badanai
Balcer
Barnett
Basford
Batten
Beaulé
Béchard
Beer
Bélanger
Benidickson
Benson
Blouin
Boulanger
Boutin
Brewin
Brown
Byrne
Cadieux (Terrebonne)
Cameron (High Park)
Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Cantin
Caouette
Cardin
Caron
Carter
Cashin
Chapdelaine
Choquette
Chrétien
Côté (Chicoutimi)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Cyr
Davis
Deachman
Deschatelets
Dionne
Drouin
Drury
Dubé
Dupuis
Emard
Eudes
Favreau
Forest
Francis
Frenette
Gauthier
Gelber
Gendron
Girouard
Godin
Gordon
Grafftey
Granger
Gray
Greene
Grégoire
Groos
Guay
Hahn
Harley
Hellyer
Honey
Howe (Hamilton South)
Jewett, Miss
Kelly
Klein
Knowles
Konantz, Mrs.
Lachance
LaMarsh, Miss
Lamontagne
Lamoureux
Langlois
Laniel
Latulippe
Laverdière
Leblanc
Leduc
Lessard (Lake St. John)
Lessard (St. Henry)
Lloyd
Loiselle
Legault
Macaluso
Macdonald
Mackasey
MacNaught
McIlraith
McMillan
McNulty
McWilliam
Marcoux
Martin (Essex East)
Martin (Timmins)
Martineau
Matheson
Matte
Moreau
Morison
Mullally
Munro
Nicholson
Nixon
O'Keefe
Olson
Otto
Ouellet
Paul
Pearson
Pennell
Pepin
Perron
Peters
Pickersgill
Pigeon
Pilon
Plourde
Prittie
Prud'homme
Regan
Richard
Rideout, Mrs.
Rinfret
Robichaud
Rochon
Rock
Rondeau
Rouleau
Roxburgh
Ryan
Saltsman
Sauvé
Scott
Sharp
Stewart
Tardif
Teillet
Temple
Thompson
Tremblay
Tucker
Turner
Walker
Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Webster
Whelan
Winch—153.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): With permission, I wonder if I could suggest that in the circumstances we might forgo the private members' hour in order that after 240 speeches on the flag question we might be able to come to a decision on this matter before six o'clock?

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): No, Mr. Speaker; we want to hear from the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), who has not spoken on this subject for six months.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any pairs to be declared?

It being five o'clock the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely notices of motions for papers, private bills and public bills.

Private Bills

PRIVATE BILLS

ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES OF CANADA

Miss Pauline Jewett (Northumberland) moved the second reading of Bill No. S-36, to incorporate association of universities and colleges of Canada.

She said: I am honoured to have been asked to introduce this bill in this chamber. The purpose of it is to incorporate a new nation-wide, bilingual body to replace two existing organizations. The new body is to be known as the association of universities and colleges of Canada—l'association des universités et collèges du Canada. This will replace two existing organizations, the national conference of Canadian universities and colleges, commonly known as the N.C.C.U.C., which is a non-incorporated body, a voluntary association of universities and colleges, and the Canadian universities foundation, commonly known as the C.U.F. which is an incorporated body.

The purpose of combining these two existing organizations into a single new organization is primarily to facilitate the work of the universities and colleges of Canada in their task of promoting higher education in this country. No new tasks are being given to the association of universities and colleges in this field. It was necessary, however, that the new body be incorporated because it will be taking over the functions of one of the previous bodies, the Canadian universities foundation, and one of these functions was the distribution of federal grants to the various universities; and it is of course necessary to be an incorporated body before this can be done.

There will be ample opportunity to discuss the bill in detail when it goes to committee should any hon. members wish to have fuller information. I might, however, draw on the evidence which was given by the president of the new association, Principal J. A. Corry, of Queen's University. In the course of the evidence given before the committee on banking and commerce in the other place on Wednesday, November 4, 1964, Dr. Corry stated:

> We are not interested in any new departures, but only to develop further the kind of things we have been doing and to do them more efficiently. We discovered in the last few years that the secretariat, which tries to serve both the voluntary association and this corporation—

He is referring to the secretariat of the Canadian universities foundation and the N.C.C.U.C.

> —gets involved in a great deal of duplication in bringing the same material before both bodies. That occurs at a time when the universities are under such heavy demands and when we do not want to be engaged in any kind of wasteful effort that we can possibly avoid.

Then he goes on to say:

> There is one other reason I wish to mention. The Canadian universities foundation as presently organized is such that, as we have discovered, there is no satisfactory way of ensuring that we get on to the present corporation a fair representation of the universities of the different regions and, of course, of the universities of the two official languages. The new proposal is a way of trying to meet that serious objection through the present form.

Dr. Corry goes on to give other reasons for the establishment of the single, new, nation-wide bilingual organization. It is important for us to bear in mind that this request comes from all the universities and colleges of Canada that are now members or are eligible for membership; they number 46, I believe. These are both English and French speaking institutions, and are to be found in the schedule to Bill No. S-36. It was at their request that this bill was brought forward in the other place, where it has been passed, and it is now being brought forward here. I trust that all hon. members will want to do whatever we can to assist the universities of this country to do their job as well as they can. If they all feel, as I do, that one of the best ways for them to do their own job most effectively and most efficiently is through a single organization combining the two existing organizations, then I hope we will do all we can to facilitate this request.

I understand there is a possibility that some members of this chamber intend to filibuster this bill today; indeed the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) was kind enough to tell me that they did not intend to let it pass, the reason being, I understand, that they are not prepared to let any measures pass that come to us from the other place. I find this very disturbing because the association of universities and colleges—which as I say, represents all institutions at this level of learning in Canada—is very anxious to get its new form and get down to business under its new organization.

As I have already indicated, it is a bilingual organization. It is one of the organizations which we, surely, in this country want to do all we can to help develop, since as we all know there is a tendency nowadays for many professional and other organizations to split off into their English and French sections and become two separate groups. This association of universities and colleges is not doing that, and therefore it seems to me

[Mr. Speaker.]

we should give it even more support than we would ordinarily.

I make a plea, therefore, that there not be any attempt made to talk out this bill on grounds which relate to another matter entirely. It is in a sense pure accident that it went through the other place first; it could have gone through this house first, and if we had agreed to the principle of the bill it would have passed this chamber and then gone to the other place and, I assume, would have passed there as it has already. Indeed, should there be any filibuster on this bill, any extended discussion simply to talk it out, I would point out the following.

[*Translation*]

May I quote the words of the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) himself, as recorded on page 10927:

—that is not freedom, but abuse, a tremendous abuse of the freedom of speech.

[*Text*]

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I am interested in the concept, and I think this house should support the concept, that universities and colleges are not provincial things in the area of their concern. Universities are, by the very nature of their establishment, things of the world, and I believe that any attempt to promote that aspect of their concern should have the wholehearted endorsement of this house. I was very interested in the hon. member for Northumberland (Miss Jewett), who is sponsoring the bill, saying that we in this house are anxious to help the universities. I would think that as well as speaking in this house she would be taking some steps to see that the treasury benches have paid some heed to her plea, because the Canadian universities foundation has had a long-standing appeal to the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) for increased grants both capital and operating. That is an aside, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure it will be dealt with in a budget that will come before us very soon.

I have listened for an anticipated objection, of which the hon. member for Northumberland has given the house notice, from the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire). I cannot imagine a more cynical way to attack another place or another part of parliament than to hold up this type of bill, if this is to be the case. I hear no denial so I am going to go on with this aspect of my remarks. If the hon. member for Lapointe finds objection in the other place or to the other place, he has the avenues available to him that the promoters of this bill have had. Private—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I see that the debate concerning Bill No. S-36 is centred around my supposed intentions as stated by the hon. member for Northumberland (Miss Jewett). I did not object to her statement because I thought that it was insignificant.

However, I would point out to the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Fairweather) that he should inquire about what we are doing and listen to our statements before he makes any comments in this respect, and then he may talk about our intentions.

I disregarded what the hon. member for Northumberland said. She came to my office and, suddenly, she mentioned what I am supposed to have told her, but distorting my thought. I did not say anything.

Under the circumstances, I say to the hon. member for Royal that I never made any statement in this respect, and I would ask him to talk about Bill No. S-36 without referring to our intentions.

[*Text*]

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with this reassuring news that the house has nothing to worry about, and I will certainly not take another minute. All I have to say is that we on this side support the objectives in what is a straightforward piece of legislation which is entitled to the enthusiastic support of all hon. members.

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I for one will not attempt to anticipate any remarks that may be made by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) or indeed any other member of the house. I rise simply to say that I listened with interest to the introduction of the bill into our house. I notice that its objects are to foster and promote the interests of higher education in Canada. I also notice from a brief examination of the schedule that it appears to be a very representative organization, as proposed in the bill, of the institutions of higher learning in Canada. Therefore I am pleased to join with the hon. member for Northumberland (Miss Jewett) and the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Fairweather) in indicating my wholehearted support of the bill and of the purposes which those who are seeking to develop this organization have in mind.

I agree with the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Fairweather) that those of us who are members of this house should perhaps, in approving the passage of the bill, indicate that we feel this house has a responsibility to take steps to foster and promote the interests of higher education in Canada to a greater extent than we have in the past; and I hope there will be an early opportunity for us to discuss all aspects of our responsibilities in more detail than I feel it would be in order to do under the bill which is now before us.

I am sure my colleagues will join with me in doing what we can to support them in the passage of this bill through the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, we heard, a while ago, the hon. member for Northumberland (Miss Jewett) advising us of the intentions expressed by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), today or yesterday—I do not quite know—in connection with Bill No. S-36; the hon. member for Lapointe and our party must be given their due.

We feel that Bill No. S-36 is logical and we see no objection to Canadian universities and colleges grouping together in an effort to achieve definite goals and specific aims in their field of endeavour. I was pleased to note that, in clause 10 of the bill, it is specified that the official languages of the association will be French and English and that, in clause 11, the head office of the association will be established in Ottawa, the capital of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the preamble to the bill reads as follows:

Whereas the National Conference of Canadian Universities and Colleges, an unincorporated body, hereinafter called "The Conference", and the Canadian Universities Foundation, a company incorporated pursuant to the Companies Act by letters patent dated February 4, 1959, hereinafter called "the Foundation", have by their petition prayed that it be enacted as hereinafter set forth, and it is expedient to grant the prayer of the petition.

There are at least 15 clauses in the bill as well as a schedule listing the colleges and universities which will be members of this new association.

The hon. member for Northumberland said earlier that we would not allow the bill to be passed. It is not because we have anything against the universities and colleges, but because we have a slight grudge against the other place. A bill was introduced a long time ago—my remarks are perhaps out of order, but it is precisely because there is some discrimination against a province which requested the passage of a bill that we object to the passage of other bills. There is a limit to everything. I feel that the patience of the people's representatives, of the members of the house has been overtaxed. We have responsibilities, and I think that any bill likely to promote the development of our country should be considered on its merits, irrespective of political partisanship. We believe that there is in this house some partisanship which should not prevail here. We are ready to pass bills in the best interests of the population or a certain segment of the population needing or asking for more freedom and justice to which they are entitled in every field of our national administation.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, we are in favour of this Bill No. S-36, and as soon as the other place acts fairly towards a certain province, namely British Columbia, we will be ready to pass this bill and we will not raise any objection to it or to the other bills now under consideration for one, two or three months and which have been discussed every Thursday or every second Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. S-36 will enable colleges and universities, as I said earlier, to look after their own business, to help as much as possible students now attending those colleges and universities or those who will do so in the future. We see that this bill aims at furthering higher education in Canada. I think that students are in a position to help in that respect because they are so directly concerned and because it will be their problems that the association of universities and colleges of Canada will be studying.

Section 3 reads as follows:

Subject to the by-laws which may be enacted from time to time pursuant to section 7, the membership of the association shall be composed of the universities and colleges named in the schedule to this act, and such other corporations, organizations or bodies as are from time to time admitted to membership pursuant to this act.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that colleges and universities in all parts of Canada will be members of that association. In fact, there are members in Nova Scotia, Alberta, Quebec, Manitoba, British Columbia, Ontario. It seems that all the provinces will be represented, or that colleges and universities in every part of the country will join the association.

In my opinion, colleges and universities show that they have a sense of unity, which

is preached so often in this country. Since those university or college students are getting a higher education, they recognize the need for association, the necessity of uniting in order to reach the objectives peculiar to their situation, to their condition or the need for them to help one another.

Mr. Speaker, if one considers Bill No. S-36, one sees that the University of Montreal, Laval University, Loyola College in Montreal, the university of Trinity college, the University of Toronto, the University of British Columbia, Carleton University here in Ottawa, the University of Ottawa, the Collège Jean-de-Brébeuf in Montreal, in short all the recognized universities in this country will be members of the association, as well as our leading colleges.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is a good movement. The students of our universities and colleges are taking a worth-while step; they are making a commendable effort in order to promote higher education within our country.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to say more on the bill before us. However, I should like to say once again that our intention is not to stand in the way of university or college students, but to bring to reason the members of the other place who are delaying a piece of legislation that everybody has been looking forward to for a long time. Under those circumstances, although we earnestly support the principle of Bill No. S-36, we think that eventually, in a week or two, we will have an opportunity to pass this bill without discussion.

But in the meantime we feel it is our obligation and responsibility to say that if democracy does exist in Canada, the time has come to make it clear that the members of this house are not the only ones who have to exercise democratic principles, but that the other place should also respect the soundest principles of democracy in action, a democracy respecting all the people, the provinces, the organizations, the individuals, but especially the province of British Columbia, as we have been requesting for some two or three months.

Mr. Speaker, we are in favour of Bill No. S-36, but we could not let it pass today. However, we will not hesitate to do so as soon as we have evidence that democracy is working in Canada.

Mr. Jean Chrétien (St. Maurice-Laflèche): Mr. Speaker, I have only a few words to say in connection with this bill, but I should like to commend the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) for the moderate tone of his remarks on the legislation under consideration.

I was struck by the spirit in which this measure was prepared. That is precisely the kind of spirit which should exist in Canada. The bill recognizes the two official languages at the same time as the universities and colleges of Canada.

I understand why the hon. member for Villeneuve says that his party and himself cannot, at this time, permit a vote on Bill No. S-36, an act to incorporate the association of universities and colleges of Canada. However, may I make a suggestion to the hon. member?

I understand that the Créditistes may be somewhat angry because the Senate has not yet granted a bank charter to a certain group of citizens from British Columbia. However, I believe that the Créditistes would attain their objective if they confined their opposition to bills concerning the incorporation of new chartered banks or other corporations. But considering that the purpose of this bill is to create an association of Canadian universities and colleges, I believe that if it were passed this afternoon, the hon. member for Villeneuve and his supporters would promote their case, because the population might feel that the group supporting the member for Villeneuve is analysing the situation and showing enough broadmindedness to accept a very important measure which is thoroughly characteristic of our country and which reflects the new spirit which must prevail in this country.

If his group permitted this measure to be passed this afternoon, it would promote, as I said, Canadian unity.

[*Text*]

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up much time, but I do want to speak in support of this bill which has been advanced by the hon. member for Northumberland (Miss Jewett) on behalf of a very responsible body in Canada. Anything we can do to assist universities I think should be done. In this particular instance the cause is a very worthy one.

I have risen as well to condemn the attitude taken by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) who stated that he was in support of the measure, but at the same time held the threat over this house that he would not allow the bill to pass, and that his party would not accede to it until the other place had met the request he has made. I think his

remarks in regard to the other place are irrelevant, and that the attitude he has taken on behalf of his party is certainly a threat, if not implied coercion.

Mr. Grégoire: Make me laugh.

Mr. Churchill: The hon. member who is now interrupting is attempting to make a mockery of the House of Commons, where the right to free speech is enjoyed except on those occasions when that hon. member interrupts. I hope one of these days the Speaker will name him.

The leader of the Créditiste party is bordering on hypocrisy by speaking in favour of the bill yet refusing to pass it, or alternatively promising that it will pass within two or three weeks, knowing full well that this house may soon adjourn for the Christmas recess. He has stated that he is not going to permit the passage of this bill, but disguised his purposes by suggesting that he is in favour of it. I have risen to register my objection to that kind of action.

This bill has come from the other place and has been approved there. Its objective is worthy. The explanation given by the hon. member for Northumberland has satisfied this house, as far as I am concerned, and I think it should be allowed to pass immediately.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member for Villeneuve would allow me a question.

Mr. Caouette: Surely.

Mr. Lambert: No, a question cannot be allowed, as the hon. member has already spoken.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The hon. member for Villeneuve has completed his remarks.

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in this bill. Throughout my adult life I have been in support of anything which will assist in promoting education, but I must admit I am somewhat at a loss in that there is no explanatory note in the bill itself. The only thing on which I can base my support of the bill is the remarks the hon. lady made and also the fact that there must have been a reason for the bill being passed by the other place.

As I said, I understand the purpose of the bill is to promote facilities that will bring our educational institutions closer together,

so that their representatives may discuss educational matters and put forward opinions with the end in view that the educational facilities of this country will provide a better and more advanced education for our young people. However, should the bill not be approved at this time I should like to see some explanatory notes put in it. I foresee that the house will adjourn or prorogue and this bill may come up a second time in the other place. I hope that will not be necessary but if this should happen I suggest to the hon. lady that some explanatory notes should be provided, as is done with all other bills, whether private or public, so that people who have not followed the debate in the other place or even in this house will be able to become more familiar with the bill. However, the hon. lady has given a good explanation of the bill, and based on that explanation I am prepared to say I am in favour of it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. G. C. Lachance (Lafontaine): Mr. Speaker, I intended, a minute ago, to direct a question to the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette).

I understand that another member of that party will probably speak presently, but considering the attitude of the hon. member for Villeneuve and his seemingly hearty approval of the principle of this bill, I would ask him whether it would not be advisable to permit second reading of the bill, so that it could be considered in committee, and let the third reading stand.

That is my suggestion.

I am wondering whether the hon. member for Villeneuve and his colleagues would be ready to accept that suggestion.

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak on this bill, but in view of the awkward—I was going to say the dishonest way in which the hon. member for Northumberland (Miss Jewett) has—

[*Text*]

Miss Jewett: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, did I hear the hon. member say "dishonest"?

Mr. Grégoire: I said "a dishonest way to introduce the bill".

Miss Jewett: I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that. There was nothing dishonest about the way I introduced the bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I am sure the hon. member for Lapointe would not wish to have that remark remain on the record.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, if proper attention is paid to the wording, one finds that the word "dishonest" was used; I have not said "déshonnête", I said "malhonnête".

Mr. Lambert: It is the same thing.

Mr. Grégoire: It can be seen that the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) does not understand the subtleties of the French language.

Mr. Lambert: Much more than you think.

Mr. Grégoire: It is perhaps the reason why he is still mistaken.

In view of the awkward way this bill has been introduced by the hon. member for Northumberland, I believe it is my duty to go over what she stated in her introductory remarks.

We do not object to this bill, Mr. Speaker. I see in the bill a list of the universities which were mentioned a moment ago; I see the name of Laval University, which is a great institution; there I studied philosophy for a year, under qualified teachers, and I had the opportunity of obtaining a diploma. Besides, I studied for several years in the law faculty. I also obtained my B.A.—even if I attended the Jesuits' college, the B.A. was granted by Laval University.

I see the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska (Mr. Pepin). I believe he was once a professor at Laval University.

Mr. Pepin: No.

Mr. Grégoire: No. Not that one; he was not lucky enough to enter such a great university.

Now, I notice also the names of colleges such as Brébeuf—

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, has not the hon. member for Lapointe just proven what was put forward by the hon. member for Northumberland, that is that the hon. member for Lapointe and his colleague, the hon. member for Villeneuve, were going to resort to all kinds of tactics to preclude the passage of the bill this afternoon? It is precisely what the hon. member for Northumberland asserted.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, something is wrong. He is the fourth member of the Liberal party who has risen to speak on this subject; three Tory members have spoken. I am only the second Créditiste to take the floor, and you say that we are the ones blocking the passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Liberals are a bit off their figuring today.

Besides, I feel I am entitled to speak at least once on a bill to incorporate the association of universities and colleges of Canada.

The hon. member for Northumberland quoted remarks I had made, but then I had figures in support of them. I feel I have the right to repeat them once again since the hon. member left the door open and to correct the impression she wanted to create.

When I say: "It is no longer freedom of speech, it is licence or abuse", 229 speeches had been made and 119 hours had been spent on the same matter. But we have been considering Bill No. S-36 for barely 45 minutes.

That is the reason why I say this bill was introduced in a dishonest way, because a 29 day debate is compared to one which started only 45 minutes ago. This bill was introduced in an incompetent manner, and I do not hesitate to say so.

Mr. Speaker, I was about to say that I could see institutions like Brébeuf college, St. Marie college—I must find out why the Jesuits' college, St. Charles Garnier of Quebec is not in this list for, in my opinion, the rector of this college, Father Larivière, is an extremely competent professor. For a long time he was chairman of the classical colleges in the province of Quebec, of which the Jesuits' college was a member.

This bill is to incorporate the association of universities and colleges, the conference of universities, the foundation of classical colleges. St. Charles Garnier college of Quebec was a member of the foundation of classical colleges, since its director was the able and competent president of the said foundation for several years.

I, therefore, wonder if this is not due to an oversight. But in any event, to make sure no error has been made—

[*Text*]

Miss Jewett: That kind of question can be asked when we go into committee.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: And we intend to ask it when this bill is studied in committee. But first, I wanted to point out this fact, and the hon. member for Northumberland will agree that it was normal and natural, when I saw the list of the colleges, that I should expect to see first, Laval University and St. Charles Garnier college of Quebec. I was pleased to find Laval University, but I must note that—at least at first glance—no classical

college of the city of Quebec is included in that list.

I remember quite well that the St. Jean Eudes college and the Quebec seminary belonged to the classical colleges foundation of the province, which would be part of the association of universities and colleges of Canada.

At any rate, we cannot object to this bill, because colleges and universities have contributed a great deal to the development of our people. Grouped together, those institutions will then be in a better position to set forth their demands. They will have a stronger voice.

It is shameful to find that this year 700 young people were turned away from Laval and Montreal universities for lack of space in the medical school. I would like to conduct a survey among the fathers of those young people; these parents have perhaps denied themselves in order to send their children to public school for seven years and to secondary school for eight more years. The fathers of many of those young people probably were unemployed masons, plumbers, bricklayers, carpenters or electricians who could have constructed buildings for medical faculties. But none the less, those youngsters are refused admittance to those universities after they have completed seven years of primary course and eight years of classical studies. This is a shame in a country like Canada.

This is a scandalous state of affairs when we take into consideration our responsibilities in this regard. The provincial government may say its *mea culpa* when it accepts such a situation in the province of Quebec and in Canada in this 20th century.

Grouped together, the colleges and universities will be stronger and more vigorous in denouncing these scandals which occur in Canada; I am happy to have the opportunity to mention it.

Universities will then be able to point out to the federal government that it is grabbing all taxes although the provincial government has priority needs, including education.

Unfortunately, the provinces cannot meet all the needs in matters of education because they lack sufficient funds, since the government in Ottawa occupies most fiscal fields.

Mr. Pepin: Yes, that is true.

Mr. Grégoire: That is right, it is quite true; it is a fact. The hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska (Mr. Pepin) has just put it in *Hansard*. He said: Yes. Is not education a primary need in Canada?

Mr. Pepin: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Grégoire: Is it true, or not, that the provinces need more revenue to satisfy their educational needs?

Mr. Pepin: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Grégoire: Is it not true that the federal government is collecting the greater part of taxes in Canada?

Mr. Pepin: That is quite possible, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, the statistics are there to prove it: 60 per cent are collected by the federal government, 20 per cent by the provinces, and 15 per cent by the municipalities and school boards. The federal government he denies everything he said while he crumbs to the provinces.

An hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Grégoire: It is a fact which the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska cannot deny. Since he became a member of parliament, he denies everything he said while he was a university professor—

Mr. Pepin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Everything the hon. member for Lapointe said about me regarding the past is a lie.

Mr. Grégoire: It is not I who says so. Everywhere in the province of Quebec the students are saying: we used to trust Mr. Pepin but since he became a Liberal member in the federal parliament, he is just like the rest of them.

Mr. Pepin: On a point of order Mr. Speaker. I do not agree that the hon. member for Lapointe speaks on behalf of all the young people of French Canada.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order; I should like to ask the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska (Mr. Pepin) if the word he used a moment ago is not a most unparliamentary one?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pepin: On the contrary, Mr. Speaker. I have been most considerate and gentle in my remarks. I simply denied the hon. member for Lapointe the right to speak on behalf of French Canadian youth. He said that all our French Canadian young people were disappointed with the ideas I was defending now. I cannot see how the hon. member for La-

pointe can speak like this on behalf of our young people in French Canada.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I did not speak on behalf of French Canadian youth, not in the least.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order; perhaps the translation was not correct. If it was not, then of course I will accept the explanation given by the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I did not say the whole French Canadian youth; I said: Wherever we go we meet young students who tell us how disappointed they are with our politicians, because they had confidence in the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska, but since he became a Liberal he is now like the others.

That is what I said. If the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska would go back in the province of Quebec from time to time he would find out what the people think of him. He had a brilliant future, but as soon as he became a Liberal it changed.

Mr. Caouette: That altered his future.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Those remarks have nothing whatsoever to do with the matter under consideration, and I hope that you will call the hon. member for Lapointe to order.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): I think the point of order raised by the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska is well taken. I suggest to the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) that he confine himself to the principle of the bill to which we are now giving second reading.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I thank you, but if you read *Hansard* again, you will see that it is the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska who made the first interjections which were out of order; it is he who wandered from the subject and who delays the debate by his many interjections.

In closing I would like to say that we approve the role of our universities and colleges. As soon as they are united, they will be able to speak more forcefully to the federal government in order to expose its attitude at various levels. They will be stronger in their claims and to obtain for the provinces that greater source of revenue they need to meet the priority needs of education at the present time. Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock.

[*Text*]

Miss Jewett: Question, question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Is the house ready for the question?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, I regret that I do not have more time at my disposal to discuss a matter which is of interest to Canadians all across the country.

I might say that I support this bill but, on the other hand, I should like to ask a few questions to clear up some minor points which seem to be obscure in the bill itself. Those points might be included in the bill, but when I read it I did not see them. Therefore, I should like to have further explanations on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have to interrupt my observations, but I must point out to you that it is six o'clock.

[*Text*]

Miss Jewett: Filibuster.

Mr. Grégoire: Well, you speak about it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order; the hour for private members' business has expired.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

CANADIAN FLAG

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SIXTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Batten that the sixth report of the special committee on the Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, be now concurred in.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): We have now reached a point at which we must consider whether or not the report which has been presented by the flag committee should be concurred in.

Surely, before any vote is taken in this connection we should be told where the

government stands on that report and on the flag design presented by that committee for adoption. The last occasion on which we were provided with information by the government as to its stand on a flag design was when the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) spoke in this house in favour of a three maple leaf design on a white background with blue borders. That was not the design which is proposed by the committee for adoption. It was not the flag design supported by the majority of the members of that committee. And certainly there is no assurance, and none has been given to this house, that the design to be selected by the government if the report of the flag committee is adopted is the design which the majority of that committee indicated they preferred.

Still further, we have been given no reasons by the government to explain the silence of its supporters with regard to the design recommended by the majority of the members on the flag committee. We should know the reasons why the government thinks differently today about what is desirable in a flag design—why its opinions are not the same as they were when the Prime Minister told us why he considered that the flag which should be flying from the flagpoles of this nation should have three maple leaves on a white background with blue borders. We should certainly be told why the Prime Minister believes today that a flag with one maple leaf on a white background with red borders is representative of Canada as a nation and acceptable to its people.

In addition, we would like to hear the views of various other members of the Liberal party. They should tell us why they feel today that this particular flag ought to be adopted, when not so very long ago they were telling us that a flag with three maple leaves was the only possible flag for Canada and indicating what it represented in the way of history and tradition.

I feel we should have the benefit of the views of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) who is deputy leader of the party opposite and its chief spokesman for the province of Quebec. We should know why he feels today that a red bordered flag is more appropriate than the Pearson pennant which he embraced so readily when it was proposed by the Prime Minister.

Without doubt we should hear the views of the Secretary of State (Mr. Lamontagne), the man charged with the responsibility of caring for our history and traditions, the man who is the guardian of all that is traditional in this nation. He should tell us why he feels we should embrace this one maple leaf flag which is now proposed.

We should hear, also, from the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Tremblay). After all, is he not the man who must take responsibility for removing from the citizenship courts of this nation the picture of our Queen? Let him tell us what flag he feels should be placed in these citizenship courts as a symbol of our past history and traditions. I suggest to hon. members opposite that they get out of their love seats and stand up and explain why we should now embrace a flag design which differs in such a marked way from the one they told us only a few months ago was the only flag for this Canadian nation.

In this regard I should like to read a short letter which appeared in the Yarmouth *Herald,* Nova Scotia, on September 2. It states:

> If one takes a British red ensign and emblazons upon it the distinctive arms of Canada it still remains a foreign flag.
>
> But, if one takes the national flag of Peru and emblazons upon it a maple leaf—the leaf of a tree by no means distinctively Canadian, and of which there are several different varieties across the country—

And, I may add, a leaf which does not appear in some provinces of this country:

> —it immediately becomes a distinctive Canadian flag, and not foreign at all.
>
> Being neither British nor Peruvian in origin, my mind is not closed to an explanation of this piece of baffling wizardry. But I am, at the moment, completely confused.
>
> Yours truly,
> Robert B. Blauveldt

I may say to that gentleman, he is not the only one in this nation who is confused; indeed there are many in this House of Commons, including myself, who become completely confused when they watch the footwork of this government when it comes to the means of determining what should be the flag of this nation. Not only are they unwilling to accept a flag which contains in it symbols of our past history and tradition, but they are unwilling even to provide themselves with reasons for now shifting, if they are, from a three maple leaf design to a one maple leaf design. They tell us that we should vote. What are we to vote for? Do we know what this government will do when the flag committee report is adopted by this house—if it is? Have we any assurance that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) will not then

pass an order in council indicating that the three maple leaf design shall be the flag of our nation, which is his design?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: The report is there.

Mr. Coates: "The report is there", my hon. friend says. What guarantee have we that this report will be enacted in any way? Many reports have been adopted by this house with regard to which governments have taken absolutely no action. How do we know this is not going to be the case in this instance? How do we know what design the government will decide upon? Certainly there used to be a leader of the Liberal party who looked into crystal balls and came up with decisions. Maybe that is all right for Liberals, but Conservatives want facts. We want to know where these various ministers stand with regard to the flag design they are eventually going to foist upon this Canadian nation, a design which has no association with our past in any way, shape or form.

There are many implications in the report of the flag committee. We demand an explanation from this government as to what it is going to do about the report, and how it is going to do it, before the house can look forward to our acceptance of this report. We have noticed in the past, and in the recent past, that the Prime Minister sometimes likes to find himself in other places when questions should be answered in this house. In the past we have been put in a position where we could not secure the answer from the Prime Minister, when he found it best to be somewhere else in this nation. But this is not going to be the case with regard to the report of the flag committee that is before the house at this time, and we will get answers to the questions we are asking now or this report will not receive the concurrence necessary for it to be enacted in this house—and it is just as simple as that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Coates: This arrogant silence we have had to contend with from this arrogant government for too long now, on this matter of vital importance affecting every Canadian in every part of this nation, is not going to continue if there is to be any hope by this government of having the report of the flag committee accepted, even on a division. Certainly if the government desire the degree of unity that they talk about so often in this house, I suggest to them that the Prime Minister of this nation come into the house and indicate to us that they are willing to accept a flag design which has contained in it symbols of our past, of the history and tradition of the founding races of this nation. I suggest that he indicate that he does not want a near-Peruvian flag as the national flag of this country, that he saw some merit in the great speech made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) in this house today, that there is real merit in the stand that has been taken in this house by the official opposition in regard to—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I should like to bring to your attention the fact that from the outset of his remarks, the hon. member who now has the floor, has not addressed the Chair once. Since he has very few interesting things to tell we would ask him at least to address the Chair.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order. Will the hon. member resume his seat.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, that is the inconsequential type of interruption that has been forthcoming from that quarter of the house. It should be ignored because it has absolutely no merit, and there are no manners associated with it either.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Coates: Every time a member rises in this house and starts to talk about history and tradition we hear from those who have no desire to continue the past history and tradition of this nation; they go blabbering on with inconsequential interjections, unwilling to listen to reason, unwilling to listen to anything; willing only to force their will on the Canadian nation and blot out—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Plourde: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

If the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Coates) wants to vent his spleen on some of his colleagues, let him not turn toward the members at the other end of the house. We called order simply because he was addressing the members of the house instead of the Chair, as he should do. He has not been addressing the Chair for exactly three minutes and he is talking about the point of order made by the hon. member who rose before me.

Canadian Flag

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): I would ask the hon. member who has the floor please not to invite the type of points of order which we have been getting over the past few minutes.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order, please. It is no use commenting on points of order made by other hon. members, once the Chair has ruled that a point of order is not in order. Would the hon. member please proceed.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your ruling but I can only say that it is a cause of some irritation to a speaker when members such as the hon. member who has just taken his seat—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order, please. The hon. member should realize that the Chair has taken that into consideration, and that is why I am inviting him to resume his speech.

Mr. Grégoire: Question.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, it would appear that as long as I speak about the matters which I feel must be involved in a flag design for it to be acceptable to me, there will continue to be interruptions from those who do not wish to see the symbols of our past represented in the design of a flag to which they can bow down and adhere.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think one could at least say this about the flag design which was embraced by the government last May, that it could be anchored to a degree to events which had occurred in our past. This was the main argument of the Prime Minister when he proposed this design and gave his reasons for adopting it when he spoke in May. But surely we have a far different situation today, for we have a flag design proposed which is completely new, completely devoid of any associations with our past, with no associations with the traditions of this nation or with the fact that we have been a nation for 97 years. This is a flag that would probably be most suitable for a new nation on the continent of Africa, a nation which is emerging, having been given its democratic rights as of now. But how ridiculous it is that a country which is 97 years of age is proposing to adopt a flag design that is so similar to the flag of Peru that the only difference is that one has its coat of arms in the centre and the other has a maple leaf.

[Mr. Plourde.]

Mr. Matheson: That is not true.

Mr. Coates: I hear "That is not true" from the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson). Let the hon. member for Leeds stand on his feet and say whatever he wants about his love story, or whatever it is he wants to speak about, but let him do it in his own time and not mine.

Mr. Matheson: Would the hon. member permit a question on this matter. Would he kindly tell this house, having made that statement, the proportion of red-white-red on the Peruvian flag compared with the recommended flag; and would he also tell us all the colours which are involved in both these flags? Because he is not telling the truth.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member might have been the father of the other flag, but if he is the father of this one it is illegitimate all the way. Because unless you become a mathematician or an upholsterer or a dress designer or a furniture dealer there is absolutely no way to associate this flag with any facet of Canada's past, and indeed it bodes ill for Canada's future if this is where we are going in the matter of selecting a flag design which is supposed to be representative of a nation 97 years old, and a good many hundreds years of age in development.

Surely we in this house are correct in demanding from the Prime Minister and the other ministers I have already named an explanation as to how we are going to have a distinctive flag, one which is representative of something. If Canadians have been shocked up to now by what this government has been trying to do to arrive at a flag design, it is nothing in comparison with the shock they are going to feel when they see this flag flying from the flagpoles of the nation. That is when the shock treatment will really set in—when the people see this meaningless flag flying from the flagpoles of the nation, having replaced the beautiful flag which today flies from the peace tower and from every other flagpole across the country.

We have not yet arrived, Mr. Speaker, at a position where we in this house can take a vote on the flag committee's report; and we will not arrive at that position until the Prime Minister is ready to come into this house and explain why he, in the words of the hon. member for Leeds, loves this flag today when his love affairs with the last one was constant only until the flag committee was set up.

Mr. Barnett: Would the hon. member permit a question. Would he be prepared to give his assurance to the house that if the Prime Minister does come in and make a speech on the flag we can then proceed to have a vote on the flag committee's report?

Mr. Coates: I thank the hon. member for giving me this degree of control over the Progressive Conservative party, which allows me to make decisions for every member therein. Unfortunately I am not in a position to have that type of control; nor do I want it. As a matter of fact, I believe that the action of the members of this party, following a definitive explanation by the government as to what it will do about the new flag once a vote has taken place on this motion, will indicate the position taken by this party in respect of the expected order in council. A vote having taken place in respect of the motion now before us will lead to some recommendation being made to the other place. One must hope that the honourable gentlemen of that place will have some consideration for the feelings, as they have been expressed, of the people of this country. Surely no responsible government would wish to shirk its responsibility in this regard.

Is it too much to ask the Prime Minister to indicate to this nation why he feels there should be a new and distinctive Canadian flag? After all, he is the man who has placed this House of Commons in the position where it has been for months, considering this question. Surely we can expect that the Prime Minister will stand and abide by a vote on the recommendation of the special committee on a Canadian flag, yet we have heard little or nothing from his supporters about that recommendation. Surely it is time that we should hear from the treasury benches as to how they feel about a distinctive and different Canadian flag. Surely we should hear from those individuals who voted for this proposed design in the committee and proposed the committee report now before us. Surely this is the time when we should hear from the ministers of the crown, who are responsible for the direction of this country. What can we expect from this government in the way of direction? Surely they consider themselves responsible to the people of Canada.

The government which now proposes that we adopt this flag is the same government which proposed last June that we adopt the flag with the three maple leaf design. At that time the suggestion was made that that design was the one most acceptable to Canadian people. That was the government's statement. They have now changed their minds. If they find they must change their minds, and they are not sure, as is obvious, which flag is the flag to be adopted by this nation, surely they must realize that the people of this country should be given a choice.

The government now urging the adoption of the flag, as set out in the motion we are now discussing, is the same government which has changed its mind about the flag and about the time the flag must be adopted. Their argument seems to be that we should adopt the flag advocated by the majority of their members.

As a result of this attitude we have been subjected to a tortuous debate. We have been held responsible for this debate because we will not agree that the presently proposed design, recommended by the committee, is the most acceptable to the people of Canada. We do not intend to allow the House of Commons to be placed in a position of voting for or against something which is favoured only by the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and others who occupy government benches. Those gentlemen feel that the proposed design is the one acceptable in this country. Those are the same ministers who favoured and supported the three red maple leaves design as presented by the Prime Minister. Perhaps they were impressed with that design because it was proffered by the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, we are anxious to hear from the Prime Minister and his supporters as to their feelings in support of the flag proposed by the committee report now before us for concurrence. I am sure they could satisfy their desires at an earlier date if they produce answers to the many questions which have been asked. Surely they cannot expect overwhelming support for their proposal, or any support at all, when they, at the same time, continue their attitude of complete silence, which has been apparent since the committee's recommendation was presented to this house.

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, my first words must be in reference to the fact that we have not heard from the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) about this report from the flag committee, which was set up by this House of Commons. This is not a majority report, in view of the fact that almost one third of the members voted against it. It is very strange, indeed, that the Prime Minister

of this country has offered little or no support for the recommendation proposed by a committee made up of members, the majority of whom are his supporters. Surely his silence is an indication of childishness and petulence, and an apparent display of contempt for parliament. This attitude is an example of the great disregard for the wishes of the people that this government has adopted. Surely it is only a matter of common courtesy on the part of the Prime Minister of this country to stand in his place and give us some indication of his reason for asking concurrence in the report of a committee of this House of Commons.

This issue has been alluded to as one of the most important measures to come before this house in a great number of years. No one in Canada will dispute the fact, whether they want a change of flag, or not. Surely, in view of that fact, the Prime Minister of this country should stand in his place and answer the questions asked by the members of the house. I think tonight of the many times during my school days when I had the task of putting the union jack on the rope and hoisting it on the flag pole. I think also of the action taken in later years by the government of Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King which gave to Canada a new flag in the form of the red ensign. There is a lot of history throughout those years and a lot of that history was Liberal history. There is no question in so far as that is concerned.

Earlier in the day when I listened to the Prime Minister count the number of speeches that have been made on this question I thought of the questions that are going unanswered in this country today and I could not help but think that he would have been better employed inquiring into other activities that certainly interest Canadians and must interest him as the chief administrator of the country. The changing of a flag is not a simple measure such as a money bill or many of the other changes that parliament makes in statutes. In my view it is a part of the constitutional set-up of the country and I am surprised that throughout this debate very little attention has been given to it by the chief guardian of the constitution of the country, the Prime Minister himself. In saying that, I know he has to be in other places at times. He has many duties; but the Prime Minister of this country has no duty that is greater than his duty to sit in his seat in the House of Commons when an important measure is under consideration, and we had hoped that we would have seen him more frequently.

I think too tonight of the traditions of this country. I am in the unhappy or happy position, whichever way you want to look at it, of not having either a French or English background. I believe that most Canadians of my generation with a background not altogether dissimilar to mine want no part of the feuds that have been a part of the history of this country. It may be said by some, and I believe this is the argument of the Prime Minister, that perhaps because of these feuds, these things that have happened in the past, there should be no reference to the founding elements of this nation in the new flag. But as one of those who have never been a part of either of the two founding elements of the nation I cannot help but feel that we in this parliament today are in much the same position a firm is that decides to change its name, or when an organization decides to make a new beginning. But I ask you, sir, in all sincerity, how can a nation make a new beginning without some of the foundations upon which it was originally built?

When I look at the recommendation that has been made to parliament by the committee and consider the action that was taken by the Liberal members of the committee, I must say that, while I do not want to reflect on them, the decision taken by them in the committee indicates to me that they must not have been consulted when the Prime Minister brought in his three leaf design in the first place. It may have been his design, but the design that was endorsed by the Liberal members of the committee was another design altogether, and the outstanding fact to be remembered in this whole matter is that not a single Liberal member of that committee went to bat for the Prime Minister's design.

The thing that bothers me about this whole matter is this. We have heard a great deal of talk about unity among those who sit on the benches opposite, unity among the members of the government opposite and the unity they have given this nation, but when it came to supporting the design they had supported earlier in the house when it was brought forward by the Prime Minister the Liberal members of that committee did not give evidence of that unity. How can they ever explain the inconsistency of their position? Is that not the reason why the Prime Minister's seat is empty tonight? He cannot come into the House of Commons tonight and explain away the inconsistency of that position. That is why hon. members opposite are

very silent so far as that particular matter is concerned.

There are those in the house who have referred to the union jack as a foreign flag. They have referred to the fact that the fleur-de-lis is something foreign.

Mr. Caron: Yes.

Mr. Nasserden: The hon. member for Hull (Mr. Caron) says "yes".

Mr. Caron: Yes.

Mr. Nasserden: And he repeats himself. But when I go into the province of Quebec what do I see? I see the fleur-de-lis flying from the flag poles.

Mr. Caron: I never liked it.

Mr. Nasserden: The hon. member for Hull says he never liked it.

Mr. Caron: No.

Mr. Nasserden: And he agrees again. But when I go into the province of Quebec I see the fleur-de-lis. When the people there have their parades you see the fleur-de-lis. Those of us who come from other than English or French stock are not ashamed that the French were a part of the founding elements of this nation, or that the English were part of the founding elements of this nation. That is one of the reasons we would like to see on the Canadian flag not only the union jack but also the fleur-de-lis.

I cannot imagine the guardian of our constitution, who after all is the Prime Minister of our country, countenancing an action that would wipe out in one fell swoop all of the history of this country. What complicates the whole matter is that from those Liberals who sit behind him in the house we have had during the debate so far this wonderful show of unity. There has just been one dissenting voice from all those on the benches across the way. Is that not an outstanding fact, one to be noted by history and one to be noted by the people in every part of this country?

Some hon. Members: Question, question.

Mr. Nasserden: I would be glad to answer any questions.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Nasserden: I can tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, those are easy questions to answer. It will not be so easy for those who ask these questions when they go back to the electorate of this country in the election that will follow. The answer to some of these questions is to be found in the almost quarter of a million views that have been transmitted either individually or collectively to the Prime Minister and members of his cabinet by means of telegrams, petitions, letters and designs that have been submitted from every part of Canada. This government—

Mr. Grégoire: Name them.

Mr. Nasserden: —this careless Prime Minister, says this flag will be adopted in the name of national unity. How can there be the unity necessary when so many people have taken the trouble to write letters, send telegrams, sign petitions or submit designs? I imagine, in addition, that there have been those who have individually attempted to influence members on the other side of the house, just as they have tried to influence members on this side of the house on this important matter.

I hold no brief for any particular design tonight, Mr. Speaker. I want to say that I believe this is one of the saddest days in Canada's history. We see the Prime Minister's empty seat following the vote on the amendment and we know, whether through design or carelessness, the Prime Minister of this country is allowing this debate to continue without his intervention to shed some light on what the government proposes to do following concurrence in the report. I think thousands and thousands of people tonight will be wondering what manner of parliament we have in Ottawa.

Mr. Grégoire: We want the names.

Mr. Nasserden: Someone says, "We want the names". They are the unnamed Canadians—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nasserden: They are the unnamed Canadians who cannot sit in this House of Commons because they have sent others here to represent them. An hon. gentleman opposite made an interjection which I am not going to answer. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the people across Canada expect the Prime Minister of this country to give more attention to a matter such as this than he has shown in this cavalier dismissal of his responsibilities, this abdication of his responsibilities as the guardian of the constitution. He should give the opposition and the house some indication of the course the government intends to follow after concurrence in this report.

I do not wish to say any more.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Canadian Flag

Mr. Nasserden: After all that applause, I think I may continue for a while. I see the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) smiling. He is in a genial mood tonight. He was one of the two cabinet ministers, I believe, who took part in this debate. Surely tonight, in that expansive mood, when he is in a position so close to the Prime Minister that he must know what is going to happen, he will want the rest of us to know as well. I do not want to say anything more in that regard. I see the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau).

Some hon. Members: Order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order, does the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Boutin) have a question?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boutin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): What is your point of order?

Mr. Boutin: Mr. Speaker, since everybody seems happy to see the smile which brightens up the face of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp), why not suggest to the house that his smile be substituted for the maple leaf, on the distinctive flag?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order. The hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Nasserden) has the floor.

[*Text*]

Mr. Nasserden: I want to thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is the type of point of order that we have had throughout this debate, or so-called point of order. It gives us some indication of the seriousness with which hon. gentlemen opposite have taken this whole matter. I am not going to try to reply to it at all.

There are one or two things I want to say about the flag of Canada before I do conclude my remarks.

Mr. Grégoire: This is the fourth time you have concluded.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, when one has such an attentive audience it is difficult to conclude. I do want to say, in all seriousness that a Canadian flag with a red maple leaf in the centre, in my opinion, will not inspire that devotion from the people of Quebec that all of us would like to see. I say that because I believe the people of Quebec would rather see a green or gold maple leaf in that arrangement. I may be mistaken about this, but that is what I believe as a result of the observations I have been able to make during the last four or five years when I have been in that province. I want to say this, too—

Mr. Grégoire: In conclusion.

Mr. Nasserden: I regret that there have been all these interruptions which have made my remarks such a hodge-podge. I see hon. gentlemen opposite laughing. This is hardly the time when hon. gentlemen opposite should be laughing because, after all there is a lot more hangs on the decision that is about to be made in the House of Commons once a vote is called than hon. members realize at the moment.

When you are planning to change the symbol of a nation as is envisaged by the present government it ill becomes those on the government benches who have a majority in the House of Commons, with the assistance they receive from the other parties, to treat as lightly as they do the whole matter under discussion.

I wish to say in conclusion—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): I am sure hon. members would like the hon. member for Rosthern to bring his speech to a happy conclusion.

Mr. Nasserden: There can be no happy conclusion in a debate such as this when the Prime Minister is not in his seat.

Mr. F. J. W. Fane (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I think I should first ask you to have a bale of thistles brought in so hon. members on my far left will have something to keep them busy while I am speaking. I am amazed that tonight of all nights, after one of saddest days we have experienced in Canada, no one has come forward on behalf of the government to make a statement on the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to a new national flag.

Certainly a semblance of a flag was picked out by the committee that worked on it, but what real Canadian in Canada wants a flag which is not Canadian and which is not distinctive, but which is the flag of some other country—except that it bears a dead maple leaf in the middle in place of the coat of arms of that country?

Mr. Barnett: Nonsense.

Mr. Fane: The flag of Peru. Look at the list of flags. We are not getting a distinctive flag, if this is the flag the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) intends to impose on us. In any case, he should be here. He should make a statement telling us exactly what we can expect and what we shall be voting for when we vote on this motion which is now before the house.

I for one am not prepared to accept statements by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) as the spokesman for the government. I think the Prime Minister himself should make a statement and, failing him, a senior cabinet minister on the front bench whom he trusts, or should trust. If the right hon. gentleman feels it will compromise him to tell the people of Canada what national flag we are to have, why can we not hear from one of his senior colleagues instead of from a backbencher sitting in the front row over there, one who sets himself up as a heraldic expert?

One cannot expect anything better from this government, however. They are afraid to get up and speak. All except three have been afraid to rise during the last part of this debate. Not a cabinet minister spoke. That certainly shows disrespect of and disregard for the feelings of millions of Canadians across this country. Who is pushing them? Who is blackmailing the Prime Minister? Who is blackmailing the government? Why do they not have enough intestinal fortitude to get up and make statements in this house? They are extremely vocal at other times; ministers have been travelling all over this country of ours making speeches.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am wondering whether the remarks of the hon. member are really relevant to the resolution before the house. At the moment it is a motion for the adoption of the sixth report of the special committee on the Canadian flag. It seems to me that arguments advanced by hon. members should be in favour of or against the adoption of the report, and I should like the hon. member to refer his remarks to the subject matter of the discussion.

Mr. Fane: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I think any remarks I have made were very relevant to the debate. However, if you want to know right now exactly how I feel on the flag which has been picked out for us, let me say I feel it is not adequate. I am not in favour of its being the flag of Canada and I never will be. I served in two wars and I was proud to fight under the flag we had; and I wonder how many of the two or three million ex-service men and women in this country would be proud to serve under the travesty of a national flag which has been presented to us today. We may have to call it our national flag but believe me I am one who is most unwilling to accept it.

An hon. Member: And you represent how many?

Mr. Fane: I represent, as I told the house earlier, people of 40 different national origins and I speak as one who received an over-all majority in the last election. Anyway, I want to say that the flag which the committee picked out is not distinctively Canadian. It has a red maple leaf on it. Maple leaves only turn red when they are dead. If there is to be a maple leaf on the Canadian flag it should be a green maple leaf to show the surging life of this nation. As I said the other day, Canada is a growing country, a country which in the course of a few years will be greatest country in the world. We shall be the leader of the nations as, today, the nation to the south of us is the leader of the nations. I predict that for Canada, and I have lived here for many years. I wonder now, as I have wondered for quite some time—in fact, ever since we began debating the choice of the flag committee—how the Liberal members on that committee can reconcile their choice of a flag with that of their Prime Minister. What must the Prime Minister feel like when every one of the Liberal members on that committee repudiated his choice of a flag.

Mr. Grégoire: Oh, that has been said.

Mr. Fane: That is something that is beyond understanding. It is beyond my understanding, at least, and if it is beyond my understanding it is beyond the understanding of a great many other people. What does the Prime Minister think of that? Is he going to resign because his appointees on that committee turned him down? There were seven of them. They turned him down to a man and woman, every one of them. I believe that is a slap in the face for the Prime Minister whom they claim to love so much.

An hon. Member: Absence makes the heart grow fonder; they certainly must love him.

Mr. Fane: This flag is supposed to create unity in our nation. I think the people who believe that are very blind. This flag will not create unity, and there is no other way to look at it.

Mr. Choquette: Your party is divided, that's for sure.

Mr. Fane: What about yours? I think my hon. friend from Lotbinière should join his pals down in the corner and eat thistles with them.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Fane: Why, Mr. Speaker, they get so impatient that they begrudge me even a drink of water. As I was saying, the unity of Canada is something for which everybody in Canada should strive.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fane: I am very glad to have approval from all quarters of the house for that statement, because I think everybody should be prepared for a little give and take if it will provide the unity that is required in this country. All the give should not be—

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

Mr. Fane: You sit down, and I will answer a question when I have finished.

Mr. Grégoire: Then I rise on a point of order.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Grégoire: Actually, it is a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker; I would like to call it a question of privilege. Could the hon. member sometimes change the tone of his voice a little?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. please.

Mr. MacEwan: If you had half the guts that man has, you wouldn't say that.

An hon. Member: More fascist behaviour.

Mr. Fane: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that the unity of Canada is something that is paramount in this country of ours and there should be no question about that. Why cannot everybody get together properly? I said there must be give and take on all sides, from all parts. It should not be expected that one side will do all the giving and the other all the taking. The sacrifice has to be equal, and until people are prepared to make an equal sacrifice in this country Canada can never hope to be united. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that in the constituency from which I come the people are united. I have told the house there are people of 40 different national origins there, and we are united.

We figure that we are Canadians. We have intermarried; we have joined together. Our customs were all different, but we have joined together and made one culture in the area in which I live. Why cannot Canada as a whole, as a nation, do that? It is just a case of listening to some mountebanks, demagogues who would endeavour to destroy our nation. Whether they have taken the cue from people within this country or from without, I do not know; but I hope to heaven it did not originate within this country. It must be from without, and somebody fell for a smooth, fast talker. That is where the difficulty started in this country.

I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I stand for unity in this country and I will never stir up national animosity in any part of Canada. Personally I will never do that; I never have and I never will. If I can display feelings like that, why cannot all the people in this parliament get together and arrive at a proper flag—not just a flag, any old thing, because any old rag just will not do for this nation of Canada, I assure you, Mr. Speaker. A flag should provide unity. If we can get some togetherness, some give and take on all sides, from all parties, we would be a lot better off. Then we might get together and develop a flag—but not this one. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that is how the people I represent feel also. Again I must say that it is an insult to parliament, it is an insult to the people of Canada that the Prime Minister has not seen fit to take part in this debate. Preferably he should have started the debate off, but he should come into the house and make a statement as to what he thinks about it. Is he scared that his party will repudiate him again? They should not, if he does that.

I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of the provinces in our nation have spoken out definitely and decisively against this flag. So far as my area is concerned my constituents wish me to support the red ensign. As I have remarked several times before, we are prepared to give up part of our red ensign. We would wish to have some of the symbols of our heritage, the heritage of Canada, on our flag. This is a very serious time in the life of our nation and I think the Prime Minister should be here to make his statement.

Mr. W. H. A. Thomas (Middlesex West): Mr. Speaker, there appears to be in this chamber considerable hurry to get along with the business of choosing a national flag. This

is one of the most important matters that the parliament of Canada has ever been called upon to decide. I have pleaded before, and I do so again, that we should not be in such a hurry to take action which we or those who come after us have reason to regret. A flag is the symbol of a nation. It becomes very important to the people of a nation. Therefore we should take all the time that is necessary. Neither time, effort nor expense should be permitted to stand in the way of choosing a national flag which will tend to promote national unity in the country rather than discord.

This afternoon we disposed of one question and we are now speaking to the main motion for concurrence in the recommendation made by the committee that we adopt the flag with the red bars at the ends and with a red maple leaf between those bars. This afternoon the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) asked what comes next. Is the government, he asked, willing to accept this recommendation of the committee? No answer has been given to that question. The government have not put themselves on record as to whether they are willing to accept the committee's recommendation in the way of a flag. Then again, what procedure will be used if and when the house does adopt the recommendation of the committee? How will the house proceed to give effect to the committee's recommendation?

Another question which was asked was: What becomes of the two resolutions now on the order paper numbered 44A and 44B? The first of these was the one placed on the order paper by the government—by the Prime Minister—recommending that this house adopt the three maple leaf design. What happens to this resolution? Resolution 44B, also put on the order paper by the Prime Minister, calls for the house to adopt the union jack as the commonwealth flag or as the flag of the empire. Then there is another resolution, No. 45, dealing with a related topic, the national anthem. These are questions which I believe this house has a right to have answered before we come to a vote on this matter. Surely it is not too much to ask that the Prime Minister or some member of his government should undertake to satisfy the house and make the position of the government clear in regard to these questions.

The party to which I have the honour to belong, in common with all other parties in the house, is doing, I believe, whatever it can to promote national unity in this country. Opinions may differ as to how national unity can best be promoted. There are honest differences of opinion regarding the procedure which should be adopted with this end in view. Our party has taken the stand that for the government to impose a flag by a vote of this house is not the best way to promote national unity. We have the right to present our view and to urge our view upon all hon. members of the house. We wish national unity: all parties are working for national unity. How can we have national unity, however, without a reasonable compromise between the two elements in our population which are causing the disputation and trouble at this time?

Compromise, Mr. Speaker, presupposes a giving on both sides. The English speaking people in this country wish to retain on our national flag some symbols of our past heritage. But we are quite prepared to accord the French speaking people in this country a similar privilege—that they should have some symbolism of their past history also on our national flag.

I understand the feelings of our friends. They are quite willing to forgo any symbolism of our French heritage in Canada provided they can, at the same time, eliminate all the symbolism of the British heritage in connection with our country from our flag. The English speaking people are not prepared to accept that arrangement entirely, but they are quite prepared, as far as I have been able to learn, to compromise.

I sent out 4,000 questionnaires to the people in my area. I blanketed the area which was covered and sent the questionnaire to every family within that area. I have received something in the neighbourhood of 1,000 replies, of which 50 per cent have expressed favour for the retention of the red ensign. About 40 per cent expressed favour for that flag which has no symbolism of the past, namely the three maple leaf design proposed by the Prime Minister.

The significant fact is this. The majority of supporters of the red ensign are willing to accept a compromise. If our French speaking colleagues in this country were willing also to accept a compromise, I am sure there would be no difficulty in selecting a national flag. Our French speaking colleagues have a right to express their opinions, feelings and allegiances, but I do feel that they have not shown a willingness, as have the English speaking people, to accept a compromise. Surely that is what we need—a compromise. We must consider both sides. If we can select a flag acceptable to both our founding

races, I am sure that every other ethnic group will also accept that choice.

While referring to the two founding races, perhaps I should state that I believe most of us have forgotten that the two original founding races of this country were the Indians and Eskimos. The flag now being proposed does not embody any symbolism of those two races. What consideration has been given in the design of the proposed flag to Canadians who have come to this country in the last 97 years? Surely it is not too much to ask that the acceptable Canadian flag be a compromise of the feelings not only of the two founding races of this country, but of the feelings of the many thousands of Canadians from other countries.

Surely it is not too much to ask that we take our time and try to select a suitable design. I cannot understand why we should hurry in our selection of the Canadian national flag. Pressure has been put upon us ever since the flag issue was brought before us so many months ago. Our whole legislative program has been built around the flag issue. In fact, since the throne speech our debate and legislative consideration has been associated with the flag issue. We talked ourselves through both an Easter and summer recess. Now, in anticipation of a Christmas recess, none of us knows what to expect. What will happen? Who can give the answer? It is a good thing that we passed legislation creating nine statutory holidays per year. Thank goodness we can at least count on those.

The special committee on a Canadian flag recommended something which I do not feel is an honest and genuine compromise. It does not embody any symbols of our past. I give credit to the members of that committee for doing their best under these highly emotionally charged circumstances. However, in blindness to public opinion, they have brought forward something without historical symbolism, without recognition of the contributions of the two founding races, and without recognition of the feelings of the majority of the Canadian people, and for those reasons I cannot accept the committee's recommendation. I must, therefore, in all conscience, vote against the committee's choice.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that some genuine action toward compromise should take place. I think some compromise should be adopted which I can take to my constituents in Middlesex West and say: We could not retain the red ensign, but at least 75 per cent of the supporters of the red ensign have accepted this compromise, and we recommend that this compromise be accepted. As the situation now stands, I can only say to those members of my constituency who are Legion supporters that the recommendation of this special committee of the House of Commons is not acceptable on the grounds that it does not incorporate any symbols emblematic of our past history and traditions. That is not good enough, Mr. Speaker.

The government is seized with the responsibility of adopting measures supported by the majority of the people of Canada. The opposition must criticize, constructively, and has done so. It has suggested that we compromise by holding a plebiscite. Surely the government, in light of all the criticism and objection about this flag procedure, should be prepared to withdraw this resolution and send the question back to the special committee, or perhaps to a new joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate. Let us make a new effort to solve the flag issue. There is no hurry to adopt a new flag. We are not now going to have a flag by Christmas, even though this recommendation is adopted, and provided the Senate lives up to its usual record for speed. Let us try again in a committee to come to some compromise. Perhaps a committee made up of members of the Senate and members of the House of Commons could bring in some new ideas, so that we could adopt a flag which is, or will be genuinely accepted by the Canadian people. Perhaps as a result of the establishment of such a committee a compromise could be acceptable to both English and French speaking Canadians. Perhaps then there would be no losers or winners on the flag issue, but acceptance of a flag which would promote national unity rather than bitterness in the eyes of Canadians throughout this nation.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to touch on one other situation, namely that this government does not have a mandate from the people of Canada on the subject of a Canadian flag. It is a fact that the government is a minority government, but I do not hold that against them. They are doing the best they can. We know they have a big majority in the house on the flag issue and we know they have been well supported in the house during the 20 months they have been in office. But there was no mention in our area of a flag without symbolism of our past being imposed on the people of Canada during either of the last two election campaigns. This may have been an issue in some places. I believe the hon. mem-

ber for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) said it was the issue upon which he and his colleagues were elected, or at least one of the main planks in their platform. It was not a plank in any platform in our area and for that reason partly I say that the government did not have a clear mandate from the people of Canada to change our flag.

The promises made in our area included a national pension plan which involved an increase in old age pensions out of the first contributions made to the plan, an increase in old age pensions without any increase in taxation, which we will admit had a very attractive sound to the people. Then there was the promise in regard to wheat. We were to have $3 wheat on the prairies. This was a very attractive plank in their platform. We were to have a support price of $2.40 for soybeans in southwestern Ontario.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Would the hon. member kindly resume his seat. It may be that the hon. member's comments are relevant to the motion now before the house but that is not readily apparent to the Chair. I would ask the hon. member if there is any way that these comments and remarks can be related to the motion now under consideration.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Speaker, I was pointing out that to my mind the government has no clear mandate to impose a flag on the people of Canada. I was outlining the problems and issues that were a part of the election campaign in our area and I was going to make the point that the flag was not one of those problems and issues in our part of the country, but these other things were. All of the kinks were to be taken out of the Department of National Defence and out of government administration in general. We were to have a greater measure of world peace. The country was to come closer to Utopia than ever before, but there was no mention of the flag issue.

With the government having no mandate to impose a flag, the only suggestion I can make is that unless the government can find some way of approaching this problem other than simply imposing a flag by a vote of the house, unless we can set up a new committee of the Senate and the House of Commons or a new committee of the house alone and keep on trying to find a satisfactory design, then I think the only fair thing for the government to do is to withhold the imposition of a flag until they get a new mandate from the people of Canada. I think they probably need a new mandate in other respects as well. I think the whole policy envisaged by the government aimed at creating national unity, of which the flag is only one part—the opting out provision, the rewriting of our constitution, the British North America Act—all of these things together with the imposition of a new flag should be taken again before the people so that the people may have a chance to express their confidence or lack of confidence in the government. We need an election before a flag is imposed by a vote of the house.

The contract of confederation was entered into in 1867. That is 97 years ago, and for 97 years it has worked and served Canada. Some will say not well; some will say that it has served us well. But I should like to take the house back over the years to those days when confederation was under consideration and to place on the record the feelings of the leaders of the two parties then, including the leader of French Canada at that time. The Conservative leader, of course, was Sir John A. Macdonald. His attitude toward the empire, toward Canada and toward the flag is well known. In 1884 he spoke in Toronto on the future of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is perhaps the greatest monument to his courage and resolution. These words of his are to be found on page 36 of J. Pope's "Flag of Canada" published in 1912. These were the words of Sir John A. Macdonald:

> This will be 10 days from London—

He is speaking of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

> —to the new city of Vancouver on the Pacific coast. The run across the Pacific to Yokohama may be made in 14 days; the whole trip will thus be made in 24 days from London to Yokohama, a saving in time of at least 20 days over the route via Gibraltar and the Suez canal. The English colony of Hong Kong may be reached by the Canadian Pacific Railway in less than 30 days from England, or 16 days less than by Gibraltar and the Suez canal.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member because his remarks are, of course, of great interest. But it does seem to the Chair that he is straying rather seriously from the matter which he should be considering, the adoption of the sixth report of the special committee on the Canadian flag. Again I say it may be that these quotations are related to the question whether the house should adopt or reject the committee recommendation, but I would suggest to the hon. member that perhaps his

remarks should be a little more relevant to the subject matter.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Speaker, these remarks do have a definite relationship inasmuch as they indicate the attitude of the Canadian political leaders in 1867 regarding the flag of Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. My very respectful suggestion to the hon. member is that what this house has to consider is the opinions of the political leaders at this time and not as they were in 1867.

Mr. Thomas: If you will bear with me for one more sentence, I will come to the end of this quotation. These are the words of Sir John A. Macdonald:

> During all that time the traveller will never be out of the sound of the British drum and may always have his eyes resting on the union jack.

Now, we come to the attitude, and this is a shorter quotation, Mr. Speaker, of Hon. George Brown, that great Liberal leader in 1867 during the debate on the formation of confederation. This is concerning a flag, and George Brown, that great leader of the reform party was ever a staunch upholder of the union jack. In the course of the confederation debate, he said:

> It may be that some among us will live to see the day when, as the result of this measure, a great and powerful people may have grown up on these lands—when the boundless forests all around us shall have given way to smiling fields and thriving towns and when one united government, under the British flag, shall extend from shore to shore.

Again, we have mention of the British flag which in those days was the union jack. Here we have the Conservative party and the Liberal party representatives speaking with no objection to the union jack. Then we come to the opinion of Sir George Etienne Cartier, who in those days was the great French Canadian leader from Quebec. He was equally strong in his devotion to the British flag. This is a report in the Quebec *Morning Chronicle* of May 23, 1862, and reads as follows:

> The vote against the militia bill of 1862 was recorded, as we know, against a measure which was to provide, in a better and more efficient manner, for the defence of the country. We feel, therefore, that we fell in defence of a measure, the passing of which we considered necessary to secure us the full enjoyment of our free political institutions, under the protection of the glorious flag of old England.

Now, there was no dispute in those days when confederation was set up; the flag was acceptable to all elements of the country—to

the Conservatives, to the Liberals, to the people of Upper Canada and to the people of Lower Canada. There was no feeling whatever, no objection to the use of the union jack. It has only been of late, apparently, that an objection has developed to the use of the union jack. This sentiment may change. There are about 5.5 million people in Quebec and there are about 3.5 million of those people, I believe, who speak no English but speak French only. There are about 10.5 million people in Canada who speak English only. Now, our problem at this time is to get together on a compromise flag, a flag to which all people can subscribe and in the selection of which there will be no winners and no losers.

I have a letter here written by a group of distinguished people which has a distinct bearing on the selection of a national flag. Bits of it have been referred to a number of times but the letter, which is not long, has never been used. There are parts of it which have never been used. This letter is signed by a group of distinguished Canadians such as Dr. D. G. Creighton, professor of history, University of Toronto; Dr. Eugene Forsey, director of research, Canadian Labour Congress. I may say that I called Dr. Forsey just to make sure that this was a genuine letter and that the sentiments expressed in this letter were honest, and the real sentiments of the people concerned. I was assured by Dr. Forsey, when I read him excerpts from this letter, that the letter was genuine and represented the opinions of these people. The other signers are, Mrs. H. A. Dyde, Edmonton; Dr. W. L. Morton, professor of history, University college, University of Manitoba; T. H. B. Symons, president and vice chancellor, Trent University, Peterborough; Jean Palardy, author, film director, Montreal; Dr. Denis Smith, assistant to the president and assistant professor of politics, Trent University, Peterborough; David M. Harley, barrister and solicitor, Toronto; Eric McLean, music critic, Montreal; Walter Pitman, head of the history department, Kenner Collegiate, Peterborough. He used to sit over in one of those seats. Then, there is Dr. Macgregor Parsons, Red Deer, Alberta and Scott Bull Symons, assistant curator in charge of Canadian collections, Royal Ontario museum, Toronto.

This letter was addressed to the Prime Minister under date of May 27, 1964, and it is just as pertinent today as it was then. I quote:

We have thought deeply about the flag issue, and believe it necessary to write this open letter to you as an expression of our common feelings. May we emphasize that we do not speak as political partisans, but only as concerned Canadians representing several parties.

We applaud your decision to seek a distinctive national flag for Canada, and recognize your courage in doing so. We believe, as you do, that the flag should be a source of national unity, and that it should be unmistakably Canadian in character. However, we protest that the single leaf flag is neither of these things. Its only advantage is that it is innocuous, that it produces tepid approval, mild disapproval, or indifference, and that it can therefore be adopted without any display or strong feeling whatever.

Mr. Grégoire: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; I regret that I have to interrupt the hon. member, since it is now ten o'clock.

At ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, December 11, 1964

The house met at 11 a.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. WOOLLIAMS—LETTER TO BANFF ADVISORY COUNCIL FROM NORTHERN AFFAIRS MINISTER

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I think when you hear my question of privilege you will find my argument irrefragable. It arises out of a letter written on September 19, 1964 by a minister of the crown. My question of privilege affects my personal responsibilities to my constituency; and when I read the last paragraph of the letter, which as I say was written by a minister of the crown, I think, Mr. Speaker, you will also find it not only affects my responsibility as a member of this house but also the responsibility of any other person serving his constituency as a member of parliament.

This letter was addressed to the Banff advisory council, Banff, Alberta and was written by the minister of northern affairs. I should like to quote from the last two paragraphs. The letter is lengthy and I do not want to take up a lot of time. If any hon. member wants the whole letter read I am prepared to read it, but my question of privilege involves the last two paragraphs, which I am sure the house will find interesting and I trust, Mr. Speaker, you will even find shocking. The second last paragraph reads:

> I was most interested in Mr. Woolliams' reference on page 10040 of the debate to my letter to council of November 4, 1964. I am curious to know by what means Mr. Woolliams received a copy of that letter which he has subsequently used for partisan purposes which I do not think are in keeping with the kind of relations which I would like to have with the Banff advisory council.

Now we come to the crux and the meat of it.

> If the council would like me to send copies of all my correspondence with them, I would be glad to have that advice from you, and act accordingly.

The last paragraph is what I find shocking, Mr. Speaker, which I say affects my responsibility to my constituency and the responsibility of other members. It reads:

> I sincerely hope that Mr. Woolliams' remarks were not requested by the Banff advisory council or by any member of the council.

It is the last sentence with which I come to grips. This is it:

> I would hope that the council will conduct its relations directly with me at all times.

What this minister has done on this occasion, and what he did when he met that council, was threaten it. He said "You have to deal with me or I will not consider any of the suggestions made by you". I suggest that is irresponsible and an erosion of the responsibility of any member. This is a shocking letter, and I am sure the Prime Minister is shocked to know that one of his ministers has written in this manner to the people of the constituency of Bow River.

CANADIAN FLAG

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SIXTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Thursday, December 10, consideration of the motion of Mr. Batten that the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, be now concurred in.

Mr. W. H. A. Thomas (Middlesex West): Mr. Speaker, in the very limited time remaining at my disposal I should like to continue the promotion I put forth last night for a genuine compromise flag, which would be something that all Canadians could support, ending this contest without winners or losers.

Reaching a compromise is similar to horse trading. The seller starts with his top price and the buyer starts with his bottom price, and then a step by step process takes place to reach an agreement. After conferring with some of my colleagues I have decided to move the following amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Mandziuk). This amendment is designed to clear away the brush, leaving the way open for a real compromise flag. I move:

> That the sixth report of the special committee be not now adopted but that it be referred back to the committee with instructions to strike out in paragraph 7 all the words after "Canada" and substitute "be the Canadian red ensign."

And that the committee for such purposes be revived.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by Mr. Thomas, seconded by Mr. Mandziuk:

That the sixth report of the special committee be not now adopted but that it be referred back to the committee with instructions to strike out in paragraph 7, all the words after "Canada" and substitute "be the Canadian red ensign."

And that the committee for such purposes be revived.

Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will come to the amendment which has just been proposed when I deal with the votes that have already been taken by the committee whose report we are now considering. I believe I am the 71st member of parliament to take part in this discussion. I was the first of 174 speakers on the original flag resolution, and I am the 71st in this second discussion involving the flag recommended in the committee report.

Last evening it was suggested that before a vote is taken the views of the government should be made clear in respect of the committee report. Indeed, the impression seemed to have been created last night that if only the Prime Minister, speaking on behalf of the government, would give his view on this matter we could then go ahead and take a decision. So I am very happy indeed to oblige this morning and I hope the result which was indicated last night will be realized after I have spoken.

The question was asked last night, where does the government stand on this matter? I would point out first, Mr. Speaker, that what we are considering is not a government motion but a motion for concurrence in the report of a committee of this house, a report which is before this house not as a government motion, a report on which every member of this house has the right and the duty to vote as a member in a free vote. It is not, therefore, a question of where the government stands; it is a question of where every member of this house stands.

I am speaking this morning as one member of the house who is Prime Minister. I am speaking for myself, but I am also authorized to state that every member of the government, as a member of the government, supports the recommendation of this committee; and we are very happy indeed to have with us in this support not only members of the Liberal party but also members of opposition parties, including front bench members of the official opposition.

I was asked yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition what steps the government proposes to take if this report of a committee of the house is adopted by parliament. I can assure him, as I assured the house last June in answer to a similar question, which answer appears on page 4319 of *Hansard*, that if the recommendations in this report are accepted by parliament the government will then take the necessary action to implement those recommendations. The recommendations of the sixth report of the committee provide for a distinctive Canadian flag.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Before the Prime Minister goes on, may I ask him this question. If parliament concurs in the committee report, what are the plans of the government with regard to the Senate?

Mr. Knowles: Abolish it.

Mr. Pearson: I dealt with this question last June, but I am glad to deal with it again. This is not an unreasonable question by my right hon. friend.

Mr. Diefenbaker: There have been so many changes since June.

Mr. Pearson: There is one respect in which there has been no change since June, and that is the official opposition have prevented a decision being taken on this matter.

If the recommendations of this report are accepted by the House of Commons, they will be considered by the Senate. If they are accepted by the Senate, they become recommendations of parliament and the necessary formal steps will be taken afterward to bring these recommendations into effect. My right hon. friend knows, I think, what those steps are. In any event, I put them forward previously and I will be glad to go into that later.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Will it be by resolution in the Senate?

Mr. Pearson: Actually the formula will be laid down to the house if and when the recommendations are accepted. I would be very happy indeed, if the houses of parliament take positive action in regard to these recommendations, to associate a former prime minister and privy councillor with me in the formal steps that will be later required.

The recommendation of the committee for a Canadian flag was criticized yesterday by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition in

what I thought was an impressive speech, although I did not agree with it, largely because the design for a Canadian flag embodied in these recommendations eradicated our past; that the maple leaf flag somehow eradicated our past, the maple leaf flag as the national flag of Canada, with which will be associated, though not as a national flag, an emblem which will recognize the association with the commonwealth of nations and our loyalty to the Queen.

This does not, Mr. Speaker, eradicate our past. This recommendation for a distinctive national flag, far from eradicating the past, salutes the Canadian future, the future of a great, united Canada, with many races, many peoples, two founding language groups, and many people who are proud to be Canadians. Yesterday, the right hon. gentleman said, and I think I am quoting him correctly, that to forget the past is to condemn the future. Who is doing that in this house, Mr. Speaker? Who is forgetting the past—

Mr. Churchill: The Liberal party.

Mr. Pearson: —and who is condemning the future?

Some hon. Members: You are.

Mr. Pearson: Is it condemnation of the future, the adoption of a Canadian national maple leaf flag?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: Those of us in the house who are of British descent do not forget our past, our traditions, our mother country and—

Mr. Korchinski: You sure act like it.

Mr. Pearson: Some hon. gentleman opposite says I act like it. I will let my own record speak for that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: Am I supposed to be forgetting my British past because I look forward to my Canadian future?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: I dislike speaking about myself, especially on an occasion like this, but I believe I have given evidence in my own life, in my own career, in my service in peace and war, of my devotion to the British past of this country, my devotion to the symbols of that past, my willingness to serve under those symbols when it was necessary to do so; and I do not apologize to any hon. gentleman in this house for my devotion to that past and my dedication to a Canadian future.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: Yesterday the right hon. gentleman, in some moving words about the dedication of the French speaking element in this country to the British institutions and the British symbols of this country in the past, talked about the great heart of French Canada being, as he felt, with him in the stand he has been taking. To support that position he quoted from the words of a man from Quebec who has made his mark in Canadian history, Mr. Speaker Lemieux, who said many years ago—and perhaps the right hon. gentleman will forgive me if I requote this:

> If you ask me why I am a British subject, and why I wish to remain one, I reply . . . that I prize most those institutions that secure me most strongly in our rights and liberties; and am proud to be a sharer in that great work of advancing peace and progress throughout the world, for which the British empire stands.

Those words, Mr. Speaker, are a moving illustration of much that is best in our history, but they are also an indication of how history changes and how important it is for us to change with it. The past can and must be honoured, but surely the past must not be permitted to prevent the changes that are necessary to adapt to the future; and if Mr. Speaker Lemieux were in the house today he would not be able to speak in exactly those terms. He would not be able to talk about the British empire in the way he talked about it in this quotation, because principles may not change but institutions do change. The British empire has changed. We do not talk about the British empire now in the sense that we talked about it 25 or 50 years ago, and quite rightly so.

There is no British empire in that sense. There is a commonwealth of nations of which an independent Canada is a part, an independent Canada which is proud of these traditions, proud of the principles on which our political life is based; but an independent Canada which now feels it should have the symbols of its independence, as we have been getting them over the years. Changes have taken place and we adapt, surely, to those changes. Someone has said that a country which ignores the lessons of history is condemned to repeat its tragedies. We do not ignore the lessons of history when we support Canadian symbols for Canadian nationality.

We, Mr. Speaker—and this is an indication of the change I am talking about—who served in the Canadian forces from 1914 to 1918—and I served in both the Canadian and the British forces—knew that whether we were serving in the British forces or in the Canadian forces we served under the union jack, not the Canadian red ensign. None of us saw a Canadian red ensign in those years.

Mr. Churchill: That is not right, and you know it.

Mr. Pearson: None of us saw a Canadian red ensign in those years.

Mr. Churchill: You didn't serve in France, either.

Mr. Pearson: No, my service was very undistinguished, I admit; but I served—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: —and I served, as a Canadian, under the union jack and was proud to do so. It was not until 1945, by order in council, that the union jack was replaced by the red ensign as an official flag for Canada. At that time we all remember that a great many sincere people in Canada opposed that change. Many who are now worried about the change from the red ensign were worried about a change from the union jack, but I think we all agree now that this was a desirable and an inevitable stage in our national progression.

What we are doing in regard to the report of this committee is discussing, considering and, I hope, approving a recommendation of a parliamentary committee which is carrying out in its recommendation the injunction of an order in council passed as far back as 1945; and yet we are supposed to have rushed into this matter. I would ask hon. members to remember that this was authorized by order in council, and I do not recall those hon. gentlemen opposite who were in the house at that time taking exception to this action by order in council, not by parliament. The order in council recommended the adoption of the red ensign, a provisional recommendation pending decision by parliament. We are asking parliament in 1964 to take that decision on the basis of a report; not on the basis of a government resolution—that procedure has been altered—but on the basis of a report from one of its own committees in which all parties in this house were represented. Are we now to be refused that right of decision, Mr. Speaker, on grounds that we are ramming this through?

When it was first put forward in 1945 by order in council it was a provisional decision, and we are now asking that this provisional decision be changed to a parliamentary decision in 1964, a parliamentary decision for a Canadian national flag to which the party I have the honour to lead has been dedicated in resolutions at party conventions through two election campaigns as a specific commitment and, unlike other political commitments that I know about, a political commitment to be carried out if possible, or to be attempted if possible within two years of taking office; that is to say by next April. I can imagine the criticism to which we would be subjected in the 1965 session of this parliament if we had not taken that kind of action which we said we would take in a specific time period.

The committee that was set up when the earlier debate on this subject indicated that no easier, quick agreement was going to be reached by a free decision of this house worked hard, effectively and sincerely, and I would like to join others in congratulating its members of all parties and particularly, if I may, its chairman.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: Eleven out of the 15 members of that committee accepted the flag design recommended in its report; 11 out of 15. That is 70 per cent, or a little more, of the membership of the parliamentary committee; and among those 11 are representatives of every party in this house including the official opposition.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: The right hon. Leader of the Opposition has taken the position that if there had been two more, if there had been 13 out of 15 and not 11, no further debate would have been necessary and the matter could have gone to parliament for a quick decision. If there had been only two more, we would not need a plebiscite.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: We would not even need 74 speeches on the report of the committee. No delay would have been required. I am very, very sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the committee was not able to secure those two extra votes. I appreciate, however, the position of those four members who could not accept this recommendation, a position very honestly, sincerely and firmly held. The right hon. gentleman yesterday had something to say about the report of this committee and the

various votes, and an amendment has been moved this morning which was put forward as a compromise, something on which perhaps—

Mr. Churchill: No.

Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that was the expression used; it was an honest effort to find a compromise.

Mr. Churchill: As a preliminary to a compromise.

Mr. Pearson: I stand corrected, Mr. Speaker; it was put forward as a preliminary to a compromise.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: Perhaps that makes me even a little more suspicious about it. Preliminaries can sometimes take a good many weeks in this house. The committee considered a motion for a national plebiscite. That was defeated, and I will not say anything about it. They considered the adoption of only one national flag. As pointed out by my right hon. friend yesterday, the motion for one national flag was carried 14 to 0; and of course we all agree that there can be only one national flag. Then the committee voted on the Canadian red ensign as the national flag for Canada. That motion was defeated by 10 to 4. Now as a preliminary to this compromise we are asked to send the report back to the committee and have them reverse that decision, which was 10 to 4 against the red ensign, which is now to be sent back to be voted on.

That is indeed a pretty far reaching preliminary. But I would point out to my right hon. friend that when that vote was taken on the Canadian red ensign, to the preservation of which as a Canadian national flag he and his supporters are dedicated, that did not prevent, and I am glad it did not prevent, the Conservative members on that committee considering other designs and, indeed, supporting other designs, including a design which they favoured strongly and which was not the Canadian red ensign but which did have symbols of our British and our French associations.

The right hon. gentleman took strong exception to Liberal members on that committee swallowing—I think that was the word he used—the three maple leaves flag and, in the interests of getting the maximum amount of support possible for a Canadian national flag, accepting another maple leaf design. They considered this matter in exactly the same light, I assume, as did the Conservative members on that committee after the red ensign vote was defeated, and they also cast around for other designs which might be satisfactory to the committee.

Therefore we find other votes were taken. The three maple leaves design was retained by a vote of 8 to 6, but the single maple leaf design was retained by a vote of 13 to 1. I honour the members of the committee from this side of the house for the compromise they were willing to make to get the maximum basis for support, and I do not think, Mr. Speaker, they should be criticized for that any more than the other members of the committee should be criticized if, after taking a vote on the red ensign, they also looked around for some other flag which would receive the maximum amount of support.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, 11 of the 15 members of this committee agreed on a red and white Canadian flag built around the symbol of the maple leaf. The right hon. gentleman wonders why they deserted what he and others have called my flag, the one with three maple leaves. I wonder what he or his supporters would have done, Mr. Speaker, if I had tried to impose my will upon the Liberal members of that committee so as to force a majority committee report on a design which had previously been put forward in this house by me, thereby attempting to make that committee report what hon. gentlemen opposite would have called a government design. What kind of committee would it have been then?

Therefore the committee, in the exercise of its judgment, its wisdom and its desire to get a recommendation for a flag which would have a strong basis for support from every party—and it succeeded in this—made the recommendation which it did. I congratulate the committee on that recommendation, and I think the work they have done justifies the decision that was taken some weeks ago to set up this committee.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, that at the time we on this side agreed that the debate on the resolution should be brought to an end until this committee was set up and had reported we were accused of abandoning our position. We were laughed and sneered at for retreating. I remember some very strong words which the right hon. gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition, used in Fredericton when he arrived there for an important occasion and learned about the committee being established. It turned out to have been a very good

thing to do, I think, and I hope the right hon. gentleman will agree with me in this and will therefore feel a little differently about committees than he did on November 13, 1945, when he spoke on a resolution to set up a joint parliamentary flag committee. At that time he spoke in terms which indicated that that was the worst possible course which could be taken by this parliament. As reported at page 2090 of *Hansard* for November 13, 1945, the right hon. gentleman said:

> So that when an amendment was moved by hon. members on this side of the house the other day, the idea behind it was that instead of putting this matter into the cockpit of a committee where there may be engendered passions such as resulted from the placing of a similar question in committee in South Africa, we suggested that the government face the issue as a government—

Well, Mr. Speaker, we all agreed that this matter should go to a committee. We did not face it as a government in that sense; we sent it to a committee. That committee, as we hoped it would, brought about greater unity in the search for a design which would appeal to the greatest possible majority in this House of Commons. That was the purpose in setting up the committee, and I think that purpose was achieved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, are we, in face of that work which has been done, and as proposed by the right hon. gentleman, to ignore, to reject, to abandon this report? The right hon. gentleman said yesterday that it would be a step forward if we would only postpone the whole matter and forget about the report. Mr. Speaker, it would be a step backward if we were to do this, and it would prevent this matter being decided for the indefinite future.

In a very interesting television broadcast in June of this year the Leader of the Opposition—this broadcast has been referred to previously, Mr. Speaker—used these words: "It is parliament's responsibility to look after this matter". A little later, again quoting from the text of his broadcast, he said:

> You say, should it go to the Canadian people. I say no.

And again—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman is simply quoting excerpts. I said there should be a plebiscite. I said it at that time and I have continued to say that. But I did say that there should not be an election fought on the question of the flag.

Mr. Pearson: The right hon. gentleman will have to give his own interpretation to his words, but his words also included this expression.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes, you read it.

Mr. Pearson: I will read more if it will make him feel any better. The right hon. gentleman said:

> Put this matter of the flag before the Canadian people and I fear the results.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes, that is what I said.

Mr. Pearson: Then we are agreed on that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I do not mind the applause. What I said was, do not put it before them as an election issue. I advocated a plebiscite. Throughout the remarks which the right hon. gentleman is quoting he will find that over and over again I advocated a plebiscite. But I did say, do not put this matter before the Canadian people as an election issue, he himself having threatened to put it forward in an election and then having to withdraw.

Mr. Pearson: I really do not want to be unfair to the right hon. gentleman, but surely to clear this matter up the best thing to do —and I will be glad to do this as soon as the procedure makes it possible—is to table the full text of what the right hon. gentleman said.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is right.

Mr. Pearson: In any event, Mr. Speaker, the matter is now before parliament. We on this side as members of this party, with one exception—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: An honourable exception.

Mr. Pearson: Well, there are more exceptions on the other side. I would be happy, Mr. Speaker, to compare the quantity of exceptions but not the quality. In any event, we accept these recommendations, Mr. Speaker, and my right hon. friend opposite rejects them. That was made clear by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition yesterday.

It has been said that we should drop this matter. Some very earnest and sincere appeals have been made to us on this side to drop it because it is premature and controversial. It has been suggested that it is premature and that, after the stand that we on this side have taken, after the development over the years and after decades of nationhood, it should be postponed indefinitely. Mr. Speaker, what would be gained by that?

Would there be less controversy over a change next year, the year after or the year after that? Would the refusal to face up to this matter now not increase the controversy in the years ahead? Would there be a real chance of getting the kind of parliamentary support for this report which I hope even now we will get? Would there be any chance of that if we did nothing next year, the year after, or the year after that? Would there be any less controversy about the design next year, or would there be any more chance of finding a generally acceptable solution next year? Mr. Speaker, I think this is the time to act, especially after the consideration that has been given to this matter over the months. Let us have a decision on this matter now.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, some hon. gentlemen opposite seem to indicate that we on this side cannot be serious about this matter, and cannot be as passionately sincere as they profess to be. The right hon. Leader of the Opposition indicated this yesterday when he said we had deserted the flag that we had put forward, and that if we had been as serious about that flag as they are about their red ensign, which they partially abandoned at least in the committee, we never would have deserted that which they sneered about a few months ago as being the Pearson pennant.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned I put forth that design after a great deal of thought, consideration and discussion with experts of one kind and another—and we have lots of flag experts these days—as what I thought to be the most appropriate and most beautiful design.

Mr. Diefenbaker: And the one with the historical significance.

Mr. Pearson: Yes, and the one which has historical significance; indeed it has. The three maple leaves have historical significance; and so has the single red maple leaf, as has been pointed out.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, then may I ask the Prime Minister why it was that when he spoke in June he said the single maple leaf had no such historical significance.

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not recall using those words. I am quite willing to admit that in my view the three maple leaves have more historical significance than the single maple leaf, but the single maple leaf appeared on the arms of Canada, and I do not think anybody is likely to depreciate the significance of the single maple leaf, which not only has historical but a great deal of other significance, as anyone who has ever served in Canada's forces knows.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: What the right hon. gentleman is suggesting is that I insist on my personal preference in this matter; that I insist on the flag of the three maple leaves design in spite of the fact that 11 out of 15 members of a parliamentary committee, representing every party in this house, recommended the single red maple leaf on a white background, and red and white are the national colours of Canada and have been so for a long time.

Mr. Rapp: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Pearson: The right hon. gentleman now has suddenly acquired a deep affection for the three maple leaves—

Mr. Rapp: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Pearson: —with blue borders—

Mr. Rapp: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It does seem to me that the right hon. Prime Minister is entitled to—

An hon. Member: Let us keep the record straight.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Rapp: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would you kindly take your seat. It does seem to me that there is such a thing as courtesy. However, is your point of order a serious one?

Mr. Rapp: It is very serious, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure the Prime Minister would not wish to leave an error uncorrected in the record. He has stated time after time that the flag committee recommendation was approved by an 11 to 4 vote. At no time was there a vote of 11 to 4. Our chairman never voted, and the record should show that the vote was 10 to 4.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my hon. friend's preoccupation with this question of order. It is quite true that the vote which took place was 10 to 4, but the chairman of that committee has moved concurrence in this report.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: I think therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is fair for me to say that of the 15 members of that committee 11 support the recommendations of this report.

Mr. Rapp: That could be, but the vote never occurred that way.

Mr. Pearson: I quite agree that the vote was 10 to 4, because the chairman did not vote. Normally the chairman would only vote if there was a tie and he was required to break that tie. Mr. Speaker, when the three maple leaves design was before this house the right hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to it in the following terms: "I have seen better trademarks."

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is right.

Mr. Pearson: Unfortunately there has been a great deal of depreciation and sneering about the maple leaf as an emblem on a flag. I do not understand why hon. members opposite take that attitude toward this symbolism of Canadianism. I suggest it is unfortunate that the impression has been created in certain areas and quarters that the maple leaf is not worthy of being a national symbol of Canada on a flag, and I hope that when the dust of the debate has cleared away, if this recommendation carries, we will all be proud of the fact that the central feature of our flag is a red maple leaf.

The next criticism that has been levelled at us on this side is that if it is not the Pearson pennant, as it used to be called, it is somehow or other a flag design put forward to appeal to only one section of our population. It has been suggested time after time since last June, in speeches made by members on the other side and in statements made outside this house, that this has been done by the government, and now presumably by the committee, as the result of some kind of deal with one part of Canada—with Quebec—and that somehow this is Quebec's flag. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be more malevolently designed to stir up division and controversy in this country. It is untrue and it is unworthy.

Mr. Caouette: Dishonest.

Mr. Pearson: And dishonourable; and nothing could be more prejudicial to national unity in our country at this difficult time than these anti-Quebec flag and other insinuations. I think I join nearly every member of this house in deploring these divisive and demagogic tactics. To suggest, Mr. Speaker, that to introduce or support a maple leaf flag, whether three maple leaves or a single maple leaf, is to surrender to Quebec is an insult not only to our French speaking fellow Canadians but to those English speaking members of this house and English speaking Canadians outside the house who support these proposals—and many do—for the best and the most patriotic Canadian reasons. When this controversy and debate are over I hope we can somehow remove from consideration by parliament the feeling that any one part of Canada is more concerned in this matter than any other part of Canada, because this is a Canadian proposal we are submitting to parliament.

The issue now before the house, Mr. Speaker, is the right of parliament to come to a decision. Arguments have been repeated over and over again in the discussion. Statistics show how many speeches we have had and how many days we have devoted to this discussion. Surely no one inside or outside the house can argue that parliament has not had adequate opportunity to consider this matter in committee and in the house. Of course free and full discussion is absolutely essential to the parliamentary process, but full and free discussion is not the same as obstruction, as the prevention of a decision on a matter after discussion.

We have rules, and we have used them very sparingly. I hope we will never have to use them except very sparingly in emergencies. We have a rule to prevent this kind of thing. It is called closure and it is used practically every week, sometimes nearly every day, in the mother of parliaments at Westminster. Fortunately we have not had to use it very often in this parliament.

An hon. Member: 1956.

Mr. Pearson: Yes, it was used in 1956, and do not ask me to explain or apologize for the way it was used then.

Mr. Diefenbaker: You voted for it.

Mr. Pearson: I voted for it; indeed I did. I voted for it, but let me remind the right hon. gentleman that after what he said about the use of this rule in 1956 and after his commitment to remove this rule from the standing orders, what did he do about closure? I hope he will pardon me for mentioning this but his intervention made it necessary. The rule was retained, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The right hon. gentleman supported closure in 1956 and flouted parliament, and he cannot explain it.

Mr. Pearson: No doubt it was retained by my right hon. friend and his government because they may have thought it might be necessary to use it in the future to prevent obstruction and filibustering. We have had a great deal of discussion on the matter before the house. The issue, therefore, is not now the right of debate, not the right of free and full discussion in parliament. The issue now is the right of parliament to make a decision after debate. If the official opposition or any opposition, because they feel so strongly about this matter, claim the right to prevent any vote by using the rules, then the government or members on this side of the house who feel equally strongly and sincerely have the same right to use the rules to bring about a vote after full discussion if that is the only way a decision can be reached. The other alternative is dissolution and an appeal to the people on the prevention of a vote.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, we will not have to follow either of these courses. But if we on this side are not to be prevented from exercising the right of decision, then the members of the opposition should show some responsibility by not prolonging the right of discussion until it becomes obstruction. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, a minority can impose its will on a majority by ultimatum, and this has been suggested in this debate. "Withdraw your measure or alter it and your tactics concerning it to suit us or we will bring parliamentary business to a standstill."

This would make a mockery of parliament and the parliamentary process. I am sure the right hon. gentleman does not contemplate or approve that result. Perhaps he will permit me to quote what one of his predecessors, Sir Robert Borden, had to say on this point on April 9, 1913, as found on page 7389 of *Hansard*. He said:

> No one is more ready than I to acknowledge that liberty of speech and freedom of debate must be preserved, but I venture respectfully to suggest that these privileges must be observed and maintained under such conditions that they shall not be allowed to degenerate into license and obstruction.

Our friends in the New Democratic party have indicated they do not believe in the application of closure. They are not opposed as a party, and apparently some of their members are not opposed as individuals, to the recommendations of the report. I believe some of them will support those recommendations, from the record of votes we have already had. But they feel it is quite proper, and I am not criticizing them, to use the rules to stop debate on recommendations which they may not necessarily be going to oppose, so we can be forced by the rules to debate something else which they wish debated. That is not closure to bring about a decision, Mr. Speaker. That is a form of closure, using the rules, to prevent a decision by altering the course of debate. They have the right to do that. They have the right to use the rules for that purpose. If they can secure a majority for the application of the rules to alter the course of debate and postpone the discussion of a particular subject, they have that right.

Parliament's decision on this matter was assumed to be necessary 20 years ago. I repeat, is it to be prevented now? The government is not imposing anything on parliament. It is asking for respect for parliament's right to decide after full and complete debate. If we reject that right, then parliament becomes meaningless. That, Mr. Speaker, is the issue. The government proposes and parliament disposes. The opposition has a right and a duty to oppose, to criticize, to clarify, to hold up, but does not have the right to prevent a decision. I repeat, if it can do this then the parliamentary process is meaningless.

I hope, therefore, very sincerely that it will be possible to have an immediate decision on this matter after all the discussion that has taken place concerning it and, indeed, when every possible point of view has been put forward time and time again. It has been said that we on this side have no mandate to proceed with this matter. The right hon. Leader of the Opposition has argued that this is a deeply controversial issue, it is a divisive issue, and that we have no mandate to proceed at this time.

Parliament, Mr. Speaker, has a mandate to decide. It is said we are a minority government and we should not bring forward this controversial measure. We are a minority government, but this is not a minority parliament. So I hope this parliament will be given the right to exercise its fundamental duty; that is, to decide after a full and free debate.

Notwithstanding what some hon. gentlemen may have said in the heat of debate across the chamber, we on this side have one thought only in asking parliament to come to a decision on this matter, to decide one way or the other. We are concerned, as

hon. gentlemen opposite are concerned, with the unity of our country. We have, as they have, pride in its progress, and we have confidence in its destiny. We are sincere in that feeling. To help reach the goal of a great, united Canada, to which we are all dedicated, I believed and I still believe we should have a national flag that stands for Canada, that flies as a symbol of Canada alone, that neither dishonours nor betrays the past but looks to the future; a flag that will say one word and that word is "Canada".

For this national purpose I believe a design is required which is solely Canadian, and that will be accepted as such by all Canadians. If, Mr. Speaker, the absence from our national flag of symbols which to a large part of our people seem to represent early differences, if that is the feeling among a very substantial proportion of our population; if there is almost unanimity in that part of the population to secure the adoption of a flag which will look forward and not backward to symbols of its own origin or any other origin; and if that feeling is shared by at least a large proportion of other Canadians, whether a majority or not I do not know, whose background is not the same as Canadians in Quebec—if it is necessary to have that kind of flag which without rejecting our past looks to our future and in that way will bring us together, is the absence of those earlier symbols from a Canadian flag too much of a sacrifice for the rest of us to make in the interests of unity in this country? Well, I suggest it is not a sacrifice at all, especially when the symbol takes the form of the maple leaf which over the years has meant so much to every Canadian in war and in peace and has become so deeply a part of our symbolic history. This is especially true when the other symbol of our past, which has appeared on our flags in the past, the union jack, is to be recognized in another way.

The hon. member for Leeds, in his intervention a few days ago quoted one or two words from a speech given in Montreal in 1923 by Right Hon. David Lloyd George when he was receiving the freedom of that city. I wonder if I may quote the rest of that sentence. At that time Mr. Lloyd George was talking about Canada's military tradition after the first war, the sacrifices, triumphs, glories and tragedies of Canadian participation in that war. He was dealing with the second battle of Ypres, and he said:

> The Canadian heroes—they fought it, they fought it through the whole afternoon, they fought through the dusk, they fought against all the principles of scientific warfare right through the night, and when the dawn came the position was saved. And more than that. The maple leaf was embroidered forever on the silken folds of the banner of human history.

Has the time not come, Mr. Speaker, to embroider it now on our own national banner? Surely those of us who do believe that the time has come and who support this change in our flag can honestly and sincerely feel that in doing so we will be helping to bring all Canadians closer together in a new pride in their country and all that it has meant and can mean.

So, Mr. Speaker, I appeal for a decision now, a decision of parliament after the discussions we have had over the long weeks; a decision of parliament on this report, a report not of the government but of a committee of parliament; the recommendations in a report of a committee of parliament concurred in by the representatives of every party in this house. I appeal, Mr. Speaker, for a decision by this parliament in which all the people of Canada are represented. I appeal also to all members, once a decision has been taken, a decision of parliament, to accept it and rally around the decision. I appeal, Mr. Speaker, to the Leader of the Opposition to put his great authority and prestige behind this decision, whatever it may be. He and those who have supported him on this issue have fought long and with a passionate sincerity for what they believe. I hope we will be given the same credit for passionate sincerity in putting forward what we believe.

I ask the Leader of the Opposition, a privy councillor, a former prime minister, a dominant parliamentary figure for many years, if the decision of parliament is to support the recommendations of this committee, to join us in saluting Canada's new maple leaf flag. I ask him to help us rally a united parliament behind that flag, if this is the decision of parliament, as it is raised high to fly over Canadians who honour their past and respect their traditions, Canadians who also face the future in confidence and faith, in unity and in strength, and who wish to face that future under their own national symbols.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I spoke at length yesterday and I do not intend to traverse the arguments I advanced then or the course of that debate. I rise simply to

refer to one or two matters arising out of the Prime Minister's speech.

I was particularly interested in his concluding remarks in which he called on the opposition to rally around Canada's flag. Apparently that speech was written for use after parliament had decided the way the Prime Minister wishes it to decide, because as yet that appeal has no effect whatsoever. We are discussing the question as to the nature of the design of Canada's flag, and until parliament makes its decision there is no reason for anyone to answer a specious challenge such as he has just placed before us.

I am going to mention just one fact because it must be clarified, and it is this. In all that speech, covering the areas that he desired to cover and of course detouring from those he did not wish to cover, he was unable to make one argument to support his stand that those people sitting opposite, the government of today, had any mandate from the Canadian people to bring about a flag upon which no vestige of the union jack is to appear. As a matter of fact he was challenged several times during the election campaign—I believe twice—to say what he had in mind and what the Liberal party had in mind for a distinctive national flag. On no occasion did he answer that.

As far back as 1961 he gave an interview in Amherst, Nova Scotia, in which he spoke of a distinctive national flag and he was asked this question. In that distinctive flag—and I am simply paraphrasing because I do not have the material before me—in that distinctive flag would you remove the union jack, and his answer was "I am not telling you."

He puts up the old argument that we who oppose this are therefore opposed to Quebec. That argument I hurl back at him and into his teeth.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We are not trying to impose a flag. We are trying to give the Canadian people an opportunity to say what that flag shall be, because there was no mandate to the Liberal party in 1961 through 1963 that gave them any authority on the part of the people of Canada to thrust our past aside.

We are not trying to impose a flag on any province or portion of Canada. Our endeavour, I repeat, is to give the Canadian people an opportunity to determine a matter that was never before them excepting in a nebulous way. Indeed, the Prime Minister was most careful to say, when he was injecting these suggestions, that because we oppose the viewpoint expressed by the flag committee we are anti-Quebec.

What did he say in Amherst? He said the choice of the flag would be made after consultation with the ministers from the province of Quebec.

Mr. Pearson: That is not true.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Who brought this—

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I have to rise on a point of privilege and tell my hon. friend that that statement is not true and never was said.

Mr. Diefenbaker: All right.

Mr. Pearson: It has been denied. It was denied by me immediately after the purported report of the broadcast.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the recording is still available. We have a complete transcript of that speech. It was he who first brought this up. It was he who said the choice would be made—a completely unworthy statement on his part—and he has been trying to run away from it since because he realized its import. On the same occasion when he was asked "What are you going to place on the flag?" his answer was the courageous one, "We won't tell you; we are not letting you know." Therefore there was no mandate.

The reason I mention mandate is because of his rather thinly veiled threat of closure. Well, we have heard these threats before. First he said the government would stand or fall on the three maple leaf flag. Then when he found himself in a position where he might fall he decided not to stand.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Then he backed away from that and said "If you don't watch out you are going to have an election." It was at that time I said an election fought on this issue would not be beneficial for Canadian unity, and I still have that viewpoint. He said "You will have an election," but we did not cringe; we did not gasp in the face of the threat, so what did the Prime Minister do then? He followed the customary course of backing up and saying "Of course there should not be an election." So the course has been to tell us what he is going to do and place the veiled threat before the house.

In this case, however, he knows he has these allies of his who sit over in this corner, the Créditistes. Allies they are today, but only a few short months ago they were un-

worthy in every way. I can place on the record some of the statements that were made regarding these hon. gentlemen, statements made by Liberal members, statements made by the Prime Minister ridiculing their policies, statements made by leaders of Liberalism, not the least of whom is the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis). He is a great tribune. He went through the province of Quebec and excoriated Social Credit; he showed that it was an ally of Hitler and Mussolini. People believed these hon. gentlemen. However, today they are all together. What a family relationship this is.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I have the floor.

Mr. Caouette: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

I should like to know the connection between the statement of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the choice of a distinctive national flag.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman will wait, I am going to satisfy his curiosity for information in a moment. I am glad he asked that question, because only the other day that well known democrat, that believer in parliamentary democracy, the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), was all ready, apparently, to move the previous question and impose closure. Now that he has the approval, the approbation in anticipation, of the Prime Minister I am sure it will not be long before the water boys of the Créditistes again operate to help the government of the day, and we can look forward to a motion on their part to carry out the wishes of the Prime Minister.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege—

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do hope these interruptions are real questions of privilege, because otherwise they would be out of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Imputing motives to members of this house may give rise to a normal question of privilege.

It is presumed that we intend to support the government. That is untrue, but at least we are sufficiently honest and politically conscious to support the good measures submitted by the government, because we do not consider ourselves as members of the opposition but as members of the House of Commons, of the Canadian parliament.

I deny the Leader of the Opposition the right to question our intentions and our honesty in the circumstances.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, that is not a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I do not deny the hon. gentleman political conscience. He did not refer to conscience; therefore I take it—

Mr. Grégoire: Yes, I did.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —there is significance in the fact that he placed before the word "conscience" the word "political". It is of political conscience that I am now speaking. The fact is that the other day it was this hon. gentleman who threatened this course of action and I expect, as I said a moment ago, that it will not be long before the allies of the Creditistes will join with the government to bring in this motion which the government is loth to bring in but can support if they have the benefit of its introduction by their Creditiste allies.

Mr. Pepin: Apologize to Balcer.

Mr. Grégoire: What about Balcer?

Some hon. Members: What about your deputy leader?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are in the process of hearing some very interesting speeches today, and I do hope we can continue to hear them.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, there is a very fine spirit of levity apparent, and I am glad the house is receiving my words in that kindly way that always characterizes this chamber, except on occasion. I started by saying there was no mandate. I now quote, for the benefit of the house, what has been said in this regard. I have had to send to my office to get material, so perhaps it will not be in the order it should be, because I had not expected the threat of closure today.

I do not mind; let them do it. But the Canadian people will not forget that because the government could not convince, they decided to throttle parliament by bringing in closure. Let that be perfectly understood.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: In 1917 a measure was brought before the House of Commons to produce a system that did contribute to Canadian disunity. I refer to the conscription measure. It was brought before the house and in the course of the arguments against it Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe said this:

> I contend that this house has neither the mandate nor the authority to pass such a measure. Now, this action on the part of the government becomes even more arbitrary when it is accompanied by the rigorous application of the rules of this house which are actually imposed upon us. It is assuredly tyrannical—I believe the word is still within the limits of moderation—to employ the gag in order to have such a measure passed by a parliament such as we constitute just now.

Mention was made of Sir Robert Borden. I am going to quote some of the statements that were made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in this connection. In 1911 and 1912 there were great debates in this chamber. They talk about our debating for 22 days in connection with the flag.

Mr. Grégoire: Thirty two.

Mr. Diefenbaker: As I said yesterday, the Prime Minister made it very clear in a speech in Hamilton that there had been no interference with the legislative program because, after all, all that had been sacrificed were the holidays of members. Sir, let me now place before you what Sir Wilfrid Laurier said.

Mr. Grégoire: Dispense.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He was dealing with a question that has now been suggested by the Prime Minister. For weeks the debate went on in 1911 on the question of reciprocity. The minister of finance of the Liberal party and Mr. Patterson—I forget what portfolio he held —returned from Washington with what was to be a treaty between Canada and the United States. The Conservative party opposed that, and week after week the argument went on. I have read the press of that time, and the press said there was obstruction because the Conservative party went on and on in that regard. Finally Sir Wilfrid Laurier dissolved the house and his government went down to defeat.

In 1912 the Conservative party brought in legislation in connection with assistance to the British government for naval construction, a measure that would not be acceptable today and was greatly divisive at that time. The Liberal party opposed it; they stood firmly. I do not know how many weeks the debate went on, but it was a lengthy one. I have some of the press clippings of that day, in which it was said how unfair it was for an opposition so soon after an election to stand against a government which had a majority; not a majority dependent on allies, but a majority in the house. Finally the Conservative party introduced closure and the legislation respecting the navy went through. It went to the Senate, the Senate turned it down, and it never came back because the Liberal party was right in its stand. The Conservative leadership realized, after the fullest discussion had taken place, that such was the fact.

It is well to read what took place when the question came before the House of Commons in the session of 1912-13. Closure was moved on April 9, 1913, as recorded at column 7411 of *Hansard*. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. J. D. Hazen rose in their places, and the speaker was the leader of the opposition. Mr. W. B. Northrup then rose and moved that Hon. J. D. Hazen be heard; he was one of the Conservative ministers from the province of New Brunswick. Then Sir Wilfrid said:

> When you have a majority in this house, that is what we have to expect from you—shame!

They are not my words; they are the words of one of the greatest parliamentarians in all Canadian history. Then the motion was put and was carried.

Sir Wilfrid spoke later on, as reported at column 7430, as follows:

> But no; he had not a word to say, but to apply closure in anticipation—

Then at column 7432 he is reported as saying this:

> During the 15 years I was in office it sometimes happened that friends came to me and told me that I was not doing justice to myself or to the party, but that I should impose closure, as had been done in many parliaments. Sir, I am a Liberal of the old school; I have been brought up in the school of Fox and of the old leaders of the Liberal party; and I could not bring myself to the point of depriving a minority in parliament of such a valuable weapon as it would be deprived of by the introduction of closure. Perhaps I was wrong; perhaps I was too generous. Nay, I was not; I would rather stand here today, having refused, after the 15 years of my administration, to impose closure, and having decided to abide by the old rules. The rules of the house are intended to apply to the discharge of the duties which the house owes to the country, and to the sovereign.

A few sentences later he said:

> It has been charged against us that we have delayed the business of the house, that we have prevented it from going on.

That has not been charged here because the matter has been cleared away by the Prime Minister's frank statement which I quoted earlier.

> Sir, I deny the charge altogether; there is not a word of foundation for it. If the business of the house is not more advanced than it is, the fault cannot be laid at our door, but at the door of the other side.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the state of affairs today. Indeed, when the Prime Minister gets out on the stump on some of these trips of discovery, he speaks of the wonderful record of this government and of how much legislation it has got through. That is when he is outside the house. Sir Wilfrid went on:

> It is quite true that when we came to the first of April, supply had not been voted, and the financial year was at an end; but if supply had not been voted before that, whose fault was it? Was it that supply was demanded and was refused?

Then as reported at column 7433 Sir Wilfrid went on to say this:

> Everybody knows that whenever a measure of public importance was brought to our attention we gave it our best consideration, and it was passed.

That is our position today, Mr. Speaker. Every piece of legislation this government has introduced and carried along has been passed. Indeed, we have been so anxious to get the government to produce the legislation it has not got that we have supported the adjournment of the house so the government might bring these measures forward. Then Sir Wilfrid Laurier continued:

> It is true, sir, that we opposed a certain measure. It is true that we opposed the bill for naval aid. We did that with all the might at our command; we did it with all the means at our command under the rules of the house. Am I to be told that in the exercise of this power of strenuous opposition we did anything which is not in accordance with the best traditions of parliamentary government?

Mr. Speaker, his words of 1913 come back to us today and can be applied to the present circumstances. He continued:

> Sir, at all times in this house, at all times in the mother of parliaments, there have been questions upon which the minority thought it owed it to itself to offer the most vigorous opposition possible. Under the rules of the house it is expected that the two sides of the house shall carry on the business, as was stated by my right hon. friend today, and so it is generally; but there are occasions, I repeat, when the opposition or a minority owes it to itself, on account of the strong views it holds upon some public measure,

> to oppose that measure with all the force at its command.

What we have done is to carry out the concepts of parliament espoused by a great parliamentarian. Then Sir Wilfrid continued and said that the remedy is not closure, that it is not the application of brute force. He said the remedy is an appeal to the people. He continued, as reported at column 7435 of *Hansard*:

> The people, after all, are the judge and the jury. The people, after all, are the parties to pass judgment as between the government and the opposition—

Then he said:

> I am sure it was not a pleasant task that my right hon. friend performed today; and, for my part, when I compare my conduct with his conduct, I am proud that I resisted all applications for closure, and that when the time came I appealed to the people, as I did on reciprocity.

Then as reported at columns 7435 to 7437 he uttered some words which are very significant. He set out the number of times when closure had been applied when there had been obstruction. Then he said that in every case the opposition was right, as it is right today.

The Prime Minister asked me why we did not abolish closure. We had the measure ready for the house but there were other matters to be dealt with. We believed in priorities in matters which deserved immediate attention. A committee on procedure was set up but did not bring in the recommendation in question. At all times we said we would not impose closure and we followed that course, although we did not in fact abolish it as we said we would. Though the legislation was ready, when defeat came to us we could do no other than accept defeat and go to the country.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the right hon. gentleman would not mind my making a purely factual reference. The right hon. gentleman will recall a motion which he brought in to refer the matter to a committee. On that occasion I, speaking on behalf of the official opposition at that time, offered to support the immediate abolition of closure. So the right hon. gentleman could easily have done this that very day without any further debate.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, that interruption is most beneficial. I ask the hon. gentleman now, holding the belief he did with regard to closure, how is he going to vote when there is a motion in this house?

Is he going to follow his principles or follow his party?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman has addressed a direct question to me and I know, in the way he always does, that he will let me answer it equally directly. I said at that time that we would support a government which had an overwhelming majority in carrying out its mandate from the people. I did not say that we believed there should be no form of closure, but I said—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Winkler: Wiggle, wiggle.

Mr. Pickersgill: Surely, Mr. Speaker, I can be allowed to speak; I have listened to hon. gentlemen opposite. I said that we were not going to obstruct the government which had a clear mandate for which it had twice asked the people. I say to the right hon. gentleman that we twice asked the people of Canada to give us a mandate for a distinctive Canadian flag, and I suggest that that mandate should also be respected.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, that question turned out to be the usual unobjective ejaculation without sense or reason or fact to support it. As a matter of fact, I quoted from the hon. member's statement yesterday and he ran for cover. I pointed out what he said, that without the union jack there would be division in Canada.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I denied that statement yesterday, and there is a rule of this house which states that when an hon. member quotes from a press report which is not in quotation marks, and an hon. member says that it is not an accurate account of what he said, the member's word must be accepted. I made whatever statements were made in Quebec, and those statements were not correctly reported in the press. I indicated that fact the following day, and the right hon. gentleman has no right to take the original report and quote from it. This same thing has happened on many occasions, and I suggest that the right hon. gentleman should stop questioning the words of other hon. members.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I have had a search made to obtain the denial that the hon. member mentions, but there has been no record of it which anyone has been able to discover. However, the hon. gentleman was in a difficult position in this regard. After all, in the shadows standeth Joey. If there is any misunderstanding about who "Joey" is, let me state that the premier of Newfoundland has said that there will be a union jack and, as far as he is concerned, nothing else. Mr. Speaker, how uncertain is the course of the government in this connection; because having wiped the union jack aside, and having said it should not be part of Canada's flag, they are now going to have a second one. But we say, put them together.

I suggest to the Prime Minister that he stop making fatuous and nebulous threats, because we have received too many of them. Do not have your allies make your motions, or allow them to make threats because we are not in any way—

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The hon. gentleman has invited this, so I must give him some assistance. Do not make threats and expect those in the Creditiste party who support you on every occasion to pull you out.

Mr. Grégoire: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I say to the leader of the Creditistes, what did those friends of his say about him only a few years ago? The minister of health, speaking in Calgary said Réal Caouette should not sit in the House of Commons. That is what they thought of him then. Today there is a wonderful feeling of co-operation between—

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Today there is a wonderful feeling of co-operation between the members of the—

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Two wrongs do not necessarily make a right. Do you have a question of privilege?

Mr. Grégoire: I have a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition said exactly the same thing in my constituency, and his candidate lost his deposit in that election.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I never directly or indirectly made any such statement, and the hon. gentleman knows that what he has said has no basis in fact.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Canadian Flag

Mr. Grégoire: On a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. All hon. members realize that during political campaigns there is a certain lyrical quality to statements.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I want to quote now—

Mr. Grégoire: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I should like to quote from the hon. member again and mention that—

Mr. Grégoire: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Grégoire: On the same question of privilege, the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Do you have a question of privilege?

Mr. Grégoire: Yes, Mr. Speaker. At the same meeting the Leader of the Opposition, while in my constituency, promised a new distinctive Canadian flag, and I should like that fact to be on the record.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the fact that that statement is put on the record by the hon. gentleman does not add any credibility to it. Before one o'clock I should like to quote to the members of this house the words uttered by the Minister without Portfolio as recorded in *Hansard* of October 9, 1962, at page 304 as follows:

> Mr. Speaker, it does not behoove a party leader, especially in his maiden speech before the nation, to speak nonsense, even though he is the leader of the Social Credit party. I hope that after hearing his deputy leader, he was reminded of the golden era of the Italian government under the Benito Mussolini administration.

Then he went on to say:

> They lied to the people during the last election campaign, they lied on television and they are keeping it up.

Those are the remarks uttered by that hon. member about members belonging to a party which today has been taken into the sheepfold, and I thought it only right that the house and the country should know of them.

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Dupuis: I should like to ask him why he was so proud and happy to accept the votes of the Créditistes when he was sitting on this side of the house.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, that is what they have in mind. Now we are beginning to observe the alliance between them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I should like to place on record the words of Mr. Chevrier, now a high commissioner, as recorded in *Hansard* of October 5, 1962 at page 247. He said:

> I come now, Mr. Speaker, to a series of fallacious, mendacious and untrue statements which I find in the book entitled "Réal Caouette vous parle".

Then Mr. Chevrier said:

> Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that one of Hitler's slogans, from 1929 to 1932, was—

The words then appear in German, and then this:

> "You have nothing to lose." They borrowed not only this individual's philosophy, but also his slogan.

Today those individuals who were being criticized then have become the handmaidens of Liberalism.

Mr. Speaker: It being one o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2.30 p.m.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Grégoire: Where are the Conservatives? They are not here.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I hear gabbling again from the hon. member for Lapointe but I am not going to criticize because we will recall that the lessons of history show that great city, Rome, was saved by the gabbling of geese. It is just a case of recalling one of the lessons of history.

At the time of adjournment I was reading into the record a number of statements that had been made by members who today occupy the treasury seats regarding the hon. gentlemen who belonged to the Social Credit party of 1963 and today belong to the Creditiste party. However, the only reason I placed those statements on the record was that I was really forced into doing so. Now that

there is reasonable quietness I find it no longer necessary to add any further gems of political wisdom uttered by ministers of the present government regarding those whom they now envelop in the arms of their affection.

There are one or two observations I should like to make regarding the question of closure. I am informed that last evening Mr. Poliquin, a leading member of the press gallery, advised in the course of an interview that the government was ready with closure and that a motion would be placed in *Votes and Proceedings* tonight. That being so, the fact that the hon. member for Middlesex West (Mr. Thomas) today introduced a further amendment afforded no incentive to the government to act as it intended to do. Indeed, I am further informed that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) told his supporters last Wednesday that the flag would be all wrapped up by this coming Wednesday.

I will say nothing further in that connection except that any flag brought in by closure cannot but fly over a divided nation and a discredited government. I am amazed that there should have been any such suggestion on the part of the Prime Minister today, not that we have not had these threats before. I recall that on December 20, 1951, the prime minister of that day, Mr. St. Laurent, threatened closure in connection with anti-combines legislation. In that case it was not brought in, but the mind was there.

There are those who sit on the treasury benches today, including the Prime Minister, who sat there in 1956 when parliament was flouted by the application of closure on a matter that did not command the general support of the Canadian people. I remind hon. gentlemen opposite of what happened then and of their attitude of mind in 1956. Many who sit opposite today were members of parliament in that day and some of those in the cabinet today belonged to that group that brought closure into effect because, as the prime minister of that day, Mr. St. Laurent, said, there was a time limit. One can apply that statement of 1956 so well to what is happening today because this flag debate has been a succession of time limits. We were to have a flag on three different occasions, the first of which was by July 1st, second, by the time of the Queen's visit, and now for Christmas.

The Prime Minister says that an opposition has no right to prevent a decision. Taken literally that might be true, but in actual practice one of the major features of our parliamentary system is that oppositions have a responsibility to prevent wrong decisions. We say, as does a large proportion of the Canadian people also, that for a flag to be forced upon the Canadian people by a decision of this kind, having regard to the manner in which this matter has been brought forward, will not be conducive to Canadian unity.

There is one other point I wish to mention. I was waiting for the Prime Minister to come in because I did not want to make any statement in his absence that he might want to challenge. As he opened his speech this morning I was impressed with his manner of approach to the subject. I am not in agreement, but I have a great admiration for the exchange of opinions and the clash of ideas. When in the second portion of his speech he descended into a discussion that could not be described as other than petty, political partisanship, the effect of the earlier part of his speech was dissipated. I was impressed by two expressions he used. He spoke of our flag, the government's flag, our flag.

Mr. McIlraith: No, the Canadian flag.

Mr. Diefenbaker: This is the expression he used, our flag. Then, he looked over at us and he said, their red ensign. Was it not his red ensign, Mr. Speaker? Is it not his red ensign? This represents an amazing revelation of his thinking.

He manufactured a false claim when he used the expression that we sneered at the maple leaf. There was nothing of that kind. Many of us on this side of the house are proud of the maple leaf, but the maple leaf as an emblem is a long way from the maple leaf as the design for a flag. An example occurs to me as I am speaking. What about Ireland? Ireland established itself as an independent country after generations of turmoil and difficulty. It decided on a flag. The emblem of Ireland is the shamrock. Did they place the shamrock on the flag? The shamrock was a symbol, but when they built their flag, they made it a flag of two colours representative of the unity of their country, orange and green. Certainly, no one casts aspersions on the maple leaf. We are all proud of it as a symbol of the nation. However, there is a great deal of difference between symbolic significance and that which goes to the heart and soul of a nation, the flag that must represent the people as a whole.

I will say no more on this occasion except that we have no apologies to offer for the stand we have taken. I hope the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) will ascribe to us the same degree of sincerity which he has appropriated to himself. We believe that this flag that does not have anything to do with our heritage, with the greatness, the magnificent history of our country, will not induce unity. The imposition of this flag on the millions of people who have for generations accepted the red ensign as their flag, will cause a sense of frustration which we do not want to have within this nation.

The right hon. gentleman asked, when was Canada ever represented by the red ensign? One of the greatest cartoons that came out of the first war appeared in the April, 1915 issue of the magazine *Punch*, after the first gas attack at Saint Julien. It showed Canadians wounded and dead; it showed them raising the standard of Canada. Look up that issue of *Punch* for April, 1915, and you will find that the flag in the hands of the Canadian as he raised it, raised it with the strength that was available to him after being wounded and dismayed by the gas attack, was the red ensign.

In asking parliament to give the most serious consideration to this matter, I point out once more we are not asking something that is not peculiar to the Canadian way of life, because it has been our flag for generations. Indeed, if you read the advertising for the election of 1891, you will find that Macdonald used throughout the campaign huge placards and on every one of them was a red ensign, the only difference being that instead of the coat of arms there was the number of maple leaves representing the provinces of Canada. What we have tried to do, Mr. Speaker, is not anything to prevent parliament acting. What we have tried to do is to discharge our responsibilities in connection with the choosing of a flag which will touch this and future generations intimately and effectively, in a manner that will inform parliament, even though the majority thinks otherwise, that by taking this step it will be taking a wrong step.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): I took part earlier in this debate and was able to state my views on the flag issue in ten minutes. I do not intend to repeat anything I said at that time. I just want to make a very brief appeal. I ran across a quotation the other day from a very wise author who wrote some 3,000 years ago some words which I believe are appropriate at the moment. The writer was Ecclesiastes, and he said this:

> To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven; a time to keep silence, and a time to speak.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that after some 250 speeches on this issue, and I suggest particularly to my friends in the Conservative party, that the time for silence has arrived. I cannot escape the conclusion that the prolonging of this debate will make those responsible for it look foolish. This is a situation which I can contemplate with some equanimity when I see who is responsible for prolonging the debate. However I do not believe we in this house can contemplate with equanimity the fact that not only the party responsible for prolonging the debate will look foolish but parliament itself is being made to look foolish. Unfortunately, I fear it looks that way at the moment. Everything that could be said or should be said in this debate has been said. Perhaps some things have been said that should not have been said, and some things have been said more often than they required to be said, but I appeal to those members of the official opposition who are contemplating further discussion to realize the time has now come to keep silent. The time has surely come to let parliament take its responsibility.

I appeal to all hon. members to let us vote on this resolution now, so that we can get on with other important business before the house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) will not object too strongly if I now recognize the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take too much time to discuss this matter which we have been discussing for too many months, and which seems to confuse the people of Canada. It was discussed thoroughly during the first weeks of the debate on this matter, and today the same members are allowed to repeat over and over again the same old worn-out arguments which we have heard ever since the resolution was introduced.

Yesterday, and particularly last night, we heard the hon. members for Cumberland (Mr. Coates), Rosthern (Mr. Nasserden), Vegreville (Mr. Fane) and Middlesex West (Mr. Thomas) ask questions of the government concerning its attitude respecting the resolu-

tion on the order paper, what it would do should the amendment or the main motion be adopted, what it intends to do or will do. And all this while the government had informed the house that it intended to proceed with measures on the order paper and which should be taken up by the house before Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, it is astonishing to hear those people blame the government for giving effect to their own proposals. In fact, the establishment of a committee was proposed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker). When the leaders of the five parties met the Leader of the Opposition insisted that a committee be established to study the flag issue and then submit to the house a majority report.

As was stated this morning, 11 members were in favour of this report and four against it, out of a total of 15 members.

The committee was set up following representations made by the Leader of the Opposition who also called for a free vote. The Prime Minister complied with this request: a free vote was allowed. All Liberals were permitted to vote as they saw fit. The Conservatives were also free to vote as they pleased, every one of us could vote according to his conscience and in the best interests of national unity.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, mention was also made of curtailing the flag debate. Since the Leader of the Opposition disagreed, I feel he is not justified in suggesting today that any member of the official opposition was prevented from expressing his views or that of his constituents. But, to my mind, the federal parliament has never been able to see to what extent some members are wearing blinkers which prevent them from seeing the facts as they are or to realize their narrow-mindedness.

Indeed, they only see one side of the question, and refuse to look at Canada as a whole. A matter as significant as the choice of a truly Canadian flag, of a distinctive Canadian flag, is brought down to the level of their constituency and their personal ambitions.

Mr. Speaker, some people have difficulty in realizing the facts. Some attach greater importance to the symbol of our origins than to the very existence of our nation, in short, to the future of Canada.

We rightly claim and will always claim that one must have the greatest respect for his forebears and ancestors, but there is not a single member here, including the Leader of the Opposition, who would dare put on the clothes and shoes that his forebears or ancestors were wearing 100 and 150 years ago. We must realize that we have something better to do at this time than to reduce the question of the national flag to the level of a mere political issue.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Leader of the Opposition did not grow in the public eye when he stated here that the members of the Ralliement Créditistes have thrown themselves into the arms of the Liberals. The right hon. gentleman knows that he is wrong and that he is misleading the members of this house. And I immediately point out to the house that a proposal was made two days ago not by a member of the Ralliement Créditiste but by the deputy leader of the Conservative party, the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer).

As reported in *Hansard* on page 10965, he made the following statement:

> Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. For weeks, and even months, the House of Commons has been witnessing an unparalleled debate which is completely paralysing the business or this house and transforming it into a debating society where it is impossible to reach any decision whatsoever. Freedom of speech must be respected, but we should not act in such a way that this house be deprived of its main duty, which consists in making decisions.

Mr. Speaker, this is what we want to do at this point. And I continue:

> That is why I deem that in this discussion on the flag, the whole gamut of opinions has been heard—

Including those of his party.

> —and should we extend it any further, we would but prejudice the rights of parliament and the higher interests of our country.
>
> Therefore, I believe that it is my duty to rise on a question of privilege and invite the Prime Minister—

Please note, Mr. Speaker, the words "and invite the Prime Minister."

> —or one of his ministers, to give notice that he will make use of standing order 33 to have this question settled without further delay by applying the rule of closure.

We are pressing for that application, because it is impossible to bring the leader of the official opposition to listen to reason.

Is the Leader of the Opposition ready to say that his colleague from Three Rivers has gone over to the Liberals? Is he ready to repeat that his colleagues from Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Pigeon), Pontiac-Témiscamingue (Mr. Martineau), Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière (Mr. Paul) have gone over to the Liberals, or that they are people whom the Liberals treated kindly

during the last election campaign, or that they are people who were praised by the Liberal candidates in their respective ridings or by the government in office?

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Leader of the Opposition, on behalf of the Canadian people, to be honest in his statements and to stop playing petty politics, as he did this morning and kept on doing this afternoon.

The Leader of the Opposition knows that we do not hold the Liberals in such high esteem. We have not gone over to the Liberals. We have no intention of going over to the Conservatives either. We want to remain ourselves, and we want the Canadian people to remain themselves too, all across the country. That is why we endorse, not every policy of the Liberal party, far from it, but the stand taken by the Prime Minister and the government who want to give Canada a distinctive national flag, a flag which will be the pride of the whole country everywhere, whether it bears three maple leaves or a single one.

When the right hon. Prime Minister introduced his motion in parliament, he recommended a flag design with three maple leaves on a white background and a blue border on each side.

Today the committee decides—and the Prime Minister himself said this morning that it was the committee—in order to accept a compromise, to change the three maple leaves for a single maple leaf with red bands instead of blue bands.

In my opinion, the new design is not as nice as the first one. However, the report of the committee is now before parliament, even though the design agreed to is not exactly according to our wishes.

I for one would have preferred the flag with the red and white diagonals, with a green maple leaf, promoted throughout the country about 20 years ago by la ligue du drapeau and the Native Sons of Canada. That is the flag we were endorsing.

However, we are not opposing the new design brought in. It is not that we have changed our minds, no, but we want the flag issue settled once and for all.

Within the party of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition there are members who do not necessarily share the opinion of the committee but who are ready to accept the report as submitted to parliament. There is no question, in this case, of playing politics nor of trying to toss the issue back and forth, by saying that one party is more important than the other.

The decision rests with parliament and, the right hon. Prime Minister said so at noon today, and not without reason: it is not the government which decides, but parliament.

The hon. member for Three Rivers said also that the chief duty of parliament was to decide. We are ready to decide and, as the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) said rightly a few minutes ago, it is time to stop talking, to cut off that "talkathon" on the flag issue.

When the right hon. Leader of the Opposition says that the flag issue is dividing Canada, I must say, and I know what I am talking about, that if there is a man who has spread doubts in the minds of citizens in various sectors of Canada, it is the Leader of the Opposition himself since he took up his stand on a distinctive national flag.

I happened to be in Toronto last week. I met there influential businessmen, professionals, students, people from all walks of life. Among these people, who are definitely grassroots, with whom we speak, many are disgusted with the way the flag debate is being handled at the present time in the House of Commons. And who is blamed? Not the government, not the Créditistes nor the New Democratic party, but the leader of the Conservatives in the House of Commons. Even his own followers have had enough of this obstructionist attitude, of this systematic obstruction we have seen for too many long weeks.

Mr. Speaker, our attitude—

[*Text*]

Mr. Kindt: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is naming names and naming the party. Would he name the individuals in the Conservative party that are opposed to the question he has just raised. The hon. member made a blanket statement; I wish he would nail it down.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I did not get the hon. member's question, but if he is asking me whether some Conservative followers are disgusted with this Conservative action in the House of Commons I will say yes, sir, because I met some prominent Conservative followers in the city of Toronto last Thursday.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, our position on the flag question is very well known. I am rising this afternoon in order to establish clearly and have it on the record that we are not devoted to the Liberals, but that we are in favour of common sense. And when there is common sense among the Liberals, we are the very

first ones to admit it, as we are the first ones to shout that they lack common sense too often, more often than they should. We know that also.

However, Mr. Speaker, on a matter as important as the flag issue now before us, we can only look at what Canada is and will be tomorrow. We are the ones who have to decide that as members of parliament; and only parliament has the responsibility to make a decision on the flag issue.

We will not let anybody sing to us the old refrain that we are rejecting the fleur-de-lis or the union jack. We will continue to have respect for the union jack and the fleur-de-lis, but we do not want those flags to represent us as Canadians. We want something typically Canadian, something which will be recognized as Canadian throughout the world, in all the countries where we will be received with our symbol, and not with the symbols of England or France.

[*Text*]

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I will make only a brief comment on the harangue to which we have just listened from the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette).

Mr. Grégoire: How many times have you spoken in the flag debate?

An hon. Member: We listened to you; you listen to us.

Mr. Churchill: I suggest that the Canadian people reject anything that the hon. member for Villeneuve, the leader of the Creditiste party, may say with regard to the flag because, as I pointed out the other day, he cares nothing for the flag design.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: He said, "I care not whether you take the maple leaf off and put on a sheaf of wheat, a beaver or anything else"; and what can anything else be—the swastika, the emblem of Mussolini, or something like that? "Anything else", he said.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) is not right when he says that I do not care what is on the flag.

The only thing I would object to on a flag would be the portrait of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

[*Text*]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, what I have said about the hon. member for Villeneuve regarding his opinions with reference to the flag are on *Hansard.* He cannot deny those things; they are there.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: He does not care what the Canadian flag is. Anything that the government will propose, he will support; that is his attitude. We had the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) talking about the maple leaf today. The hon. member for Villeneuve cares nothing about the maple leaf. He says, "Take it off the flag; put on a beaver, a sheaf of wheat or anything else". Why would anybody pay any attention to his remarks concerning the flag?

With regard to the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), I am always surprised in this house that people should exhibit the colossal conceit that was shown today. Members sometimes rise in this house and say, "Everything that can be said has been said on the subject under discussion"; they contribute their own remarks for five, ten or 30 minutes and then they say the debate should come to an end, and we are supposed to bow and say, "Lord and master, thou hast spoken. Your willing servants accept your dictum".

That was the attitude taken by the hon. member for Greenwood today. Having himself spoken he said that everything had been said on the subject. That sort of colossal deceit has always astonished me in this House of Commons and I did not expect to see it in the hon. member for Greenwood.

I now want to say a few words about the remarks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson). We had expected him to speak last night but for some reason or other he had to be smoked out. Last evening, when he asked us to forgo private members' hour at five o'clock, he said "Let's get on and come to a decision on this matter before six o'clock", and I said no. I would not give unanimous consent because I said we wanted to hear from the Prime Minister, who has not spoken on this subject for six months. That is, he has not spoken here in the House of Commons, although he has said things outside the house. It was June 15 when the Prime Minister made his great speech on the flag that he then had selected and which he was putting in front of us, and then he sat silent in the House of Commons for six months.

We wanted to know, Mr. Speaker, what his position was with regard to the report of the committee, which is why we pressed him to enter into this debate. We had hoped that members of his cabinet would enter into the debate and support the Prime Minister. There is some uncertainty in the country whether the members of the cabinet are supporting the Prime Minister. Now and again under duress they confide in him and confess; but no member of the cabinet has yet risen to support the Prime Minister in this debate at this time. Earlier on, only two members of the cabinet rose to support the Prime Minister and spent their time talking of other subjects. This is a disunited cabinet, as the people of Canada are well aware now.

I have seen, Mr. Speaker, the sword swallower act on the stage. Today we saw the man swallowing act—the Prime Minister swallowing himself by going back on his determination and his promise in June of this year to give to Canada a three maple leaf flag with blue borders representing sea to sea. He has now come around to the view that perhaps that was wrong, and he acknowledges error and sees that the red bordered flag with the white centre is the flag for Canada. Give him another six months and he will change his mind again. It is because of that uncertainty that we have suggested delay and postponement on a decision on a Canadian flag. We have watched the Prime Minister in action for a year and a half, and given time he will shift his position. So we are well within our rights in discussing this issue.

The Prime Minister skirted all around closure today, and there is the threat. I was in the house in December 1951 when Mr. St. Laurent spoke much more clearly with regard to the imposition of closure and held the threat over our heads. That was in December and again we are in December. So we had the threat in 1951. It was not carried out although we were supposed to run scared; but the Conservative party in 1951 was not frightened away at all. We said to Mr. St. Laurent: "Bring on closure if you are so brave", and he shied away from it. Then in 1956 closure was applied in this house. The Conservative party did not run away from that issue either; and to the credit of the then C.C.F. party, neither did they. Now we have the threat of closure again in December 1964.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, we have the attitude of the Liberal party. If the Liberal party cannot get its way it threatens closure or imposes closure. What is to happen later on this afternoon? Are we going to have an announcement that closure will be applied next week? So that is the pattern followed by the Liberal party going back to 1951, 1956, 1964; and I hope the people of Canada realize that it is an autocratic, arrogant party, intent on enforcing its will on parliament and on the people of Canada.

With regard to the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Middlesex West (Mr. Thomas), the Prime Minister, improperly, said that this was a compromise suggestion. As I understood the hon. member for Middlesex West, he was arguing, in a very carefully given speech last night, which was concluded this morning, in favour of a meeting of minds. His argument today was this: Let us know the point of departure so that if there is to be a meeting of minds we will know what things cannot be considered and what things might be considered. So he suggested in his amendment that we have a stand-up-and-be-counted vote on the Canadian red ensign. Is this to be rejected by the Liberal party? Let the members of the Liberal party indicate in this House of Commons where they stand on the flag that has been Canada's national flag for 100 years. Let us have it down in black and white. Let them not shelter behind the committee, which is what they are doing. Why anyone should shelter behind the committee, with perhaps the determining vote in that committee being a vote cast by a member of the Créditiste party, which has no use for Canada's traditions, surprises me. Here is the opportunity for the Liberal party, man by man and woman by woman, to record their vote.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I think the hon. member has some of his wires crossed. We have use for the past in this country, but I have no use and no other party has, for the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). That is where he is wrong.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles: You mean South Centre.

Mr. Langlois: I am sorry; I mean the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill).

Mr. Churchill: Insult me if you wish, I say to the hon. member, but do not insult other members from the city of Winnipeg. I must stand up for my hon. friend for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). We differ on a lot of points, but he is a citizen of a great city and he must not be insulted in

this house. I am glad that the hon. member who has just intervened does not agree with the leader of his party. The leader of his party wants to wipe out all history and tradition and this member does not, so we are glad to have that intervention.

The hon. member for Middlesex West was suggesting a step by step process, out in the open and not behind a committee, to see whether there can be a meeting of minds with regard to a flag for Canada. In the course of his remarks the Prime Minister had something to say with regard to his experience in war, and unfortunately used an expression which he used once before. He was speaking about the war of 1914-18, and the exact words he used were these, and I quote: "None of us saw a Canadian red ensign in those years". I interrupted and he repeated the statement. It is with regret that I refer to this, but the Prime Minister does not have to take my word for anything with regard to the first world war. I said earlier in the debate that the Canadian red ensign was seen by Canadian soldiers in the first world war. He does not have to take my word for that, because I gave evidence of others. I do not mind if he wishes to intimate that I was being untruthful earlier in making those statements. However, the Prime Minister is attacking the veracity of my friend and colleague, the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan). That member has placed on the record his experience in the first world war, and has brought forward pertinent evidence by quoting a statement made by General McNaughton regarding the use of the Canadian red ensign during that conflict. I am sorry the Prime Minister expressed himself in that way, and I regret having had to interrupt him, but I did find it irritating when he repeated the statements he had made earlier which we have denied and repudiated during the course of this debate.

Let me say this, so there will be no misunderstanding. The present and former prime ministers are two Canadian prime ministers who, during the first world war, volunteered their services to this country. I respect both of them in that regard. No one who volunteered for service during the war had any jurisdiction as to where he might be sent to serve, so that question does not enter into this discussion. I have as much respect for those who served during the war of 1914 to 1918 as for those who served during the second world war, as did both those prime ministers. They volunteered for service anywhere in the world, and at any risk. If I raise an objection to anything the Prime Minister has said today I do not do so because of lack of respect for the service he was prepared to render to his country during those years. I respect that attitude of the Prime Minister as much as I respect the same attitude taken by the former prime minister, the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker). These men did not stay home with the paltry excuse that they had to complete their university education, or anything of that nature. They laid their lives on the line, and by the grace of God and with good luck they survived, as did thousands of others.

I have said that the Liberal party is attempting to take shelter behind the report of the committee. This House of Commons is not obliged to accept, without question, the report of any committee, particularly a committee which is composed of less than 10 per cent of the members of this house. Incidentally, the right hon. Leader of the Opposition had suggested, as long ago as June 22, that the best way to approach a controversial subject such as the flag is through a committee. Personally I preferred a joint committee of the Senate and the house, such as the committee which considered this issue in 1945 and 1946. A larger committee should have been established rather than one restricted to 15 members. In any event, we are not obliged to accept any committee report presented to this house. I think it is wrong that the government should seek to take shelter behind a report of a committee. It is wrong for any party in this house to seek that kind of shelter.

Had the hon. members of that committee been other than the members who actually were named, I think the report would be different. Why did the New Democratic party not name as a member of that committee the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge)? Why did the Social Credit party not name as a member of that committee the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Leboe)? That party could also have named the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Patterson) as a member of that committee. Perhaps the N.D.P. could have named the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Mather) as a member of the committee. The Liberals could have been represented by a member with divergent points of view by naming the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan). Had those men been named as members of that committee I am sure the report presented to this house would not be the same as the one now before us for consideration. Those men have

publicly stated their preference for the retention of Canada's history and traditions, as exemplified by the Canadian red ensign.

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question? When you were in power, why did you not appoint Mr. Van Horne as a member of your committees?

Mr. Churchill: I cannot see any more relevancy to that question than I can in the sale of bumper stickers by the hon. minister. Perhaps he can explain the relevance to me at a later date.

A different committee I am sure would have presented a different report. The special committee was selected with extreme care, and I am sure the substance of the report of that committee was a foregone conclusion, as was the abandonment or destruction of the Canadian red ensign. Let us not take shelter behind the workings of a committee. It is nonsense to suggest that the decision of a committee, even though it has worked long hours studying a subject, is superior to the decision of 250, odd, members of this house.

The Prime Minister during the course of his remarks referred to the single red maple leaf on the coat of arms of Canada. I noted particularly his remark in this regard, and I wondered whether the Prime Minister, who served as a soldier during the war, recognized the fact, as pointed out by the members of that committee which sat in 1921, and as indicated in their brochure, that the single red maple leaf in the Canadian coat of arms was representative of the sacrifice made by the young men of Canada during the first world war. I thought the Prime Minister in referring to the single red maple leaf on the coat of arms might have made some reference to that fact. As I said before, we must either change the coat of arms—and I do not think that should be done, taking the single red maple leaf from it—or refrain from using the single red maple leaf on the flag of Canada. I do not think we would be paying a tribute to our young men who sacrificed their lives during the war by changing a symbol which has, for almost 50 years, represented that sacrifice. What has happened to the thinking of the people of Canada since that time? Is our thinking different in 1964 from the thinking of that generation of 1921 which felt that the inclusion of the single red maple leaf in the coat of arms was an appropriate recognition of the sacrifice made by 60,000 young men of a country with a population of eight million? Have we no sense or appreciation for history and sacrifice?

[Mr. Churchill.]

The Prime Minister asked why we do not embroider the maple leaf on our own national banner. That is exactly what the joint committee of 1945-46 suggested. They suggested that the shield should be taken from the red ensign and a golden maple leaf placed thereon. They in effect embroidered the maple leaf on Canada's flag. We have respect for the maple leaf in that respect. That could be an appropriate part of a flag, and it could be embroidered on the present Canadian red ensign as recommended by the committee of 1945.

Mr. Speaker, I have never objected to the maple leaf as an emblem of Canada. Rather, my objection is that it should not be the main component of our flag. Once again I suggest to the Prime Minister that this issue which has caused so much controversy, is an issue about which hundreds of thousands, and perhaps millions, of people are concerned. In view of that fact I appeal again to the Prime Minister, as others have done, to postpone this issue. I do not subscribe to the point of view, which I have heard put forward in speeches by various people, that Canada has suddenly become a new country and everything must be done differently. This is a country with a long history. If it has suddenly become a new country in 1964, those people who are talking that way will hear in 30 years from another generation that in 1994 Canada has suddenly become a new country. They will be told that a new century is just around the corner and everything will have to be different because it is new and that the older generation must be swept away and uprooted and all the symbols of the past will have to be replaced. If the proposed new red and white flag with a single maple leaf in the centre is in existence at the turn of the next century it will, of course, represent the horrible past that must be forgotten as we move into the 21st century with a new Canada. All this is just too ridiculous.

This is not a new country. This is an old country. It has centuries of history behind it, centuries of sacrifice, and we should recognize these facts. As has been mentioned in many speeches, these sacrifices were endured in warfare on Canadian soil in other years, as abroad. We also must not forget the sacrifices of the pioneers of this country who respected our flag.

Everything does not have to be new just because a few people get an idea that a new horizon has opened up. The great change in Canada, of course, as everywhere else in the

world, is in the material sphere because of the technological advances that are constantly being made. There is not much change in human nature. How can there be changes in the principles that have guided mankind? How can there be changes in our customs and traditions that are sound and have been considered to be sound over the years? Now and then you remove something which is no longer useful, but the main elements of our society carry on. Our society has been soundly based and should so continue. Some of these symbols mean a great deal to millions of people in this country.

This is a time for postponement of this issue. Set it to one side and if the people must decide it let them do so at some future date. But let it be removed from parliament at this time. Let the schools of our country interest themselves in Canadian history in a way they have never done before. As I pointed out earlier in the debate, to my knowledge the subject of the Canadian flag has never been a major topic of conversation in the classrooms of this country. Children have drawn the flag and so on, but the origin and meaning of that flag have never been discussed.

Educational circles in this country in every province can no longer ignore the Canadian flag. They have a storehouse of information on it supplied by members of this house through their arguments for and against and also by people outside the house. Let a period of time go by. Let the ministers of education and their advisers consider this matter. Let us have another look at our Canadian history books and see if something more impressive should not be included with regard to Canada's traditions. Let this be done and then, if you like, let another generation decide the question.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, we have heard some 252 speeches on the subject of choosing a flag for Canada. Of the 252 speeches, 177 have been delivered by members of the official opposition.

Mr. Churchill: Hear, hear.

Mr. McIlraith: Most of those speeches have been 40 minutes in length with some a bit shorter and a few a bit longer.

This morning we listened to a most outstanding speech by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) of Canada, a speech which I am sure in years ahead, when many of us are gone from this place, will serve as an inspiration to young Canadians. In the course of that speech the Prime Minister made an earnest and sincere plea for parliament to be given the right of decision on a matter that has been before the house and a committee of the house for many weeks, during which time all the speeches I have referred to have been delivered and during which time every aspect of the matter, I must say, appears to have been dealt with. The sincere appeal made by the Prime Minister was rejected summarily and immediately and, might I add, almost with contempt by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker).

Mr. Woolliams: No.

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. McIlraith: That still seems to be the position of hon. gentlemen opposite even though since that speech was delivered we have heard a brief but eloquently expressed appeal by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) for the right of decision by parliament to be preserved as well as an appeal by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) along the same lines. In other words, speakers from two of the other three political parties represented in the House of Commons have indicated their support for such an appeal.

In the circumstances, and to prevent a mockery being made of parliament, I have no alternative but to take the action I now propose to take. I beg to give notice that immediately before the order of the day is next called for resuming the debate on the motion for concurrence in the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag, presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, and on any amendments thereto, I will move that the said debate shall not be further adjourned.

Mr. Bell: The pipe line boys are at it again. Shades of C. D. Howe.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: The party is over now.

Mr. Coates: Why don't you start singing songs again, boys?

Mr. Churchill: Remember black Friday.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Athabasca.

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great honour to make the 178th speech by members of the official opposition in defence of our position with regard to Canada's glorious flag. The election

promises of the Liberal party have never been, and I trust never will be, taken as the law of Canada. We are here to make a decision. We are here to make a decision in the parliamentary way. I speak for my party 100 per cent when I say that it is our right and privilege to stand in this house and speak from our conscience and from our principles on each and every occasion that we believe it is our duty so to do.

I have been asked by members of all parties except my own not to drag in emotions, not to parade my war effort, and I shall not do so. I speak from principle, the principle of defending those things which we hold dear and if I did not speak about those things the very rocks of Canada would cry out. The term "stubborn" is a term of derision sometimes used in trying to deflate a political opponent. However, when stubbornness is exhibited by a man of stature, whether or not he occupies the front benches of this noble house or some obscure back bench as I do, if his statements are made with conviction and sincerity, then it is a step toward statesmanship. Mr. Churchill returned to the school of his youth after some 46 years and spoke to the classes of Harrow. He had only one, small message to give them, and that message was this: When your principles are at stake you are not to desert them, never, never and again never.

Now, 178 speeches is a long way from never. However, when the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) of this country came to this house, he came with great promise from a distinguished career in public affairs. I am sure it was the hope of the Liberal party if not the whole country, that when this man took the reins of office he would give the kind of leadership which the world and his country expected from one with such a notable career. From time to time I have stood in this house and said, I am a Canadian first and a Conservative second and, I hope, a mere politician third. This great party was largely responsible for confederation and from that day to this, December 11, 1964 we have appealed, with all the power and vehemence which we have been able to muster, to the people of Canada not to let the great experiment of confederation go down the drain.

We have been accused on numerous occasions by members of the other parties sitting in this house of being divisive in our actions. I do not see how the mere fact that I, for one, have stood and claimed I loved the flag under which I was born, the flag which I noticed outside school every morning when I was perhaps too young to understand its significance, is being divisive. This is the flag under which I served in the mounted police for 23 years, seven of which I spent in the armed forces. I do not parade this fact in any way to establish myself as a hero, as I have been accused of doing by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher). I merely say that this is a distinctive flag so far as I am concerned. The words "distinctive flag" of course have been used by those who would get rid of the British flag or any semblance of the British flag. I am not merely saying this because the statement appears in *Hansard* for this week. I refer to the extremists on the left who pretend to be more Canadian by saying they will have nothing British.

I hope that this does not include British justice because if there is one thing for which the British flag stands or the union jack quartered in our flag, it is that every citizen of this country, be he large or small, rich or poor, black or white, has equality under the law. This is what the British flag means to me, and this is what the British flag in the quarter of the red ensign has always meant to me. In case anyone thinks I am nothing but a talker I say that for 52 years of my life I have tried to make that symbol live in action as well as in words. A flag is something which we have had for many years. A flag is something which I claim we have today, by tradition and by law.

I should like to speak for a moment or two about the future. What are we going to hand on to our children, not only in the matter of a flag but in this same dual culture of which we are all proud? Where are we going to stop? As I have said, it is passing strange to me that the man who had promised to be such a great leader should not have been the first to speak in this debate, rather than third or fourth from the last. For months and months, I have sat here hoping it would not be necessary for us to appear to be filibustering. I want leadership, and I have a right to demand it from my government. The speech delivered today by the Prime Minister was perhaps his greatest speech in the House of Commons. However, I am afraid that is setting a very low standard.

Miss LaMarsh: You would not know, anyway.

Mr. Bigg: Perhaps I would not know. I do not have a truth squad to help me. I merely have my own conscience, my own sincerity. I am speaking as a private member. By the

way, in this party, and this is one of the reasons I belong to this party, one has a right to speak as a private member. No matter how much we may disagree with our chief, never by thought or word or deed has our chief ever made his imperative views known. He has always talked to us in public and behind closed doors as the first amongst equals. This is the only attitude I will ever tolerate. I would not cross the floor of the house, but I would ask for a seat alone in the corner if this were not so. I have principles and a man who puts principles above all has the right to stand as a free citizen of this country and express his opinions on every occasion. Let my chief dare to intimidate me in any way and there would be one less member of this great party.

I do not expect members opposite to understand me. Let hon. members opposite remember that when the *Hansard* which contains the greatest speech ever delivered in the House of Commons by their leader is read into the pages of history, mine will not be read; but my stand will be taken now in the light of the words of that great Conservative, Mr. Winston Churchill: I will never, never, never desert the principles which I hold.

I have stood for the red ensign. It is not a party flag. It has been Canada's flag for nearly 100 years and it would be strange if anyone born in this country, of French, English or native origin, was not proud of that great banner. The first citizens of this country who signed solemn treaties with the Queen look at the red ensign as the symbol of their freedom, and if it is taken away they will feel part of their treaties has been abrogated.

There are 6,000 native Indians in my district. We are proud of them. They are Canada's first citizens, and I will find it hard to go back and explain to them why we have thrown away that symbol of peace and security which they have learned to love. When the volunteer soldiers left Canada during three wars our native people, according to their population, made the greatest contribution of any race resident in Canada. If the so-called founding races of Canada feel they are the only ones to be considered in this matter, may I point out to them we have a solemn obligation to those simple people of the soil, to explain to them why it is necessary to tear down what they regard as a symbol of freedom and equality.

I have hoped and wished in vain to hear positive arguments why a new flag should be raised on our flagpoles in place of the red ensign. If there are positive arguments, where are they? At first when the Prime Minister presented us with his design I thought it had some merit. It contained three maple leaves, and I for one think of the maple leaf as a very dear and honoured symbol. But I want to know, why is there this negative approach?

Why is there this unanimity among certain groups in favour of tearing down the symbol we have? Why is there this strange silence on the opposite side of the house? When I believe in something I stand on my feet and say so. I make a positive contribution. If the ensign is retained I believe it will continue to be an inspiration for all classes and races of people so long as Canada remains a nation.

I make no apology for continuing the debate until I have made my point. If we do away with the red ensign we also do away with the white ensign which flies on every Canadian naval ship, and I presume we will also do away with the air force flag which flew over the airports in Britain when our great airmen, second to none in the world, helped the motherland win the battle of Britain. The men who served under these three flags, the red, white and blue ensigns, have a right to be heard.

Closure can be imposed, but far from being a great victory, far from being something to cheer about, I think it is a Pyrrhic victory. I suppose the opposition has won a small battle this afternoon in forcing us into arbitrary silence, but I wonder if they have not lost a greater battle of principle. Why is there such haste in getting rid of the flag which has served us well for 97 years? The excuse is an election promise, as if an election promise was sacred.

In the early years of the war, when the then Liberal government found itself faced with a very sticky election promise never to impose national service on the people of Canada, it held a plebiscite and approximately 87 per cent of the people voted in favour of releasing the Liberal government from its promise. In typical fashion it purported to take this as a vote of confidence, not a vote on the subject in question, which is an old trick. If the Liberal party wants to get out of this flag promise it could do the same thing, hold a plebiscite, but it has voted against doing that.

The hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), speaking on behalf of the N.D. party just half an hour ago, begged us not to filibuster and waste the time of parlia-

ment. Yet his is the party that filibustered for two years in denying divorces to people who sought them. Apparently when one section of parliament talks it is a filibuster, and when another section talks it is a national service on a very high scale. Why should the rules not apply to everybody? Why should the rules of closure not apply to every government? Obviously the Liberals believe in closure because this is not the first time they imposed it, and the circumstances are somewhat similar to a previous occasion.

The Liberals would like to force us into an election. They would like us to make that move because they know perfectly well that this flag which represents British justice is being sadly soiled. They would like it to disappear in a red cloud with a white band around it, like a Hampshire pig.

This new design reminds me of the flag of Bolivia, but the Prime Minister did not bother to tell us why we should change our flag. He did not hurry to tell us why the single maple leaf design is superior to the three maple leaf design, and why the three maple leaf design is superior to the red ensign. When the 1945 order in council was passed the cabinet of that day were apparently unanimous in deciding we already had a distinctive flag. The question then was not to choose a distinctive flag but to postpone the need for changing the design of it.

When we marched into Holland and Belgium in the spring of 1945 and helped to restore freedom in those countries, thousands of red ensigns were brought out of the clothes closets where they had been hidden from the nazis, and every house in Holland and Belgium displayed our flag. It is passing strange that the people of Holland and Belgium should know the red ensign when they saw it while hon. gentlemen opposite say they never saw it or, if they did, they purport to despise it.

If one goes south of the line on July 1 almost as many red ensigns can be seen flying in United States cities on the borders of Canada as there are copies of old glory. The people there are proud of their long association with Canada and we are proud of our long association with them. If hon. members came to the Calgary stampede—and it would do a lot of them some good—they would see the red ensign and old glory flying side by side. Now with the change, thousands of United States tourists will not know they have crossed the border when they see the flag of Bolivia over our customs offices.

When our veterans go back to Holland they will look in vain for the flag which we associate with them.

Miss LaMarsh: They will look for the maple leaf on the graves.

Mr. Bigg: Yes, it is there, and every single soldier in each of those graves was a volunteer soldier who fought under the union jack and the red ensign. I would venture to say this to the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Miss LaMarsh), that we might well consider whether our dead sleep in peace when they think we are tearing down their flag, certainly without considering it and without being given the leadership from our government which we would expect. Even supposing we did—and I am not prepared to anticipate that day—willingly set aside our flag for any other emblem, no suggestion has been made that we will lay it away with the dignity which it so richly deserves. How are we going to pay the debt to those who are not here to defend that flag? How are we going to keep peace with those? "Lest we forget":

> To you from failing hands we throw
> The torch; be yours to hold it high.

I appeal to this government in this regard and say, "They were speaking to you, not only to me. They were speaking to all of us who live here in freedom". They paid the price with their blood. If the people of Canada are now so delicate and so refined that I must not speak of blood or talk about the blood they gave and the sacrifice they made for us, perhaps I have lived in Canada too long. Some of my ancestors came here to be under the British flag. They could have had the so-called prosperity and freedom that exists south of the line. But I remind hon. members again that Canada was the first country in the world to abolish slavery; Canada was the first country in the world to give complete religious freedom. I am sorry that when the problem of freedom comes up again we must rely on the same old few volunteers who are sneered at and jeered at in this House of Commons of ours by those people who say our ideals of freedom are an empty dream, something out of the past.

When our friends to my left want to give dignity to what they say, they quote from the book of holy scripture. There are a good many verses in the book of holy scripture to cover this. I can give no better example than from the Ten Commandments themselves, one of which is:

> Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God hath given thee.

Not Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Hitler; but "the land which the Lord thy God hath given thee." I am no Jeremiah and I hesitate to bring down the wrath of Almighty God on those people who so lightly turn aside these symbols of reverence which have meant so much for 2,000 years. I will not be your judge, but I appeal to you in this regard and say that when I stand here and tell you those symbols really mean something to me, I am speaking from the depth of my heart.

Mr. Woolliams: Others will judge them.

Mr. Bigg: I do not care whether I am hissed at, booed at or if catcalls are made from the other side of the chamber; I do not care whether there are mean threats made upon my life, as they have been made in this house. Well, Mr. Speaker, threats have been made against me before; threats have been made against me for many years and I have always tried to go ahead and do my duty. That is why I am doing it this afternoon.

If and when this House of Commons should ever come to a free vote, and if hon. gentlemen opposite ever stand in their place and take their oath and say, "Without fear, favour, affection or ill will toward any person, so help me God", on the vote, I will honour that vote. When the people in this house decide to have a change of flag I want it to be done in conscience, I want it to be done on principle; and whether the red ensign is ratified or not, or whether some new distinctive flag is decided upon—one bearing the Canadian maple leaf or three maple leaves—I pledge that I will serve that flag in the same way that I tried to serve the great, old red ensign which I love.

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have said anything on the floor of the house in connection with the debate that has been going on, as has already been pointed out, for some time. In view of a recent announcement, if I am going to have an opportunity of saying a few words I should perhaps take it now. I think no one would quarrel with the right of the member who has just resumed his seat to speak with sincerity, and no one would quarrel with the fact that he was doing so. But I am glad that in his concluding remarks he did indicate that he was prepared to recognize that other members might hold somewhat different views with equal sincerity.

I would like, therefore, to address myself for just a few minutes to the amendment which is before the house, which was moved by the hon. member for Middlesex West (Mr. Thomas), in the light of some of the statements he made during his quite thoughtful and carefully prepared speech which was a prelude to his amendment. The hon. member for Middlesex West had a good deal to say about traditions and symbols. He paid particular tribute to the symbols of the past and his respect for them. With those parts of his remarks I have no quarrel, although I must say that I sincerely believe that the main concern of those of us in the present parliament should be more toward addressing ourselves to the symbols of the future rather than to those of the past.

I did feel that the member who placed the current amendment before us, along with some of the other spokesmen in his party, appeared to have a concept of the history of our country which in effect means that history has stopped and we are standing still where we are, or where we were 50 or 100 years ago. The hon. member for Middlesex West, however, did go beyond that which he properly should do, in my opinion, particularly when he was speaking in reference to Canadians of English ancestry. I have no objection to the hon. member for Midlesex West or any other member of the house who is of English ancestry speaking for himself; but as I listened to him it appeared to me that the member for Middlesex West was taking unto himself the right to speak for all Canadians of English ancestry.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in a speech which I will label as one of "including me out", because I am a Canadian of English ancestry who does not agree with the views of the member for Middlesex West.

He represents, as I understand it, one of the constituencies of the province of Ontario. His remarks led me to think, as I have been inclined to think rather often during the course of this debate, that much of it has taken place within the context of the limits of old Upper and Lower Canada. I happen to be a member representing a constituency in the province of British Columbia. I suppose it could be argued that I have very little right to take part in this debate because, after all, we are only Johnny-come-latelies in the Canadian confederation; we have only been in it since 1871. Sometimes I feel that some members in the house scarcely yet recognize that we have entered confederation.

Mr. Woolliams: That is only across the way, though.

Mr. Barnett: I was born in Alberta and have lived all my life in British Columbia and Alberta, except for the months, and it begins to feel years, which I have spent in Ottawa. I am a first generation Canadian. My mother came from England when she was a small girl. My father came to Canada when he was a young lad. So I suppose it might be argued that really I have not very much right to participate in the question which is now before the house; I am only one of those "Johnny-come-lately" Canadians. I am a Canadian of English speaking ancestry who knows no other home than this Canada of ours, and perhaps for that reason I do feel I have some concern for what this country is and what it should become.

I must confess that I have something more than an academic interest in our past. History is one of my favourite subjects of study. I should like to say at once that I think most British Columbians are proud of the name of our province. We are the only province in Canada which uses the word "British" in part of its name. I have never heard anyone suggest in British Columbia that that is a name which should be changed.

Mr. Churchill: Wait till the Créditistes hear about it.

Mr. Barnett: We are quite happy that that happens to be the name of our province; and it was the name of the British colony which entered confederation in 1871.

However, Mr. Speaker, as I listened last night to the hon. member for Middlesex West (Mr. Thomas) quoting Sir John A. Macdonald with regard to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway and how it was going to shorten the time to travel from London to Yokohama, and how the union jack was going to wave over these travellers all the way from London to Yokohama, I must say I should have reminded him that history is not a static thing. Indeed Canada, a nation in the full sense of the word, did not even exist when Sir John A. Macdonald was talking about this all red imperial route which was going to extend westward from London across the Pacific.

As far as I am concerned I think it is quite possible to make a logical argument that Canada came into being only in 1931, when the statute of Westminster made us an independent nation. I was a good deal younger in 1931 than I am now but I must say that along with a great many other young Canadians at that time I was feeling my way as a Canadian. I revelled in the fact that here were we in Canada, becoming a nation in the full sense of the word. As far as I am concerned I would have become much more excited about this issue then than I am able to become now in my advancing years. That would have been the time for us to have had a flag that was Canadian and only Canadian. That would have been the time for us to have had a flag which looked to the future, which looked to history in the making, rather than to history which has gone before. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, my feeling is that for far too long have we as a nation neglected to develop a flag symbol which was distinctively and purely Canadian, which would stand for and mark that new status we had achieved as an independent partner and a self-governing nation in a new commonwealth.

I first came to this house in 1953, and at that time still very current were the rumblings of discussions which had arisen from an earlier committee of this house which had considered a distinctive Canadian flag. My chief regret is that the government of that day was prepared to procrastinate indefinitely on this subject; that the parliament of that day was not prepared to come to grips with this question and, having gone that far, to go through to a proper decision. Therefore I must say that I agree with the remarks made a little earlier by my colleague from Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), to the effect that in his view—and this is also my view—the time has come when this parliament should, after the kind of discussion and detailed consideration which has taken place in committee, pick up where the parliaments of the 1940's left off and come to a considered decision on this question.

I know that if certain actions take place which have been proposed from the government side, speeches will be limited to 20 minutes. Even though that event has not yet taken place I do not intend to prolong my remarks certainly beyond that point. But the reason I did want to get up and make a few rather offhanded remarks was to say that I wanted to be included out from that all embracing and sweeping statement of the hon. member for Middlesex West, which in effect said that all Canadians of English ancestry were being represented by the sentiments he uttered yesterday. I wanted to make this brief statement including me out, while the subject matter of his particular amendment

was before the house. Because if there is one element of this debate which has concerned me, as a Canadian, more than any other, it is the kind of suggestion which was implicit in the remarks made by the hon. member for Middlesex West, namely that somehow or other the proposal for a Canadian flag as brought in by the committee has something to do with dividing us as to whether we are Canadians of English speaking ancestry or Canadians of French speaking ancestry. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to put on the record that I am one Canadian who does not feel that way in any way at all.

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, this is the second occasion since this debate has arisen in the house that I have taken part in it. The first occasion was when I spoke, not on the flag or the flag design but only on the method by which the house should proceed in order to determine the selection of a flag for Canada. Perhaps I would not have arisen again had it not been for one or two events which occurred recently, and particularly today. I believe it is a shame that the only member of the treasury benches to have risen, apart from the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) today, to take part in this debate is a cabinet minister who had to move closure. The last occasion upon which this was resorted to was during the pipe line debate. Many of the same people involved in that debate are still in the cabinet. Subsequent events proved they were wrong then, and they are just as wrong this time. They have obviously not learned their lesson.

The procedure of closure has been repugnant to the sense of fair play of the Canadian people. My own personal view is that never in parliamentary debate should there be a muzzling of free debate. They will say they were forced into this by a fatuous opposition. Surely we had the right to debate this issue, especially when the government dumped their three maple leaf design and produced a new one, and in view of the fact that not one member of the government stated his position until today, when the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) spoke, only after being smoked out by the debate of last evening.

They will learn, Mr. Speaker, that no government can afford to take for granted that the opposition is entirely wrong in taking a stand on what it believes. In every single case, as Laurier said on one occasion, where closure has been imposed, the opposition has been justified. I am as sure as I am standing here today, Mr. Speaker, that that justification will be proved to those who now wish to gag parliament by imposition of the closure role.

Does the Prime Minister think that a flag imposed in this way will win popular approval? I do not think so. This procedure being followed by this government is unwelcome, distasteful and unjustified, and I predict that they will live to regret it.

A flag means a lot of things to many people. A flag represents one thing to one individual and another thing to another individual. A flag to me represents one thing, and that is Canada. When the Prime Minister spoke today he said he had fought during the first world war under the union jack, and never saw the red ensign during that time. For almost ten years I served under the red ensign. I remember going to school at a place where the red ensign was raised every morning in the schoolyard. That was common practice in the west, and I think more attention should be paid to the historical traditions that were instilled in the school children in that part of the country.

This flag, instead of representing Canada to Canadians, represents a Canada betrayed. It is betrayal of the past and of our heritage, and a betrayal of parliament because of the manner in which this government has proceeded. This government has treated this whole issue contemptuously. I remember very clearly what the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) said, when he was speaking about closure, which was being discussed during the past government's term of office. I have with me today an excerpt from the Ottawa *Journal* of April, 1962 having to do with this subject. This article was written by I. Norman Smith, and I think it might be of some use if I were to read one or two excerpts from it. The article states in part:

> For some odd reason surprise is being expressed at the Liberals' eager agreement with Prime Minister Diefenbaker's move to abolish closure as a guillotine in the rules of parliament.
>
> Any of us having even a nodding acquaintance with wrong-doing will understand Mr. Pickersgill's speech as simply that of the reformed drinker who doesn't want the stuff left in his house even for emergency. He can't trust himself.
>
> Mr. Diefenbaker moved that a house committee "consider" dropping closure. No, no, cried Mr. Pickersgill, let's not talk about it, let's drop it now.
>
> "I believe," he said, "that no government in its senses would ever again use the existing closure rule in our book."
>
> But apparently he could not be sure that if the Liberals got into power again they might not again yield to temptation.

And they have done so.

> It is an awful thing to see a person have to acknowledge that in a given set of circumstances

he might go out of his senses, specially when that knowledge is based on past experience.

No, no, a thousand times no, cry the Liberals; take the stuff away.

What an amazing flip-flop they have accomplished.

Mr. Robichaud: Would the hon. member permit a question. In view of his quotation from an editorial appearing in the Ottawa *Journal*, would he be interested also in putting on the record what was said in an editorial appearing in the Ottawa *Journal* on Wednesday, December 9, to the effect that the time has come for a decision on the flag, and also makes reference to closure?

Mr. Nielsen: It is extremely interesting that during all the days of this debate, since the report of the committee was placed before the house, this is the second interjection by a cabinet minister who has not had the courage to get on his feet and say something during the debate. This is an example of the usefulness of the contributions that they have made. I suggest to the Minister of Fisheries that he should stand in his place and state his position as to whether or not he accepts the single maple leaf design with the red borders as accepted by the committee. I suggest to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Tremblay) who has jurisdiction over all the functions of the citizenship courts in this country, that he too should rise in his place and state his position. I suggest that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau), and the Secretary of State (Mr. Lamontagne) should stand in their places and state their positions. Those ministers have a very intimate reason for stating their positions on the flag issue. What have those ministers done in this regard? The Minister of Fisheries has stood up and asked an innocuous question instead of stating his position.

The course followed by the ministers during this debate has been a betrayal of even that symbol, now supported by the words of the Prime Minister, which they purport to adopt—the maple leaf. It has been dictated by a partisan advantage, particularly when one considers the very close rapport which exists among the Liberal members of that committee and the members of that committee who sit to my far left in the Créditiste ranks. In my opinion suspicions immediately occur when several Liberal members of a committee all suddenly express distaste for a design with three maple leaves which the Prime Minister suggested, when he presented it to the house on the first occasion, was the only design that had any national significance as the national flag for Canada. I suggest that action on the part of the Liberal party was dictated by a partisan advantage, and I think that fact is clear.

If the Prime Minister feels that we are too concerned with the past, as he seemed to indicate today, then why, as he has stated, is it his intention to drag the union jack into the picture? He made an impassioned and spirited speech about the maple leaf. No one can disagree that the maple leaf is an emblem of Canada. The right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) said today, about the emblem of Ireland, that they do not have a shamrock on their flag. One might say the same about the eagle of the United States. It is an emblem of the United States but it is not on their flag. One could say the same thing about the rose of England. That is an emblem of that great nation but we do not observe it on their flag. The Prime Minister fails to understand the nature of a flag, and fails to understand that a flag itself is history.

The government is afraid to face the country on this issue because of their disarray and discredit at this time. So what do they do? They resort to gagging parliament as they did once before and lived to regret it. He said today that we obstructed for 23 days. The fact remains that we were right. We obstructed for 23 days, said the Prime Minister, on the basis of the three maple leaf flag. We were right. They reversed themselves and they now have a single maple leaf. They junked the three maple leaves and are now clutching to their bosoms the one maple leaf flag.

I believe that the Prime Minister missed the point. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) said that one of the reasons we criticized the three maple leaf design was not that it indicated a lack of any reflection of our past alone, not that it eradicated any of our past heritage and history alone, but that the government itself has changed its flag and its tune since it introduced the first resolution. The Prime Minister cannot get around this fact with high sounding platitudes. They started out with three leaves and they have reversed themselves to one. Why? The Prime Minister's speech was full of sound and fury signifying, to my mind, nothing. It was full of pious platitudes. That is the best description I can give of it.

We are concerned not with words but with what is being done. What is being done is that the Canadian people are asked to accept a partisan flag—in fact, not asked to accept, because in view of the notice given by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. McIlraith) a partisan flag that has already been changed

at the behest of partisan requirements is being forced upon them. I say, sir, that the Prime Minister and his government are treating parliament with contempt by shifting and changing on the flag and that they are now adding insult to injury by gagging parliament.

They talk about respecting the past but they would junk the flag embodying our Canadian history. They talk about unity and they sow disunity. At a time like this, when frictions, gaps and fissures are appearing between the two great races of this country, they have petulantly insisted on bringing the flag debate before parliament again and again and again. They have tried, with collaboration, to foist the blame on the members of the opposition for their own ineptness and inadequacies and their lack of organization.

They talk about coming to a decision and voting on the flag, as the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) also did today, so we can get on with the business of the country. There has never been any reason why parliament could not have been dealing with the business of the country instead of frittering away endless hours on this debate merely because of the petulant insistence of the Prime Minister that the flag issue has to be decided instead of dealing with the national labour code, the pension plan, and all of those other more important matters that should have been dealt with by this parliament. There is where the real blame lies. There is where the responsibility for leadership lies. We have been getting nothing in the way of leadership from the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister talks about change. Change is one thing and honesty is another. He has made the issue the question of change, but that is not the issue at all. We in this party are not against change. If this party were against change I for one would not be a member of it. Why does the government keep the union jack which is embodied in the second resolution and which we discarded 20 years ago? It is not a question of change. It is the kind of change and the manner in which the government is bulldozing its way to change. Have the traditions representative of a large and substantial body of Canadians the right to recognition, after having been recognized for 200 years in this country, or have they not? Apparently not, because their views are now gagged. They are cut off, they are stifled, they are throttled and they are not being heard because of the high handed and arbitrary action of the government in moving closure.

I ask the Prime Minister what happened to the three maple leaves? If he was sincere in June, is he sincere now? What changed him? He has not said a word about that nor have we heard any of his cabinet colleagues or any of the backbenchers say anything about that aspect. What gives this government the right to play games with Canada's flag? Why did they change? What gives the government the right to decide that the time has come to deprive a great segment of the Canadian people of their history and traditions? This has nothing to do with the past. These are things equally valid in the present. If they do not matter, why the feverish anxiety about remembering them?

The Prime Minister says he accepts the report of the committee and that all members of his cabinet do likewise, but that does not tell us for a moment what happened to the three maple leaves. The government will accept anything as long as it gets rid of the red ensign. The Prime Minister calls it a compromise. I say, sir, that it was no compromise. It was a deliberate scrapping of their three leaf design for partisan advantage.

It certainly was time for the Prime Minister to speak. I see the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) in his seat now. I think he should rise and tell us what his personal views are on the committee report. Is he in favour of the red maple leaf on the white background with the two red bars? There are other cabinet ministers here. The Minister of Labour (Mr. MacEachen) is in his seat. Why does he not rise and state his personal views on the flag? I see the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys (Mr. Benidickson) completely absorbed in reading his newspaper. Why does he not rise and state his personal views?

Mr. Benidickson: I will vote.

Mr. Nielsen: I will vote too, Mr. Speaker, and I will vote against the single maple leaf because it means nothing to me whatsoever.

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Nielsen: There is something else I will vote against when the time comes to do so, and that is the imposition of closure in the House of Commons. I will vote against the gagging and throttling of parliamentary debate, because that is what is happening.

An hon. Member: Another black Friday.

Mr. Nielsen: It is Friday again, and another black Friday, Mr. Speaker. When the Prime Minister spoke this morning it was the first

indication that any of us on this side of the house had so far as the Liberals are concerned that there was even a flag debate in progress, because we had not heard from a single minister sitting on the treasury benches. Where is the leadership to which this country is entitled?

Mr. Greene: We are working our way up.

Mr. Rhéaume: You had better have a paid furniture invoice.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, every time I attempt to make a serious speech other members inject humour into it and it usually involves the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Greene).

Where, sir, in this single red leaf design is the heraldry, the history that were so eloquently described by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) in connection with the three maple leaf design that was so eloquently described by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) in June when he introduced the resolution? Where has that gone? In June, the Prime Minister waxed eloquent about this design for the three leaf flag; it was the only one with tradition and history. Now he approaches the whole matter on tip-toe; the whole thing has been dumped in his lap. He is now saying, I accept the single leaf and so do all my cabinet colleagues. The fact remains, sir, this flag design was chosen by ten members of this house, seven of whom were Liberals while the other three were from the splinter groups to my left.

This afternoon the Prime Minister said, certainly, I put forward the three maple leaf design. He referred to the historical significance of it. He said also that the single maple leaf had historical significance. It is strange that this historical significance should suddenly show itself when it did not have any such significance last June when the three leaf design was introduced by him. He says, however, that the three leaves have greater significance. I suppose they have three times greater significance. The members of that committee chose the single leaf design, seven of them were Liberals, and yet we are asked to believe that it is not a partisan flag, that it is not a partisan issue. I am informed also, sir, that the Liberal members of that committee voted unanimously against the three leaf design. This afternoon the Prime Minister skated around that fact.

The fact remains, sir, that either the Prime Minister and those opposite were sincere in June when they said that only the three leaves had the qualifications that were desirable in a national flag or they are not sincere now. They cannot have it both ways. Either they believe what they are saying now or they did not believe what they were saying then. If they did believe what they were saying last June, the only conclusion is that they changed their views to get the support of the Créditistes, the Social Crediters, and the members of the N.D.P. He injected into the debate this afternoon, and this to my mind was one of the Prime Minister's well known straw men, the fact that the report of the flag committee was a surrender to Quebec. I was sorry to hear him say this, because it only further inflames, and he must take responsibility for having done so, the French-English differences which appear in this country today. Who said, before he did this afternoon, that it was a surrender to Quebec? Whom was he quoting? Was it, perhaps, the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan)? No one on this side, certainly in the speeches to which I have listened or have read, has described the committee report as a surrender to Quebec.

I feel, sir, that it is a disgrace that Liberal cabinet ministers have not spoken in this debate. We have had to wait two weeks to find out where they stand, and we have had to learn that from the Prime Minister. I feel that cabinet ministers, in that spirit of leadership which is supposed to exist in any government, have a responsibility to see that we are informed on how they stand, what their personal views are. Having said these things or having indicated to the house partially why I intend to vote against closure and intend to vote against the single maple leaf design, I shall take my seat.

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, like my colleague who spoke before me, I wish to say that I intend to vote against closure and vote against the maple leaf flag. In fact, many of us on this side wonder why only one member from that side expressed his views. I refer not to the frontbenchers as my colleague did, but to the backbenchers. Why have more of you not had the intestinal fortitude to get up and tell the people what you really think. You are going to have to go back and tell your constituents.

The other day one of the speakers in this house said that the backbenchers on the opposite side of the house looked and acted as if they were imprisoned in strait-jackets. Actually, that is the way they have looked

to us ever since this flag debate started. Today, as a result of the dictatorial action of the government, we have had strait-jackets imposed on us. I was very impressed this afternoon with the words uttered by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Bigg), particularly when he reminded us of that poem "In Flanders Fields" by Colonel McCrae, part of which is, "to you from failing hands we throw the torch." I ask today, has that torch gone out? Have you thrown it?

I told you a few moments ago that you imposed a strait-jacket on us and we must accept it because that is the law of our country. I hope you are very proud of that. I said it appeared to us that you members on the back benches have refrained from speaking on this issue because you have been instructed to do so by your leaders. My colleague says you were threatened. I wonder what that threat was. The sole contribution that you people on the back benches have made in this debate—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; may I remind the hon. member that he should address the Chair?

Mr. McIntosh: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am addressing the Chair and I excluded you from these remarks. The sole contribution that will go down in history that the back benches of this government have made to this loss of the red ensign for Canada is recorded in *Hansard*. It is interjections, interruptions, laughs, facetious questions, irresponsible points of order and privilege and ridicule. In my opinion, this major issue, this very important election promise that you people say you made—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; the hon. member was cautioned a moment ago by the Chair that he cannot address other members of the house directly. He can only refer to them in the third person.

Mr. McIntosh: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I will ask you, and possibly I can get an answer. We wonder why they have remained silent. We ask why they have remained silent. I am sure their constituents will ask them why they have remained silent. I know the veterans in their constituencies will ask them why they remained silent. I am sure that in future years the children of this country will ask them why they remained silent. They say it was because of a promise that they gave to the country to give the country a distinctive flag. I wonder if they are not confusing extinction with distinction by their actions.

They may well believe it when they say that this promise made must be fulfilled. I said in the house the other day that you people went out west and made one promise that was very dear to the hearts of the western farmers. You promised $2 wheat. What is going to happen to that promise? You also promised the labour people of Canada a labour code. What is going to happen to that promise?

One member of your party promised a Canada pension plan. What has happened to that? What happened to the medicare plan? What happened for the relief of those people depending on railway lines during the question of rail line abandonment? Why do you remain silent? Mr. Speaker, I hope when they answer they will answer through you, in the same manner as you asked me to ask these questions.

Is it because they have a tiger by the tail and are afraid to let go? Is that why they remain silent? Is that why they enforce closure? Is it because they have been instructed to keep silent? The people of Canada have a right to know. Certainly their constituents have a right to know why they sat silent during these days of debate except for, as I said before, interjections and interruptions.

Is it because they have no respect for the Canadian red ensign? Is that the reason they have remained silent? Is it because their constituents do not want them to speak up? The *Hansard* record will show how many times these backbenchers got up and spoke on this very important issue which they said must have priority above all others. They have said nothing on it. Is it because there have been other types of pressure put on them? Have they been told to keep quiet for some other reason? The country is entitled to know the answer. Are they too apathetic or too complacent, not caring whether the red ensign comes down or not?

Mr. Byrne: No.

Mr. McIntosh: Is that the hon. member for Kootenay East? He has been on record more often in the House of Commons than most and has made the shortest speeches of anyone in the house. He makes them from a very good place, from his seat. Let him get up and tell us what he thinks about this flag. Why don't they speak?

Miss Jewett: I try to speak only once on any matter.

Mr. McIntosh: Yes, teacher.

Canadian Flag

Are they aware that the whole flag issue has become a red herring? The reason I say red herring is because I have in my hand *The Western Producer* of December 10, which arrived just this morning. It shows a picture of a flag suggested by a certain group in the west, and I may say this is a publication which to my knowledge has never been favourable to this side of the house but is always favourable to the party that forms the government. The caption under the picture reads:

Frank Cushon of Oxbow is shown holding his "red herring" flag which he introduced to the annual meeting of the Saskatchewan farmers' union in Saskatoon last week. The design was introduced as a joke but S.F.U. delegates took it seriously and decided to send a copy of the flag to Ottawa for consideration by the House of Commons.

Why did the Liberals introduce this red herring in the first place? Is it because they needed another 60 days of decision? We could have given them another 60 days. We could have given them a recess which cabinet ministers could have spent in their offices preparing bills properly.

Was it to divert public attention from more inefficient government or was it, as *Time* magazine said, for spite? I do not have *Time* magazine with me, but it referred to the action taken by the Prime Minister after the famous Legion meeting in Winnipeg. It said they never saw a man react so fast as after the reception he got at that meeting.

The government has conveyed to the public that the decision on the flag shall be left to the judgment of members of parliament. Dealing with the judgment of members of parliament I ask, do hon. members opposite, with but one exception, agree with what Edmund Burke has said about members of parliament and their duty? I quote the following extract:

Soul-searching and attention to business are what a great parliamentarian and political philosopher of the so-called golden age of oratory believed should be principal ingredients in the life of an M.P.

Edmund Burke said in the 1770's that an M.P. should "live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents."

"Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfaction, to their's; and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interests to his own."

Burke also held the view that an M.P. isn't elected simply to vote slavishly on every question as his electors demand. He is elected as a man of judgment on whom the electors should be able to depend. As Burke put it:

"Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it for your opinion."

Mr. Davis: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. McIntosh: Surely.

Mr. Davis: Would he take that quotation from Burke to refute a plebiscite or as an argument in favour of a plebiscite?

Mr. McIntosh: I do not know where the hon. member was all the time I was talking, but I was referring to the judgment of members of parliament. I ask you, in your judgment, did you serve your constituency well by sitting in the house and not talking on this issue at all?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It being five o'clock the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills and private bills.

CRIMINAL CODE

AMENDMENT WITH RESPECT TO WATER POLLUTION

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-68, to amend the Criminal Code (nuisance).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this bill on a number of occasions. In fact it is an identical copy of one that was introduced by the former prime minister, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) prior to his assuming the reins of office. I thought the bill had a great deal of merit at that time and since then I have introduced it from year to year in the hope that it will be a first step in doing something about the prevention of pollution of our waters.

The purpose of the bill is to make it an offence for the owners of industrial plants and oil refineries or other persons to discharge noxious matter into an interprovincial water thus endangering the lives, safety, health and comfort of the public.

In the first instance the bill was introduced to prevent, if possible, the pollution of certain waters that came from the province of Alberta and flowed into the Saskatchewan river.

For many years I have been very interested in the conservation of natural resources. I want to say that we can talk all we like about pension plans, national medicare plans and all the other social improvements that all members of this house desire; but unless

we maintain and improve our national resources, our standard of living in the future—and the not very far distant future—will begin to decline. All civilizations have been based on a foundation of adequate natural resources. I have been interested in this subject all my life, Mr. Speaker, and I know something about it. I have tried to do what I can in my own small way to conserve the land that I hold at the present time as a trustee for the government, pending the revolution. I have tried to do the same with the rivers and waters that flow on my property, and the forests and the wildlife. I believe I have had considerable success, so far as a private owner can under this free enterprise system. However, on that account for years I moved a motion in the house in the following words:

> That, in the opinion of this house, the government should consider the advisability of calling a dominion-provincial conference on conservation, with the view to the establishment of a nation-wide policy on soil, forest and water conservation and land use for Canada.

Strangely enough, Mr. Speaker, although over quite a number of years all members of the house supported this resolution in principle and gave it their blessing, shall I say, no action was taken as far as the resolution was concerned; it was talked out at the end of the usual private members' hour. On one occasion when I raised the matter the minister at that time replied. I am quoting from page 1565 of *Hansard* of February 27, 1956, where I said:

> When speaking on my resolution last year the minister gave three reasons for not agreeing to accept it. While he supported the principles of conservation in general, he gave these three reasons for not being able to accept the resolution. First, he said that the prime responsibility for conservation of resources rests with the provincial governments. Second, he said that the suggestion for federal action should come from the provincial governments. Third, he had grave doubts as to the success of a conference called to deal with all renewable natural resources.

I want to give full credit to the former minister of northern affairs and national resources for his calling the renewable resources conference in Montreal in the summer of 1961, when numerous very interesting papers were delivered to the conference. As the result of this conference there was the establishment of the Canadian council of resource ministers, and I am glad to see, from reading the reports that I get from this council, that they are beginning to tackle this question. They have laid out a program in which the question of pollution takes a prominent part, and they are also providing for the receipt of information from other nations regarding research with respect to natural resources and their development. They are also providing for an exchange of information between the federal government and the provincial governments. I give the former minister, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton), great credit for calling that conference. I think the circumstances were somewhat different then, inasmuch as the former government of Mr. Duplessis had been defeated and I believe it is quite correct to say that the atmosphere in Quebec was more conducive to calling a conference of this type than it had been in years past. I am glad to know that this council is laying down a program dealing with this problem.

I am also very glad that the present Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources (Mr. Laing) has recognized the tremendous need for a national water management policy and has made a number of speeches on this question. I note that some time ago, through, shall I say, the vehicle of his very distinguished and good looking parliamentary secretary, he made a speech in Montreal on the question, in which he clearly indicated that he realizes what we have to do in this respect and what price the public is paying for confused policies, haphazard programs and ill planned projects. He went on to deal with the damage caused by floods; the situation with respect to shipping in some of our rivers; the depletion, often to perilously low levels, of those secure supplies of fresh drinking water without which great cities cannot exist; the virtual destruction of our once great commercial fisheries. Then he dealt with the pollution problem that is only beginning to be faced. Then he went on to deal with the slow decay of sports fishing in some areas that had previously enjoyed an international reputation; the acute shortage of water for irrigation and other purposes in farm areas; the need for water for recreational purposes, and the water required for industrial purposes. Then he dealt in a very interesting way with the fragmentation of government authority in the water resources field which, he said, "fosters a fierce rivalry and a devil-take-the-hindmost empire-building in competitive government agencies, encourages waste and duplication of effort and the taxpayers' money and which virtually guarantees an appallingly uneconomic use of water resources which, however vast, are not limitless". He then dealt with other aspects of the question and made

certain proposals on how the government of the day should meet this situation. I was very pleased to see him face up to this question, because it is a very important one facing us at this time.

I want to quote briefly from an article that appeared in the October 9 issue of the *Globe and Mail*. It is headed, "But in the mass we're a pack of vandals". I agree with that sentiment and I could use that word "vandals" in a much wider way than possibly I should use it under the present circumstances. This article says:

> One of the more certain ways of making sure that one does not run out of essential goods is to make sure that one does not waste, despoil or pollute the bountiful supplies one already has. This is a fairly straightforward fact of life which is readily comprehended by most individual humans; but it is a fact that takes an awful lot of getting through the heads of the human mass.

It is a question that is going to take a great deal of education, not only in parliament and in organizations interested in this question but in our universities, high schools and the public schools. Every one of our children going to school, regardless of their age, should have their attention directed as soon as possible to the great importance of these issues. The article goes on to say:

> Canadians who appreciate a comfortable life do not stuff good food into the garbage can, smash up their furniture, yank up their rosebushes or pour the fresh cream in with the sour. They have too much respect for themselves and their possessions to indulge in such vandalism.
>
> Yet these same Canadians, in that larger home of theirs which is the country, happily litter their parks, destroy their forests, waste their topsoil and pollute their rivers and lakes. These things are quite as essential to their well-being as their more personal possessions, are, in fact, the basic wealth from which many of the personal possessions spring. But belonging to everybody they seem, in the contradictory human mind, to belong to nobody and therefore not to be worth preserving.

I think that article very clearly states the question. As I said before, unless we do something to conserve and develop these renewable natural resources of ours as a result of management policies, our standard of living which we enjoy today and the opportunities for its possible improvement through legislation both in this house and in the legislatures of the various provinces will decline in the years ahead. There is no question of that, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I am very concerned with this particular issue. In my opinion we in this house are responsible for doing what we can to improve this situation as the result of legislation or amendments to existing legislation, and by keeping the public informed of the seriousness of the situation.

Water is so important in life that its conservation and distribution must override the geographical boundaries of private property, counties and provinces, the political boundaries of federal and provincial jurisdictions, and the economic domains of agriculture, forestry and industry. If jurisdictional disputes prevent effective action, our heritage in natural resources will be lost by default, because above all boundaries is the supreme natural law the edicts of which are indisputable.

All that is to be done must start in the minds of citizens. "We may well ask", said John H. Storer, renowned lecturer on the natural world, in his book "The Web of Life", which I recommend to all hon. members to read, "whether man will develop understanding before he destroys himself by destroying his environment". To which may be added what was written by Myra Mannes, United States writer and commentator, in her book "More in Anger", which again I recommend members secure from the library and read, when she referred to "people who conserved their convenience at the expense of their heritage, and whose ephemeral prosperity was built on waste". The least we can do as responsible individuals is to become informed about the problems and make our voices heard in demanding conservation of our most priceless material resource, which I think at the present time without any doubt is water.

Before concluding my brief remarks I want to deal with a subject that does indicate the great value of water not only to Canadian subjects but to people in the United States and other countries. I want to refer to a statement made by the North American power and water alliance. The United States senate has appointed Senator Frank Moss of Utah as chairman of the new water development subcommittee. This subcommittee, known as NAWAPA—North American water and power alliance—has been appointed to make a study of how the waters of the Yukon, Northwest Territories and British Columbia—our waters, mind you—can be drawn down to the states of Utah, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, California and Arizona to make their deserts bloom. It is the wish of the United States senate to store this water in what is known as the Rocky mountain trench, in British Columbia. The United States senate wishes to turn the Rocky mountain trench into a huge lake 500 miles long if these schemes come to fruition; and I

mention this to indicate how concerned they are with the problem of water. The water from this 500 mile long lake would be taken by way of canals, reservoirs, tunnels and rivers to water the great American deserts of the previously mentioned six states. Perhaps even more important, these waters would be used for expansion of industries and populations in cities like Los Angeles, Phoenix, Tucson and many others.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is happening in this question? The United States is coming to Canada with the proverbial hat in hand claiming that they are all but out of water. Is their claim genuine, or are they conserving their own water for long range future expansion? The United States knows that at the present time Canada is still very much underpopulated, and perhaps does not realize how important water will be for Canada's future growth. Senator Moss has stated on several occasions:

> The era of space probes and miracle drugs has not changed man's dependence upon "the life blood of civilization". Cities and nations grow in direct ratio to their water supply. When that supply fails, they perish.

As they have in past history.

If Canada gives away all of her western water supply, can she continue to grow as a nation? Indeed, can she continue as a nation at all? Since 1940, or in the past 24 years, Canada's population has jumped from 10 million to 19 million. It is quite realistic to suppose that in the next 20 to 25 years the population could expand to 40 or 50 million. To support a population of this size we will have to turn away from a lot of uneconomical dry farms to irrigation of smaller, more productive farmsteads. If the United States plan is carried out, all the water of any importance left to Canada will be the Saskatchewan river system, as far as western Canada is concerned. But even now, before the Elbow dam on the Saskatchewan is finished, it is believed that the water supply will not be adequate to meet the present needs of Saskatchewan. That does not give us much hope for the future, unless we can tap some of the Arctic or British Columbia rivers. In all probability, we will be needing both these sources.

I could go on and deal further with this question, but in concluding this portion of my remarks I want to say that at the Canadian end of Senator Moss's project most of the rivers would have to be reversed. That is, the United States would have to make the rivers flow backwards and do a great deal of engineering miracles to accomplish that end. This plan has not been put into effect. Fortunately, I think the government of the day is aroused to the circumstances of the present situation and are determined, according to the statements made by the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources (Mr. Laing) and his parliamentary secretary (Mr. Turner), to develop a water management policy which will protect the needs of Canada both at the present time and for generations to come.

I have dealt with this vast project, the North American water and power alliance, only briefly, Mr. Speaker, so as to indicate how important is this question of water on the North American continent and what the United States is having to do to obtain additional supplies. My bill, shall I say, takes a somewhat shallower approach to the situation than the one I have been developing, but I have used this argument to indicate the urgency of the situation and the need for the development of policy. I was very surprised to realize when I was in the committee on mines, forests and waters the other day that there has been a committee of deputy ministers from various departments throughout the years which is supposed to meet periodically and come to decisions as the result of interdepartmental consultations on various water questions which are brought to their attention. And what do we discover? We discover that at the present time the committee has not even a secretariat, and we could not get very complete information as to when the committee had met and what its decisions had been over the last few years.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, and I see you looking anxiously at me, I urge the house to consider the purposes of my bill amending the Criminal Code as a first step toward the further prevention of pollution of our rivers which flow from one province to another, or which may in the future be transferred from one province to another by gravity or by pumping. This amendment to the Criminal Code represents only a minor step, but I suggest we take that first step on that long road we have to travel.

Mr. Joseph P. O'Keefe (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge) on the presentation of this bill. I assure him that I agree wholeheartedly with the principles of it; however, I have some reservations as to its effect. First of

all, I do not think a private member's bill is the proper way of doing this job and, second, that Bill C-68 is not wide enough or all embracive enough.

Mr. Herridge: We quite frankly admit that and suggest that this is only a minor step in the right direction.

Mr. O'Keefe: I agree with the hon. member but say, to use his own words, it is rather narrow.

It has been said that the gravest and the most difficult of any government problem is the matter of arranging the means of making industrial organization and humanism compatible. In this day and age I suggest that is what parliaments are for. This is not a new problem. It might be interesting to observe that its existence was recognized and dealt with, I might say vigorously, as far back in Newfoundland and Labrador at least as 1610. In that year John Guy, the English colonist who organized Cupids, a colony then known as Sea Forest Plantation, enacted eight laws the first of which, written in old English was: Ballast or anything hurtful to harbours not to be thrown out but carried ashore: penalty—£5 for every offence. When it is remembered that John Cabot, who discovered Newfoundland, was given just twice that amount, or £10 for his discovery of the whole of Newfoundland and Labrador, it must be agreed that John Guy enacted a law with a very severe penalty.

Of the major world problems, such as the prevention of nuclear war, the proper distribution of the world's food and the finding of fresh water, the third in the opinion of many experts is the most important. Back in the days when the Russians astounded the world with their space exploits, especially the feats of Mr. Gagarin, the late President Kennedy was asked by newspapermen how the United States could recoup its diminished prestige. They of course expected him to say "Send a United States spaceman to the moon". He surprised them by saying, "Find a cheap method for sweetening the sea".

With the exception, and it is a notable exception, of my own city of St. John's, whose Windsor lake is the source of the purest water in Canada and is fed by gravity to the extremes of the oldest city in North America, most city populations drink water which contains noxious substances such as detergents and insecticides, and these are slowly rising to dangerous levels. The discovery of an inexpensive way to separate salt from water would also mean that other chemicals could be eliminated.

I am one of the lucky ones who was born within sight and sound of the sea. Every Newfoundlander loves the sea. Every maritimer, every coastal inhabitant is, I suggest, always conscious of the sea. Anything, no matter how minor, which permits or is even suggestive of water pollution, is absolutely abhorrent to anyone who has walked with fishing gear, who has heard a boat chug out from the shore at dawn or has seen tall masts against a sunset. This is why, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy and very grateful for the opportunity given me today to speak for a few minutes on the frightening problem of water pollution.

I have seen seagulls, as I am sure you have, glorious in their freedom, gleaming crescents of ivory. I have heard the welcome sound of sea birds in the spring as they returned to my own village of Holyrood. I have also seen, as so many Newfoundlanders have, and as I am sure have others, the same birds, grotesque and slime-covered as they struggled hopelessly, wrapped in an oily shroud. I know there is an international convention for the prevention of pollution of the sea by oil, to which Canada is a signatory, but my understanding is that that convention forbids dumping of oil within 50 miles of the shore only. I respectfully suggest there should be no indiscriminate dumping of oil on the high seas anywhere. At the meeting of the last international conference, held in Copenhagen in 1959, the Canadian delegate described the Avalon peninsula, part of which I have the honour to represent in this house, and the southeast coast of Newfoundland as one of the world's hardest hit areas. Ships ending their trans-Atlantic run make a practice of discharging disgusting and dangerous oily ballast in the shipping lanes south and east of Newfoundland, and the prevailing winds and currents take it ashore, causing pollution of Newfoundland's coast and a wholesale destruction of wildlife in those waters. This makes no mention of the frightening danger of fire.

Surely my island has borne enough of the slings and arrows without suffering for the thoughtlessness and the carelessness of some captain. One wonders, does the thoughtless or careless captain, or worse, of any ship who indiscriminately dumps oil on the surface of the sea ever stop to realize the havoc those thousands of gallons of waste oil cause in the bays of our coastal waters. Does he not realize, apart from the elemental fact, that he is by his wanton act depriving fisher-

men of their livelihood? Does he not think of the beaches thus spoiled, the fishing gear fouled, or that bathing becomes difficult if not impossible and, as I mentioned earlier, the fearful risk of fire in the harbours?

Undoubtedly the ideal is the complete prohibition of the discharge of oil into the sea. I realize, however, the difficulty of enforcing such a prohibition. Yet one important step could be taken by the provision of facilities at all ports for disposing of oil. Such facilities are already provided by Britain and by Holland, and I am told now that a new process has been developed for absorbing oil on beaches or oil floating on seawater. It depends on the use of a granular mineral material which absorbs the oil and then soon sinks to the bottom of the sea. With men of good will working together, this particular type of water pollution could be overcome.

Of course, there are other problems that may be even more serious. Certainly there is nothing more disturbing than a threat of widespread contamination of ground water. Remember, it is not possible to add insecticides to water anywhere without threatening the purity of water everywhere. Nature does not operate in closed separate compartments and she did not do so in distributing the earth's water supply. Rain falling on the land settles down through pores and cracks in soil and rock, penetrating deeper and deeper until finally it reaches a zone where all the pores of the rock are filled with water —a dark subsurface sea rising under hills and sinking beneath valleys. This ground water is always on the move, sometimes at a pace so slow that I am told it travels only 50 feet a year, sometimes more rapidly, but always moving. It moves by unseen waterways until here and there it comes to the surface as a spring, or perhaps it is tapped to feed a well, but mostly it contributes to streams and so to rivers. Except for what enters streams directly as rain or surface run-off, all the running water of the earth's surface was at one time ground water, and so in a very real and frightening sense pollution of ground water anywhere is pollution of water everywhere.

If I may, I should now like to say a word or two about the problem and the myth of foaming detergents. More people, more factories, more chemicals poured on the land to run off with the water, more ships in our harbours and in our lakes dumping garbage, all this and more adds up to water pollution which has become a serious problem indeed for thinking people. I am told that experts addressing the annual meeting of the water pollution control federation in Toronto indicated that pollution is progressing faster than it is being controlled in many areas. The detergents we use in such quantities are not removed by sewage treatment plants and in some cities even the tap water now foams. The strange and almost unbelievable thing is that the foaming agent in detergents does not add anything to the cleansing powder. It only makes them look like old fashioned soap. The ironic truth is that we are willingly helping to destroy our lakes and our rivers with a completely useless sales gimmick.

Just before coming here I was manager of the St. John's tourist bureau. Next to questions on the historical significance of St. John's I was more often than not asked such questions as, how far is it to good fishing, to good safe bathing, to pleasant boating? How far is it to your best rivers and streams? Luckily my province of Newfoundland-Labrador, poor as indeed she is in material things, is rich in beauty, rich in her salmon and trout streams, her as yet unspoiled beaches and rivers, and rich in the mighty Hamilton falls where one day soon our premier will bring to reality the biggest and most dramatic hydro complex in the world.

Our rivers, Mr. Speaker, are natural resources that are either exhaustible or renewable, whichever our people wish. The cycle of neglect and exploitation that strangles the river starts with a full flowing river, a source of clear water with wholesome fish, a recreation asset of great value, and in some cases a vehicle for moving waste products. Yet how many of us have seen such rivers strangled by silt and pollution, their banks a garbage heap littered with trash dumps, their waters dangerous for swimming, unpleasant for boating, sterile of all save the coarsest life, and their waters drinkable only after expensive filtering and disinfection by chlorine. A full stoppage in our supply of chlorine, a most unlikely happening, would probably put a very considerable portion of the population in hospital in a few days.

So I appeal for a greater awareness of our neglect. Not long ago I had the pleasure of hearing the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources (Mr. Laing) speak on this problem, and I assure you he and his officials are very much aware of it. There are those of us, ordinary people as well as politicians, who should and must keep prying, pushing and pestering the authorities to put teeth into an act which will prevent pollution. This awareness, this effort and a break-

through in the process of using our vast store of salt water would revolutionize the world's economy. President Kennedy was right. It is a far more exciting prospect and surely a far more practicable one than landing on the moon.

Mr. D. W. Groos (Victoria, B.C.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to give my general support to the bill. My remarks will be brief because I see the time is getting short and I know that other members of the house would like to speak on this subject. The reason I support the bill is that at heart I am a conservationist. I think that any of us who have travelled abroad from this fair Canada, particularly those who have travelled to the Far East and who have seen the situation that exists there today, where conservation has been one of the last things the people have had in mind, have very quickly become conservationists.

I am very pleased to see that the whole matter of conservation and the whole matter of pollution are very much in the minds of other organized bodies throughout the world than the one the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge) just mentioned in his speech. I have just returned from the NATO parliamentarians meeting in Paris. Although I was a member of the military committee, I noticed that the scientific committee had this matter under consideration. They were dealing particularly with the pollution of water as a result of nuclear development, but they went very much beyond that in their deliberations.

If we want to bring the matter somewhat closer to home, I would point out that in today's *Globe and Mail* there is an article describing how a whale was killed off the Oregon coast, off the Pacific coast from which I come, and the whale apparently had become radioactive as a result of the waste products carried down the Columbia river from the Hanford atomic plant. The fault I find with the bill, as the hon. member himself admitted, is that it does not go far enough. I should like to see the problem of pollution dealt with in a more general and broader way than is done in the bill. I think it is one of the basic requirements for the enjoyment of life that we should have clean water and clean air and that we should preserve the beauty of our countryside, including the preservation of wildlife, flora and fauna.

So far in my life I have seen tremendous changes take place in my part of the country. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, a great

[Mr. O'Keefe.]

period of industrial expansion is now under way in the west. I am not going to blame the industrial firms themselves. There is a statement to be found on page 823 of *Hansard* for February 13, 1962, which I think covers the situation very clearly. If certain things that are going on in my part of the country today are taking place, I believe it is because the companies involved are not being pressured to take action and very naturally they will do nothing until they are. I wish to read an extract from a paper prepared by Mr. J. R. Menzies, chief of the public health engineering division, Department of National Health and Welfare, Ottawa. He states in part:

> Broadly speaking, the effects of pollution become a matter of general interest only when they are notoriously bad.

I am taking part in this debate today because although I do not think things are notoriously bad in British Columbia, yet they could be better and, as the hon. member has suggested, I think we must be vigilant with regard to the industrial development that is going on in my part of the country. In this bill we are dealing with the pollution of clean water. Clean water comes from creeks, rivers and lakes, and it is not only clean drinking water about which I am concerned. In my area we have a large fishing industry. The same clean water for human consumption about which we are speaking also provides the basis for a very profitable commercial fishing industry and also provides a very valuable source of revenue, through moneys expended by tourists interested in sport fishing. If we are going to keep the water clean for human consumption I think that at the same time we must give equal this commercial fishing industry and sports attention to keeping the rivers, streams and lakes clear to provide a base from which fishing industry is derived.

I have noticed that within recent years in my own part of the country, because of the method of logging, the area in which many of the small streams and lakes are located has been laid waste. This has resulted in flash floods which wash down sand and gravel into the streams covering the spawning beds with mud. I have noticed that slash is left to accumulate in the creeks and the salmon cannot get up the rivers to spawn. If they are able to spawn their fry are not able to survive, because of these flash floods tearing down the spawning beds.

When we are looking at the matter of water pollution, upon which I am only touch-

ing in view of the time element in this debate, we should look also at the matter of air pollution. I think we have a big problem. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, that no one seems to be taking a stand against the pollution of the atmosphere.

Some 20 or 30 miles north of my riding, we have a very large pulp and paper sulphite mill. When the wind and weather conditions are right there is a most unpleasant smell in the atmosphere which emanates from these plants. It may be that this is the smell of money, Mr. Speaker, but it is also something which I find simply appalling. The hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge) will agree, I am sure, that something could be done if we were to provide a body to look after the interests of the public in connection with this type of thing. In the case of the large smelter at Trail, the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company were eventually persuaded to remove from the atmosphere the poisons that were being poured out of their smelter. They only took this action under pressure. I find that no pressure is being brought to bear upon the pulp and paper company. I am sure that if there were, if there were some central organization to apply this pressure, we would long since have had this ghastly smell removed from the atmosphere.

Why is it that nothing is being done? I notice the hon. gentleman has brought forward this bill many times in the past. I have been very interested in reading what has been said, and agree wholeheartedly with it. An almost identical bill was brought before the house, as the hon. member said, by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) in years past. Why has nothing been done about it? I think perhaps it is because this is a matter which obviously has federal and provincial implications. Even in so far as the federal government is concerned, who knows which department of government is responsible for looking into these matters? Is it a matter for the Department of National Health and Welfare? I suppose that it relates to both health and welfare. Is it a matter for Northern Affairs and National Resources? I think it comes under national resources. Is it a matter which should be the responsibility of the minister who has jurisdiction in the field of federal-provincial relations? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is the responsibility of all three.

Now, in so far as conservation is concerned, since it is related to the question of pollution, I should like to cite a personal experience which I hope will be of interest to hon. members in this house and drive home to them the importance of this problem. I can recall some years ago going up a river in China, the Yangtze, and believe me this is a river that can only be used for irrigation purposes and for travel. It is not a thing of beauty. It is so polluted, Mr. Speaker, that if any westerner happens to fall over the side of the boat into the river he is immediately brought ashore and put into a hospital where he is filled with wonder drugs and kept under surveillance. This is the kind of thing that happens when you are not careful about matters of pollution.

In dealing with the matter of conservation, perhaps hon. members would be interested in knowing that this river is yellow and muddy because there has been no thought given to preserving the contours of the land, to keep the underbrush and trees growing to prevent flash floods, such as those I mentioned in my part of the country, and which there give rise to the spoiling of the salmon fishing beds. In fact, as you go up this mighty Yangtze river, when you get to within 50 or 60 miles of a town, the trees disappear. This results from the people leaving the towns to chop down the trees for firewood. When you get within 30 miles of the town all the shrubs disappear and there is nothing left but grass. This is a further evidence of the despoiling of the country for human needs. Then, the most appalling aspect of it occurs when you get within ten miles of a town and you find there is not a blade of living grass in sight. The needs of the population have required them to take the grass and the roots, dry them out and put them up in bundles for fuel. This is something which has happened in another land and it is the sight of this sort of thing which has made a conservationist out of me. It is the reason for my support of this bill.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I recommend that this subject should be brought up at the next federal-provincial conference so that the federal-provincial representatives can agree on joint responsibility for conservation and pollution. Terms of reference should be laid down for a joint board to handle all these aspects of pollution and conservation to which the hon. member has referred. The only fault I can find with this bill is that it does not go far enough.

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my support for the bill which has been presented by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Her-

ridge). This bill has been introduced before and has given rise to very interesting discussions on various aspects of the conservation policies of this country. I think the bill itself, by the very limitation of its form and the fact that it only calls for an amendment to the Criminal Code, indicates some of the complexities that arise because of the constitutional situation in this country in connection with the development of adequate conservation policies. However I feel that, since it has been introduced year after year, the hon. member for Kootenay West has been the cause of creating great interest in this subject in Canada. Certainly for this reason, if for no other, the hon. member is to be commended for introducing it.

Perhaps some hon. members are not aware of the genesis of this bill. It used to be introduced prior to 1957 by the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). It may be recalled that it was due to a problem of pollution in the North Saskatchewan river, in which my former colleague, the then hon. member for The Battlefords, used to take an active part. Therefore I am a little puzzled not to see the hon. member for Prince Albert or the present hon. member for The Battlefords (Mr. Horner) in their places to support this bill.

The hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge) is to be commended for having taken up a good idea and having pursued it throughout the years, even without much apparent support from the hon. member for Prince Albert in the years since 1957. I hope the time may come again when that hon. member will lend his voice in support of the bill.

Mr. D. G. Hahn (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this bill should pass, for reasons that have previously been indicated. It is a narrow bill and deals only with a portion of the problem. On the other hand I think the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge) has done the house a service by raising the problem.

One of the great things I am worried about is that the public generally does not seem to care about the problem of water pollution, and this can be overcome by discussing the matter in the House of Commons. I grew up adjacent to and have lived all my life on the shores of one of the great lakes. I spent my summers there and still do. I have become very concerned about and aware of the pollution that is taking place in the great lakes, and I would like to quote from an article which

appeared in the *Financial Post* on April 18 last, dealing with the extent of pollution in the great lakes area:

> This is what's happening in the biggest expanse of fresh water in the world around which 25 per cent of all Canadians live and work:
>
> On lake Erie and lake Michigan, studies made by the great lakes institute indicate that, although 60 per cent of the sewage and industrial effluents are treated before being dumped into these lakes, it is essential to treat at least 80 per cent of polluted water to restore the impure-pure balance.
>
> There is a "dead" area of about 2,000 square miles at the bottom of lake Erie where fish and other organisms cannot live—there is no oxygen. The phenol count—refuse discharged by industries—is higher than the level recommended by the international joint commission, a body set up by Canada and the U.S.
>
> It is doubtful whether any beach in lake Erie is fit for swimming. The turbidity and amount of dissolved salts has increased during the past few years.

The general tenor of the article is that lake Erie and lake Michigan are already polluted almost beyond repair.

The other great lakes are suffering pollution to a lesser degree, but the pollution is reaching dangerous levels. I know from friends of mine who have summer cottages on the Muskoka lakes, north of Toronto, that those lakes are also becoming polluted and their waters unfit for consumption.

There is no need to spend a great deal of time indicating the problems which arise from this. Everyone is aware of the effect on the health of people. We are all aware of the impact on our recreational facilities. There is no doubt about the impact on our natural resources, the fish in the waters and the birds that nest by those waters. There is also the impact on industry.

In short, it is a situation that cannot be allowed to continue, yet it is one we have allowed to continue. It is a man-made problem and through our lack of care we are in the process of destroying in the great lakes area one of the major natural resources of the country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

We are now on an amendment moved this afternoon—

[*Text*]

Mr. Knowles: We are on private members' hour.

Mr. Caouette: You are right. O.K.

Mr. Hahn: At least I am glad I know where I am this afternoon.

All we have to do to cure the problem is stop pumping sewage into the water, stop adding industrial waste to the water, stop ships from dumping their garbage and sewage into the water, and stop pleasure craft from dumping sewage into the water. On the face of it, it seems a simple problem. The mechanical solutions are simple but the ways of achieving them are not. There are many jurisdictions involved. There is much study involved. Many costs are involved.

The cost of treating all sewage dumped by municipalities into the water, and which is not now treated, would be staggering and the municipalities involved probably do not have the ready funds available quickly to undertake this work.

We will arrive at a solution by discussing the matter and being concerned with the problem, and by referring it to the council of resource ministers, something which has already been mentioned. The ten provincial resource ministers and the federal minister are going to look at this problem from the national point of view and as a result of their work I hope we will reach financial solutions involved in the problem.

Further, I hope that when the international joint commission has dealt with the problem of great lakes water levels it will take this matter up. And before my time expires I make one further suggestion. I hope that when the committee of the House of Commons which is currently dealing with the problem of great lakes water levels has finished its study, it will inquire into this equally important problem of the pollution of these great natural resources.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business has expired.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Pugh: Before we adjourn could we have an indication what the business of the house will be for Monday?

Mr. Benidickson: I think all hon. members know we will carry on with the business that was interrupted at five o'clock.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, December 14, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. DIEFENBAKER—EDITORIAL IN TORONTO "GLOBE AND MAIL"

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege arising out of an editorial which appeared in this morning's *Globe and Mail*. I could take objection to other parts of this editorial, but I should like to refer to this part which deals with me personally, and which reads as follows:

> It is Canada's misfortune that the new flag was proposed at a time when the Leader of the Opposition was a man who did not scruple to pour derision on the device it was to bear, the maple leaf. The maple leaf has had a place of honour in Canada. It speaks for Canada around the world, and marks the sleeping places of all the dead of all our wars. Yet the Leader of the Opposition and the red ensign diehards of his party have mocked the maple leaf, and now they have forced its introduction by closure.
>
> This is the flag that is to fly above us, to express our pride of nationhood; and Mr. John G. Diefenbaker has not hesitated to besmirch it with words and now with this action.

Sir, that editorial in so far as it contains those allegations is a gross perversion of the truth. I have not risen on a question of privilege of this kind in all the many years I have been here because, after all, the press always gets the last say. However, that statement cannot remain unchallenged because my last reference to this was made on December 11 as reported in *Hansard* at page 11045, at which time I was referring to the Prime Minister and I said:

> He manufactured a false claim when he used the expression that we sneered at the maple leaf. There was nothing of that kind. Many of us on this side of the house are proud of the maple leaf, but the maple leaf as an emblem is a long way from the maple leaf as the design for a flag.
>
> An example occurs to me as I am speaking. What about Ireland? Ireland established itself as an independent country after generations of turmoil and difficulty. It decided on a flag. The emblem of Ireland is the shamrock. Did they place the shamrock on the flag? The shamrock was a symbol, but when they built their flag they made it a flag of two colours representative of the unity of their country, orange and green. Certainly no one casts aspersions on the maple leaf. We are all proud of it as a symbol of the nation. However, there is a great deal of difference between symbolic significance and that which goes to the heart and soul of a nation, the flag that must represent the people as a whole.

I simply say that the suggestion that at any time I cast aspersions on the maple leaf is a falsehood and an attempt apparently to misrepresent my position as being one which I have never held, do not hold now and never will hold.

PROCEDURE

FIFTEENTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour and, I may add, the great pleasure of presenting in English and in French the fifteenth report of the special committee on procedure and organization.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that I will move concurrence in the fifteenth report of the committee on procedure and organization, tabled this day, on Wednesday, December 16.

CANADIAN FLAG

MOTION THAT DEBATE BE NOT FURTHER ADJOURNED

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the notice given on Friday and in accordance with the provisions of standing order 33 I move, seconded by the Solicitor General (Mr. MacNaught):

> That the debate on the motion for concurrence in the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, and on any amendments thereto, shall not be further adjourned.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Diefenbaker: A flag by closure.

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

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Division

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. McIlraith) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Addison
Armstrong
Asselin (Notre Dame de Grâce)
Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)
Badanai
Balcer
Barnett
Basford
Batten
Beaulé
Béchard
Beer
Bélanger
Benidickson
Benson
Berger
Blouin
Boulanger
Boutin
Brewin
Brown
Byrne
Cadieux (Terrebonne)
Cameron (High Park)
Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Cantin
Caouette
Cardin
Caron
Carter
Cashin
Chapdelaine
Choquette
Chrétien
Côté (Chicoutimi)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Cyr
Davis
Deachman
Deschatelets
Dionne
Drouin
Drury
Dubé
Dupuis
Emard
Ethier
Eudes
Favreau
Fisher
Forest
Francis
Frenette
Gauthier
Gelber
Gendron
Girouard
Godin
Gordon
Granger
Gray
Greene
Grégoire
Guay
Habel
Hahn
Haidasz
Harley
Hays
Honey
Jewett, Miss
Kelly
Klein
Konantz, Mrs.
Lachance
Laing
LaMarsh, Miss
Lamontagne
Lamoureux
Langlois
Laniel
Latulippe
Laverdière
Leblanc
Leduc
Legault
Lessard (Lake St. John)
Lessard (St. Henry)
Lloyd
Loiselle
Macaluso
Macdonald
MacEachen
Mackasey
MacNaught
McIlraith
McMillan
McNulty
McWilliam
Marcoux
Martineau
Matheson
Matte
Mitchell
Moreau
Morison
Mullally
Munro
Nicholson
Nixon
O'Keefe
Olson
Otto
Paul
Pearson
Pennell
Pepin
Perron
Pickersgill
Pilon
Plourde
Prittie
Prud'homme
Regan
Richard
Rideout, Mrs.
Rinfret
Robichaud
Rochon
Rock
Rondeau
Rouleau
Roxburgh
Ryan
Saltsman
Sauvé
Sharp
Stewart
Tardif
Teillet
Temple
Thompson
Tremblay
Tucker
Turner
Wahn
Walker
Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Webster
Whelan
Winch—152.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alkenbrack
Bell
Bigg
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Cantelon
Cardiff
Chatterton
Churchill
Clancy
Coates
Cowan
Crouse
Danforth
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Doucett
Douglas
Enns
Fairweather
Fane
Flemming (Victoria-Carleton)
Forbes
Grafftey
Gundlock
Hales
Hamilton
Herridge
Horner (The Battlefords)
Howard
Howe (Hamilton South)
Howe (Wellington-Huron)
Jones, Mrs.
Jorgenson
Kennedy
Kindt
Knowles
Korchinski
Lambert
Leboe
Loney
MacEwan
MacInnis
MacLean (Queens)
Macquarrie
MacRae
McBain
McIntosh
Madill
Mandziuk
Martin (Timmins)
Mather
Millar
Monteith
Moore
More
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nasserden
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nugent
Ormiston
Ouellet
Pascoe
Patterson
Peters
Pugh
Rapp
Rhéaume
Ricard
Rynard
Scott
Simpson
Southam
Starr
Stefanson
Stenson
Thomas
Wadds, Mrs.
Watson (Assiniboia)
Webb
Willoughby
Winkler
Woolliams—85.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Minister of National Defence. Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. Groos: Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SIXTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Friday, December 11, consideration of the motion of Mr. Batten that the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, be now concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, at the close of the debate on Friday I had made reference to a quotation from Edmund Burke who said, and I shall read the complete last line of the quotation:

> Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it for your opinion.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has stated that in his judgment Canada needs a new flag to unite the country. Does the Prime Minister feel that he has achieved that purpose? Does he believe that by force he has given Canada the flag she needed? In my opinion force can never unite any country or any people. I regret that the flag we are going to have to honour in the future will have been imposed upon the people of Canada by force through the use of closure in this house. That is not a proud beginning for a flag which we should look up to with pride.

On Friday the Prime Minister said he had support for this flag from all parties in this house. He neglected to tell the people of Canada that there is opposition to this flag from all parties in this house. I think that fact should also be made known. Opposition has been indicated toward this design by members of every party of this house, so how can the Prime Minister say this flag will unite Canada? I do not think he has proved his point.

The Prime Minister dwelt upon that point at great length, and he seemed to be proud of the fact that he was in a position where he could use force at this time. I am sure the Prime Minister is not blind to the fact that the same disintegration of unity which has taken place in this house in relation to this question has taken place across Canada in each and every province. That same disunity does exist and will continue to exist.

On an earlier occasion I suggested that the flag issue had created more factions than have ever existed before. Before this debate on the flag issue there was not one faction which supported the three maple leaves design, one which supported the single maple leaf design, and another which supported a modified version of the red ensign. I suggest, therefore, that there are three more factions which have been created in this country by the flag question and debate.

How can the Prime Minister take any pleasure from his belief that the flag issue and the adoption of the single maple leaf design will unite Canada? I suggest that the attitudes expressed during the debate on this issue confirm the suggestion that this has created more disunity in Canada than any other piece of legislation placed before parliament in the history of this country. Only after the passage of time will we know the over-all effects of this flag issue. Our constituencies are represented by people of all nationalities, yet there are now more factions supporting various proposals than there have ever been.

I regret that I cannot look upon this flag with pride, even after hearing all the arguments that have been presented to this house by members not only on this side but on the other side of the house. We regret, in fact, that more members on that side of the house have not risen to state the views of their constituents. Surely, Mr. Speaker, all those members on that side who have remained silent during all the days of this debate are not representing the views of all their constituents by so doing. They have not even expressed regret that they cannot support the opinions of certain factions in their constituencies. They have not said one word in favour of the flag that has been flying over this country for a great many years. Many of us on this side of the house would like to hear them express their opinions. We wonder why they have sat silent as they have and not uttered one word.

Actually their attitude does not affect us on this side of the house. They will be responsible to their constituents and will have to answer to them for their silence on this matter. I should like to refer to a couple of newspaper editorials. I will not read all of them, but I think they express much better than I can what I am trying to get across to the house. I quote first from the Winnipeg *Tribune* of May 19 last:

> It is this newspaper's opinion that the timing of this flag proposal is bad.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Last week the Deputy Speaker decided that editorials from newspapers commenting on the flag debate should not be read at this time. Members are here to express their own opinions and view-

points and not to give the viewpoints of editors of newspapers.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, I am reading what I believe to be a true statement about this flag debate.

If the main purpose is to consolidate unity it is a peculiar approach for, as witnessed at the Legion meeting—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not wish to be ungracious to the hon. member, but if he is reading the editorial claiming that the words of the editorial are his he is doing something indirectly which he is not allowed to do directly. Perhaps he could express the same viewpoint if he wants to do so, but certainly he should not quote the words.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Speaker, I am adopting these words as my own and I think I am entitled to read them. Other members of the house have read such articles into the record.

If the main purpose is to consolidate unity it is a peculiar approach for, as witnessed at the Legion meeting, the dominant reaction is disunity.

That I believe.

Unfortunately, too, the Prime Minister's approach leaves little ground for thoughtful consideration. He asks, in effect, for a surrender of what is known for something unknown. He entertains a mystique about the price of unity which he is unable to articulate. In addition to poor timing, the method of introducing the design was odd ...

He has placed himself and his government on the record to introduce a new flag. He has rejected the proposal for a national plebiscite and insists that the issue must be decided on a free vote in the Commons.

I should like to say something more about that free vote but I do not have the time.

But then he has also added that the result would be interpreted by his government as a vote of confidence. In other words, he is prepared to fight an election on the issue. He is willing to jeopardize national unity in the hope of political advantage but he is unwilling to seek an expression of opinion in a plebiscite in which the issue would be the flag, not seats in parliament.

Mr. Grafftey: Unity by closure.

Mr. McIntosh: The Prime Minister claims he has pressed the issue of a national flag—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have found the citation in Beauchesne, fourth edition. It is citation 157, paragraphs 5 and 6.

5. It is not in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or communications emanating from persons outside the house and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the house.

[Mr. Speaker.]

6. On the 17th March, 1933, a member quoting a newspaper in debate was ruled out of order by the Deputy Speaker who said: "The rule is quite clear, that the quoting of a newspaper, an author or a book which reflects upon debate before the house, either directly or indirectly, is entirely out of order, because members are here to give their own opinion and not to quote the opinion of others. ...Members may quote an article or a book stating facts, but a commentary on any proceeding or any discussion in the house, with the object of swinging an opinion to one side or the other, is out of order." Can. Deb. 1932-33, vol. 3, pp. 3103-4.

In view of the authority cited I am sure the hon. member will do his best to give his own personal opinion.

Mr. Lambert: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think Your Honour will agree that it is common practice in the house to refer to newspaper editorials. This is one of the most difficult areas for the Chair to rule upon. I would say that the limitation is very narrow, in that reference cannot be made to editorials which comment on proceedings in the house, and that the citation is not so wide that reference to editorials or books or articles is precluded. They are commonly cited and have been for years by members both on the government side and on the opposition side. I would say that an editorial or article which commented upon the motivation of voting or on the procedure would infringe upon the rule, but certainly there is not and never has been a rule in the house which prevents an hon. member from citing an editorial in support of his argument. This is done regularly, and I think Your Honour has ample knowledge of that.

I submit that the limitation has to do with commenting on proceedings of the house. I suggest it would be improper for an hon. member to read an editorial stating that another hon. member was wrong in his presentation of the facts. I suggest to Your Honour that the restriction on reading editorials from newspapers is a limited and not a wide restriction. Therefore I think that, with appropriate care, the hon. member should be able to proceed under these circumstances just as all hon. members have been able to do in the past.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcoux: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order just raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), following your ruling, I should like to say that, in my opinion, the hon. member who was himself, at one time, Speaker of the House of Commons should not forget that members have always been given a great deal of latitude,

even lengthy excerpts from editorials being allowed. However, the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) said he was going to read a whole editorial. That is where I feel he is out of order.

If we want to read an editorial, all we have to do is to get the newspaper, but if the hon. member merely wishes to quote from it, then I think you should accept this as you have always done. But I am under the impression that this hon. member, not satisfied with having succeeded in bringing down closure, would very much like to be named, so that he could say, in his riding, that he was obliged to leave the house—

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency cannot prejudge anyone's motives in this house.

Yet he is figuring that the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek is trying to get himself named. In that case, he is prejudging the hon. member's motives, and this is not allowed in the House of Commons.

[*Text*]

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Monteith: Oh, here's the authority.

Mr. Byrne: —I thought perhaps it would be wise to let hon. members opposite know there was not some glue on my seat. I recall that when the hon. member for Edmonton West occupied the Speaker's chair he did insist that articles from newspapers or letters read at length were not in order. Today the hon. member is contending that while newspaper articles reflecting on our proceedings would be inappropriate, articles reflecting on debates are acceptable. Now, proceedings are not debates; proceedings are the actual procedures that the house follows.

The hon. member is overlooking the very fact you observed, Mr. Speaker, that the ruling is quite clear in that it says newspaper articles or books which reflect upon a debate before the house, either directly or indirectly, are entirely out of order. When I drew this to your attention, sir, earlier in the debate you did allow a considerable latitude. If members are to be allowed to read newspaper articles when it is inappropriate to read speeches, they would simply substitute newspapers and editorials for their speeches. This seems to have been a preoccupation of most members opposite during this debate.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure after all this intelligent discussion the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek sees the point and will conform to the custom and practice we usually follow in this house by giving his own opinion, which I am sure is quite good.

Mr. McIntosh: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I resume what I was saying I should like to say that if I had wanted to get myself named I would not have taken this long to do so. I want to say also to the hon. member of that party in the corner that at the outset of my observations on the editorial I said I was not going to read it all.

Mr. Woolliams: You mean that member of the fifth Social Credit party?

Mr. McIntosh: I do not know which one. However, I will dispense with that. I will say that in my opinion this issue is now creating disunity throughout the country, and there is more confusion about this issue than ever before.

The country has been told by the Prime Minister and the members of his party that if an election were held on this issue it would split the country and create disunity, and this was one of the reasons he adopted this method of implementing his desire. I say, too, that stubbornness is no substitute for statesmanship.

One writer has expressed the view that in the selection of a flag we should strive for some common understanding of what a flag is. We should understand what it means. One common understanding that has been evident from the speeches that have been made from both sides of the house is that we want to be Canadians. I believe the other day I made reference to a number of speeches from the various parties in this house who have said that we all want to be Canadians, whether we are designated now as French Canadians, English Canadians, Irish Canadians, Scotch Canadians or whatever. In fact this has been the common denominator throughout all these speeches. Can we not start from that point?

I should like at this time to ask the Prime Minister and the members of his party just what flag would be flying over Canada today, what conditions we would be living under today, if it had not been for Britain during the last two wars. This is something that I think a lot of us have forgotten. It is said that we who have supported the inclusion of the union jack as some part of our new Canadian flag should not refer to tradition. I cannot help but refer to tradition when I think of those things. If I came from French Canada or if I came from the province of Quebec I would say that those early explorers, those great pioneers who came from France

and settled in Quebec, should in some way be remembered by the people of Canada today for what they have done in creating this country of which we are so proud. Would we have a country like we have today if it were not for those people?

During this debate, Mr. Speaker, we have expressed our views as individuals. We have expressed our views as members of this party. We think we have expressed the views of our constituents. In fact some of us go so far as to say that we feel we have expressed the views of the majority of the people of Canada. We have been criticized in the press. We have been accused of obstruction, and apparently some members opposite think that is what we have been doing. I can say that I believe every one of us has spoken with conviction. We believe that as members of parliament we are using our judgment when we debate this very important issue, and the Prime Minister has said it is a very important issue. We have been debating this issue sincerely. I hope I will not again hear the suggestion that we have been obstructing on this issue.

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak for the time allotted in favour of the committee's report suggesting the maple leaf design as Canada's flag. I do this first of all because the flag that is being proposed is one which has been selected by a committee which represented all the parties in this house. This committee sat continuously for two months and made this recommendation under the able chairmanship of the hon. member for Humber-St. George's (Mr. Batten).

If we are dedicated to democratic principles, and I believe everyone in this house is so dedicated, then I believe it behooves us, after having expressed every shade of opinion that can be expressed on this subject, to let the democratic process take its course by bringing the matter to a vote and accepting the vote of this house. The maple leaf design that is being proposed is not a renunciation or a betrayal on our part of our Christian principles. Indeed, were we by a mere change of exterior symbols to cast off our traditions, our past, our Christian beliefs and everything that we hold near and dear, then certainly all those things would be very shallow indeed.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that after this debate has ended and this flag has been adopted we, as a Canadian and Christian nation, will continue to adhere to all those things that make our country great, that make the British heritage great, that make the French heritage great, and which indeed make our civilization worth living and fighting for. Whether we fly the union jack, the red ensign, the maple leaf flag or any other symbol we shall certainly continue to practise those liberties and respect those institutions which go far deeper than mere exterior symbols. Speaking as a Quebecker I think I should be the last person in the world to want to cast off the past and not honour it, nor to honour the British institutions that have given us our freedom, especially when the motto of my province is "Je me souviens" —I remember.

The maple leaf is a true Canadian symbol. Canadians recognize it as such everywhere, and others recognize us as Canadians by the maple leaf symbol. It is instantly recognizable and identifiable as a Canadian symbol no matter where a Canadian may go throughout the world. It is a symbol which was very much alive among servicemen during the second world war. Is it not a fact that the burial places of all those brave and true Canadians who gave up their lives are marked by a maple leaf? I recall travelling throughout western Europe at the end of the second world war and seeing that the routes which were travelled by Canadian forces all over Europe were studded with and indicated by the maple leaf, the symbol that led our forces to victory and which is also the symbol of the future.

I refuse to accept that the maple leaf can, in any sense of the word, be recognized as an exclusive or narrow Quebec symbol. It has never been accepted as such. It is an all Canadian symbol. Some have said that the maple leaf flag is a concession to Quebec. If by that is meant that it is a symbol which is acceptable to Quebec then I am entirely in agreement, because it is also a symbol acceptable to all Canadians no matter what their origins may be. But, Mr. Speaker, if by stating that the maple leaf is a concession to or an appeasement of Quebec one wants to stir up differences between the racial groups in this country, then I say that attempt is most damnable and contemptible.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Martineau: The new flag is the symbol of the future because it expresses unity, that unity to which so many of us have paid lip service during the course of this debate. I believe that in the maple leaf Canadians of whatever origin or background may find something in common. I believe this maple leaf flag will express for Canadians, in their

own undemonstrative and taciturn way, the firm conviction that Canadians want to live together, work together and build a worthwhile nation.

If this distinctive flag can be accepted by the country without lasting bitterness and acrimony, then Canadians will have gone a long way to prove to the world that a nation such as ours, born in strife, diverse in its origins, speaking two languages and being the embodiment of two great cultures, can survive and prosper.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Martineau: During the course of this debate many hard and bitter words have been spoken that it would have been better to have left unsaid. It is useless, futile and, I feel, mischievous to try at this stage to assess blame in this chamber or elsewhere. But the truth remains—and it is a bitter truth—that the embers of hatred and prejudice have been fanned, and if they should continue uncontrolled they could very well lead to disaster and the end of our nation. That is why this afternoon I approved and voted for the extreme measure that is closure; because I am firmly convinced that the continuance of this debate at this stage, after it has given rise throughout the land to so many utterances born of prejudice and hatred, could only achieve its normal course, the very destruction of this country.

It may be well to look at others and learn a lesson from history. Almost 100 years ago the United States of America, our great neighbours, today's leaders of freedom, were engaged in a murderous civil war. Fortunately, and I thank God, this has not happened in our country, and I trust and believe it will never happen. When President Lincoln, in his second inaugural address, spoke to congress in Washington, his country's murderous and bloody civil war had been raging for many years. As he addressed congress his mind must have lingered on the terrible price of that useless war that had pitted countryman against countryman, brother against brother, and which had already cost more lives than any war in modern history to that date and which, in his own words, would go on to the bitter end, even if necessary until—

> —all the wealth piled by the bondsman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn by the sword.

Lincoln urged his countrymen to strive on, to finish the work that they were engaged in, with malice toward none and charity to all, and to bind up the nation's wounds. Yes, Mr. Speaker, to bind up the nation's wounds; that is the task to which we should now be dedicated.

We have had our debate, and I believe that in order to bind up the nation's wounds—and they are deep and grievous—we must without recrimination, if defeated in our point of view in this debate, and without undue bombasity if our point of view prevails, accept the new flag when it is unfurled; because that flag will be the symbol of our country, and our country will be as great as the respect we show to the symbol that will be ours and ours alone.

If we are not mature enough to do that, if we are not big enough to forget the division that has torn us apart, then we are not even worthy to survive; but I think the immense majority of Canadians from coast to coast will accept the flag that is truly our own, and under that flag Canada will know better and greater days.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lawrence E. Kindt (Macleod): I am sure the English speaking people in this assembly, and those of English descent, are fully cognizant of the feelings expressed by the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue (Mr. Martineau). Thank God I belong to a party in which there can be differences of opinion. Thank God we have a liberal-minded party where those who have a different view can express that view.

Today, in the few minutes at my disposal, I want to put on record what other people throughout this dominion are thinking. I have in my hand a letter I received this morning from a mother who lost her son in the last war. Her son was named Cecil. I want the house to know what she has to say about the red ensign which is being debated here today as it has been for the past few weeks. She writes:

> I feel Cecil fought for the protection of this flag and gave his young life for it.

I want to make this the theme of what I have to say here today. Young Cecil was about 22. He was the pilot of a Lancaster bomber and was shot down north of Berlin during the raids which were made on that city from bases in the British isles. His gunner was the son of a former member of this assembly. The entire crew lost their lives.

As it happens, this strikes home closely to me because Cecil Kindt, the pilot of that plane, was my nephew, and the person who

wrote to me is my brother's wife, or widow; my brother is dead. So it was this boy, in the flower of his youth, who lost his life flying a Lancaster bomber during those days when we did not know whether Britain would survive and when, as Churchill said, we never owed so much to so few. Have we forgotten those days? I hope not. But here is a mother who says in her letter to me:

I agree with your opinion on the flag situation. I feel Cecil fought for the protection of this flag and gave his young life for it.

Those among us who talk lightly about a flag and about choosing a flag or destroying a flag have never felt the emotion which those of us who have been through it feel. So I say to all those who would lightly throw the red ensign away, you are spreading disunity among the people of this nation. There is no doubt about that in my mind. Do those who talk so loudly now remember the days of conscription when recruits were needed, and when we constructed air bases in western Canada to provide the armed forces with the men who were required? We built airfields and trained people to man the bombers. Those airfields were used to train people who came from all parts of the world. We put our best efforts into this work. What was the flag which flew over those airfields? It was the red ensign. These are the circumstances which are deeply ingrained in those of us who oppose this change in our national flag.

To get the right flag, the flag which Canada needs, and make it an acceptable substitute for everything else is not an easy task. It has to be a discovery, and such a discovery has not yet been made. What happened was this. A pistol was held by the government at the head of the flag committee. The committee was told to bring in a report by a certain date. Well, they threw out the flag with three leaves, which made it necessary for them to come up with something else, and this was the flag with one leaf.

That is how we got the flag which is now presented to us. It is a political flag. It is not a flag which will unify the people of Canada. If members opposite and those who think like them cannot see the possible evil effects of their action, and follow through with the result that disunity is created in this country, the blame will rest on their shoulders.

Let me say to those who write editorials condemning the Conservative party, and those in other parties who support the red ensign, that we are expressing a point of view which is held by a large section of the people of this nation, possibly 60 per cent or more. They have never been given an opportunity to express their views on this issue by way of a plebiscite. They never knew there would be a flag put forward consisting of one maple leaf on a white background until just a month ago.

[Mr. Kindt.]

I do not believe this is the way to choose a flag. We all know this design has come about because the committee was working under orders to produce. You cannot produce a flag which will be ingrained in the hearts of the people by following this approach. The government and its supporters are relying on having this flag approved so they can go out and sell it to the people. They will go out and support it—we will all support it, because it will be the Canadian flag. In other words it is a selling job they will be doing from now on, trusting that in a generation or two it will be as acceptable as the red ensign.

Well, I do not think this will happen. I think the disunity which will be created in this country as a result of the introduction of this particular flag will continue for years to come.

I do not believe closure should be used in order to obtain a flag. Nor do I believe that an emblem should be selected as the flag of this nation. Show me how many countries in the world, having distinctive emblems such as the shamrock, the rose, the thistle and so on, to name only a few emblems of the British isles, have chosen to place these emblems on their national flags. The people are proud of those emblems. They serve in just the same way as the maple leaf serves us. We are proud of our maple leaf. None of us has talked against it, but after all it is only an emblem. None of the countries in the British isles has its emblem on its flag. The Irish flag does not carry the shamrock, nor does the Scottish flag carry the thistle.

Therefore it is not necessary, neither is it desirable, to have a flag bearing an emblem. But when you are up against the gun and the head of a party tells a committee to bring in a report on the kind of flag we should have, it is simply imposing an impossible task upon that committee. Therefore, since the mistake in handling the matter in this way was made, the blame for the adoption of this flag and the mistake in connection with it lies squarely at the feet of this government.

Mrs. Margaret Konantz (Winnipeg South): Mr. Speaker, as a member of the flag committee I have felt it my duty to faithfully sit in this house during the last two weeks

and listen to all the remarks which have been made by different members. However, the one thing which has upset me more than anything else has been the insinuations which have been made regarding the intelligence of the members of that committee. I have found no one has given us any credit for being bright enough, after being together for six weeks studying the flag issue, to emerge from the committee wiser than when we went in. Quite frankly, I think I can say for every other member as well as myself that we were keenly aware of our responsibilities. We were determined to be open minded. We were willing to listen to other people's opinions and to permit full participation in all our discussions. I think each one of us was ready to study the whole issue and certainly to be non-partisan.

As a westerner I think I was probably a little more conscious than were some other hon. members of the people who come from many lands to make up our country, besides those who are the descendants of our founding races. I have to admit that as a westerner I am fiercely proud of Canada. I have had the most marvellous opportunities for travel on behalf of the United Nations association through UNICEF, which travels have taken me through nine countries of Africa and South America; and every time I come home knowing that Canada is the finest land in this whole wide world.

I believe there has been in our past too little, not too much, national pride in our country. During the six weeks that I sat on that committee I was made very conscious of how little I knew of our early Canadian history, and I gleaned much in the way of knowledge from the different witnesses we heard. I wondered why this was, and one day I asked a witness when it was that we really began to teach Canadian history in our schools. To my amazement I found that this was only in approximately 1920.

It seems to me that we have all acquired an appreciation of the accomplishments of our nation's builders. I think of the missionary martyrs, I think of the voyageurs, and I think of the explorers and their extraordinary accomplishments. As I look at this whole issue now I really feel that our lack of knowledge of Canadian history, particularly our early Canadian history, is one of the causes of our growing pains today.

Now about the people who make up this country, this mosaic of Canada; I found this summer that I was really very vague about the early settlers of Newfoundland. I had the privilege of going down there and spending a day with one hon. member going through his constituency, and it suddenly dawned on me as I read the different names of the little fishing towns built by the early settlers in Newfoundland—and I think of Portugal Cove, Bonavista, Port au Port, Ireland's Eye—and as I stopped and talked to the people in the different villages, that although confederation meant so much to them they were still very proud of their heritage.

Then, of course, we all know that the French, the English, the Irish and the Scottish are the descendants of the early settlers of what was Upper and Lower Canada and the maritimes. But at the time of confederation easterners thought western Canada was suitable only for the Indians. I believe some people still feel that way, but as a westerner I can assure them that they have a lot to learn. The fur traders were very jealous of their rights, and I think they did their best for a while to keep people out of this area of Canada; because with the farmers moving in it meant that the fur traders would have to move out. But very soon the early travellers came back to eastern Canada with stories about the rich soil of western Canada, and pioneers, intrigued by these stories, soon flooded into this part of the country and we had a new province in 1870, Manitoba.

However, the vision of a dominion from sea to sea was really only sparked at the time two British colonies, Vancouver island and British Columbia, joined together. Some people thought it was foolish to talk of a territory so far away, but with the promise of a railroad to be built within ten years a new province was added in 1871, British Columbia. This railroad was built through wild, barren land, almost bottomless swamps, muskeg, and was blasted through great mountains. This was all made possible by the Irish, the Swedish, the Italian and the Chinese individuals who had strong backs and were willing to work. It was then that the settlers poured into this vast area, coming from eastern Canada, Great Britain, the United States, Russia, Poland, the Ukraine, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Iceland, China and Japan. And there was land for all of them. Six thousand Mennonites settled on the banks of the Red river, and we will always know that this is their community when we see names like Steinbach, Stoney Brook, Rosenfeld and Field of Roses.

Then the farming Icelanders built new homes around lake Gimli, which is a beautiful place. They proved that people knowing no English and unacquainted with Canadian laws and customs could prosper in a new land if they were willing to work. With their spirit of adventure and their strong sense of freedom and attachment to their cultural heritage, the Ukrainians too have added much to our national way of life, and their contributions to community affairs have placed us all in their debt.

Let us be honest with ourselves at this time, sir. Surely today we are trying to preserve a nation in which people of many diverse backgrounds may feel at home. Let us be united by a common pride and a common dedication to the progress of Canada.

When thinking of all these other groups we must not fail to remember the first settlers of our country. As one travels west through places such as Medicine Hat, Sturgeon Creek and Yellowknife he is always reminded of those settlers. I came across a beautiful little verse the other day by Richard Huntington, as follows:

> The memory of the red man,
> How can it pass away?
> While his names of music linger
> On each mount and stream and bay?

Let us not forget our Eskimos and the name that was given to them by the Indians. About a month ago there was an art exhibit in the air terminal at Winnipeg which gave everyone the opportunity of observing the skills of these people and the articles which they offer to us who live below the Arctic circle. While I was a member of the flag committee I thought of those people, and I remembered how last fall I had read of a resolution passed at the annual meeting of the chamber of commerce; and let me remind hon. members that the chamber of commerce has approximately 900 affiliates in this country. That resolution read in part as follows:

> Parliament has not formerly adopted a distinctive national flag and Canadian public opinion polls continually record significant majorities favouring a distinctive national flag with the nation's youth expressing an overwhelming preference for such a flag. A distinctive national flag would be a strong unifying influence consistent with the status of whole nationhood.

For emphasis I should like to bring attention to the word "unifying" in that resolution.

During our flag committee meetings, as you have all heard so often before, we learned about flags; and when I went home to my constituency about two weeks ago someone suggested that I should wear a steel helmet. I must now state that I had no difficulty in explaining what the new distinctive flag was all about. It really boiled down to the fact that I only had to use two sentences to tell them that it was something to which we could give a place of honour; that the upper staff quarter of any flag is the place of honour, and that by placing the union jack in that position, which it occupies on the red ensign, we would be putting it in the place of honour. I believe the argument against the use of the union jack does not suggest any disrespect for that flag, but is made because the union jack does not represent Canada but is the official flag of the United Kingdom. It has been said over and over again that by flying the red ensign the interpretation might be made that Canada is still subject to the United Kingdom, which is denied by Canadians. So I say simply that—

Mr. Pugh: May I ask the hon. member a question? I take it that when you are talking about the red ensign you are referring to the Canadian red ensign?

Mrs. Konantz: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of the Canadian red ensign. It is simply a matter of self respect on our part to adopt a flag which will proclaim to the world that Canada is Canada and is not subject to any other country.

When it came time for the members of the flag committee to declare themselves and vote, I voted against the plebiscite for the simple reason that I felt it would add more confusion to this whole question and would not prove to be of any use in this country. If I had more time I could give a perfect example of just how confused a group can become about what is our official Canadian flag. However, as my time is running out I am afraid I cannot go into that dissertation. I voted against the Canadian red ensign as a national flag because Canada is an independent state.

I learned from the experts who appeared before the committee that our national colours were red on white. At the time we voted for or against adoption of the three maple leaves design versus the one maple leaf design I was reminded of the Christmas day I spent in Hong Kong in 1958. We all know that Christmas is a sad day in Hong Kong because on that day in 1941 it surrendered to the Japanese. I decided on Christmas morning to visit the Sai Wang cemetery and place a wreath on our memorial. I arranged to get the wreath through our Canadian trade commissioner, and it really was a most effective one. It stood about four feet high, was circular of solid white chrysanthemums with

a single red maple leaf made of carnations in the centre.

I went to the cemetery, which is on a beautiful hillside overlooking a magnificent bay, and on my arrival there I found a little Chinese gardener in his bare feet clipping the rose bushes and cleaning up the leaves which had fallen during the night. I walked down the great stairs and placed the wreath on the cenotaph, and then wandered among the headstones on the graves of our Winnipeg Grenadiers. I had not known very many mothers who had lost loved ones who are buried there, but one thing I will always remember is that on each headstone there was a single maple leaf, and I knew that when the time came for me to vote for the one leaf design versus the three leaves design I would vote for the single maple leaf.

Surely this flag, which the committee has recommended to this house, will send out the message we all want to give to the world; that this is Canada, this is a flag which symbolizes our freedom and unity, and a flag which we will fly proudly among the flags of the 114 members of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I plead with all the members of this house to put an end to this debate. Let us behave like reasonable and mature adults and bring this question once and for all to a decision. I am sure that is what our constituents expect of us.

Mr. Gene Rhéaume (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the hon. lady who represents Winnipeg South for entering this debate even at this late hour. I was pleased to hear her say that as a member of the flag committee her heart went out to the Canadian Eskimo people, and that for that reason she was able to make a choice as to a flag design. At this time I should like to invite that hon. lady, as I have done previously, to come with me to the great treeless plains of the Canadian Northwest Territories and explain to the Eskimo people what the maple leaf symbol is all about.

Because she is a convincing speaker I was also interested that she should make a plea to us to end the debate at this particular juncture, this after her own Prime Minister and his cohorts in the cabinet had decided to invoke closure to get a new flag by Christmas if they could not do so otherwise.

I had not intended to make any more comments on this matter, but the speech of the Prime Minister and more particularly of the government house leader on Friday prompted me to put a few more remarks on the record. I was particularly interested in the frequent references the Prime Minister made to the free and full debate that had gone on, and I want to put on record what he said. As found on page 11036 of *Hansard* he said:

> Of course free and full discussion is absolutely essential to the parliamentary process—

Again, as found on page 11037 he said:

> —so I hope this parliament will be given the right to exercise its fundamental duty; that is, to decide after a full and free debate.

Then that other expert on procedure, the government house leader, had this to say as found on page 11053, when he was giving notice of the closure motion with such obvious glee:

> In the circumstances, and to prevent a mockery being made of parliament, I have no alternative but to take the action I now propose to take.

Let us take a look at what the Liberals mean when they say "free and full debate". I took a cue from that little Ralliement Créditistes member, the hon. member for Lapointe, and I made an investigation of *Hansard* to see how the debate had been going. Let us find out what the Prime Minister means when he says "full and free debate". If you will look at the speeches made by members of the official opposition in the 10 days the committee report has been under discussion you will find that on a total of 661 occasions members opposite and their allies in the Ralliement Créditistes interrupted those of us who were trying to make sincere speeches in the house. These are 661 interruptions where the member doing the interrupting is identified by name. If one were to include all the interjections and smart remarks by way of harassment of speakers from this party by those members who are impatient with the democratic process, the closure kids, the number of such interruptions would be well over 1,000.

I am glad the government house leader is here, because his hands are not completely clean in this regard. The shameful thing is that 98 of these specious questions of order and privilege can be attributed to the Prime Minister and other ministers of the crown. I should like to put that on the record. The government house leader interrupted the debate 18 times in 10 days with specious points of order and questions of privilege or other questions. I can see why he might have done so with the Prime Minister sitting to his right. However, the Prime Minister was only in the house to hear three speeches. But his record is not so hot, either.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I should like to take the opportunity at this moment to interrupt the hon. member to make a slight point of order. I direct his attention to the fact that his speech should be limited to the amendment before us at the present time. It seems to me that some of his remarks relate more particularly to the question of procedure in the house, which is really not germane to the subject we are considering now.

Mr. Churchill: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I ask you, quite respectfully, to see that the rules are applied on both sides of the house. We listened to the hon. member for Winnipeg South give us a story of Canadian history and a visit to Hong Kong without anyone interrupting or raising any point of order. I think there should be complete freedom of speech in the house today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Certainly the Chair is prepared to recognize the point made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, but even though this is perhaps a special day and a special debate I do not feel that the rules of relevancy can be just thrown overboard. There is a specific matter before the house now for its consideration, the amendment to the motion moved by the hon. member for Humber-St. George's for the adoption of the committee report, and I would urge the hon. member to give that his primary consideration.

Mr. Rhéaume: Mr. Speaker, I bow to your ruling. Let us not forget that on Friday the Prime Minister was speaking to the amendment, and I am now discussing what the Prime Minister apparently means by full and free debate. I am trying to summarize the debate to date to see if it measures up to his standard. The closest the hon. lady got to the red ensign was a discussion of the Red river settlers, but none of us on this side objected to that. The government house leader interrupted 18 times and the Prime Minister interrupted nine times even though he was only in the house for three speeches. That professional interrupter, the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis), interrupted 35 times on points of order and questions of privilege, and he only returned to the house from his world wide tour on December 3. Members can see the kind of record he has in this regard.

I will conclude my remarks along this line, Mr. Speaker, by stating that the ministers of the crown, those great advocates of full and free debate, interrupted speakers on this side of the house 98 times in the course of 10 days, and together with their allies interrupted a total of 661 times. Is this some sort of Grit definition of full and free debate?

The newspapermen of the country have a responsibility in terms of reporting this debate, but press reports have not indicated that speakers from the official opposition attempting to make their cases have been harassed and heckled. How many of these press reporters—they can live with this responsibility when the red ensign comes down—reported that 661 points of order, specious questions of privilege and other interruptions were made? The hon. member for Lapointe got up and talked about the number of speeches that had been made, and the members of the press gallery were very good about giving us the running score in that regard. We had a right to expect impartial coverage of the flag debate by the press.

Let us take a look at what a free vote means. Every member in this chamber from the province of Quebec, regardless of where he sits in the house, supports the new maple leaf flag in no uncertain terms. We know this is so. I admire and respect them for doing so, and I support their right to do so. I believe these members from Quebec have set an example that will shine forth whenever parliamentary freedom of speech is in question.

On the other hand, I have nothing but scorn and sympathy for those members who have sold out and who have refused to be as honest so far as the other side of the issue is concerned. If anyone is in doubt about how they have sold out I invite them to read the speech of the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) who described precisely how it was being done among the Liberal party members. I have talked to Liberal backbenchers myself and I know the threats that were made against them. Let it be said about them in the years to come that when the moment came to stand up and be counted according to their consciences, they chose instead to swim downstream.

In his speech on Friday the Prime Minister said to members of the opposition "Come on, let us all rally around the flag once it is adopted and help me to hoist the new flag on the flagstaffs of this country". What he was really saying was "Come on, boys, help me tear down the one we have".

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: That is right.

Mr. Rhéaume: I can guarantee he will get no help from me or from anyone who thinks as I do in the process of destroying what we have had when he has not made a case for the necessity of doing so. In terms of the new one, let this be on the record and let it be clear; should a new flag be adopted for this country I will do my best to promote it throughout the far northern reaches of our country.

The northerly part of this country has known no other flag but the red ensign, because it has been only during the last few years that we have ventured that far. This will not be an easy task for me. It will be made much more difficult because my heart will not be in it. The Indian and Eskimo people in the far reaches of this country have a way of spotting insincerity. They were happy with the flag they had. For generations they have received their treaty payments, have gone to school and received their help from the mother country under this emblem.

One thing about the Indian and Eskimo people is this, Mr. Speaker. Before they change something they have to have a good reason for it. They do not discard the old ways lightly because someone has a whim or is capricious and says it would be a good thing to do. They know intuitively that the pursuit of novelty, the pursuit of change for its own sake, can lead only to social anarchy.

No one in this chamber will work harder or longer to promote loyalty, duty and devotion to whatever flag is chosen by this chamber. Nor will I, in the meantime, do anything to discredit the symbol that may be on that flag that is chosen. However, do not expect me for one second to assist in the destruction of what we have. I want to state and to emphasize, with all the eloquence I can muster, that the Prime Minister of this country can never again in my eyes and in my opinion pass himself off as a person who is willing to subordinate his personal whim to the greater and more enduring needs of this country.

The Prime Minister and his house have said "We will use closure to get a flag". They say, as they have said before, "Who shall stop us if we want to do something?" Well, I say to the Prime Minister and to his friends on the front benches, there are quite a few other things I should like to see stopped in this country before debate in this House of Commons. I would, first and foremost, like to see a stop to the highly questionable conduct of his own ministers. I have read the code of ethics that was written for him—

Mr. Sharp: Order.

Mr. Rhéaume: I can understand why the Minister of Trade and Commerce is a little nervous, but he has not been named yet. I can say this to him and to the house: any minister with any self respect would have resigned when he got a letter saying in future honesty would be the best policy. What I want to see stopped and what Canadians want to see stopped is the feeling that if you are—

Mr. Sharp: Order.

Mr. Rhéaume: —a Liberal cabinet minister you can do anything you want in this country; no one shall stop you.

Mr. Moreau: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Rhéaume: I have not the time to permit questions. I have read the code of ethics that was issued in order to help ministers understand what is expected of them. This is something I had thought everyone knew well before he was ever elected as a member of parliament, but apparently this is not the case. It says that in order that honesty and impartiality may be beyond doubt, the members of ministers' staffs, equally with ministers, must not place themselves in a position where they are under obligation—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I am sure the hon. member will realize that the Chair has some difficulty in relating the subject matter under discussion to his remarks. There may be a relationship between the two matters but it is certainly not apparent to the Chair. Perhaps the hon. member would want to bring his remarks within the ambit of the matter we are supposed to be considering now.

Mr. Rhéaume: I certainly will. What I was attempting to do was to indicate that many of us, including the Prime Minister, want to see closure put on the kind of conduct that has evidently been occurring, not on debate in this house.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. With respect may I suggest that this argument may be very valuable in another debate, but it seems to the Chair that the question before the house is not the subject matter of rule 33 of the standing orders on which there was a vote in this house this afternoon. Since that matter was disposed of, it cannot be raised in debate at this time. To that extent, therefore, the hon. member's remarks would not

appear to be related to the subject matter before the house.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I rise on a point of order. Surely Your Honour is not ruling that after the, I was going to say, outrageous course followed by the government in introducing closure in order to bring in a flag, you are going to deny us the right to say anything in criticism of this government on the subject of bringing in closure. Surely you do not say that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The only thing the Chair is doing is referring to the rules that require hon. members on both sides of the house to be relevant in their remarks, and which indicate that once a matter has been disposed of by a vote there can be no reflection on that vote.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I must say I am usually very co-operative in this connection, and I intend to be in my position as an officer of this house, but if Your Honour is endeavouring to rule that our mouths are to be shut in criticism of this government for what it did to parliament and its institutions this afternoon, you are going to have quite a lot of difficulty.

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I should like to bring to the attention of the right hon. gentleman opposite, and the hon. member for Yukon, that the motion for closure brought in by the government was voted upon by the house and sustained.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; may I suggest to hon. members that the point is not before the house. The suggestion made by the Chair was that the remarks made by the hon. member for Northwest Territories did not appear to be relevant to the amendment. The hon. member appeared, I believe, to want to follow this suggestion made by the Chair.

Mr. MacInnis: I should like to speak to the point of order. The hon. member for York-Scarborough has referred to the hon. member for Yukon. I should like to call his attention to the fact that if he would spend more time on this side of the river rather than over in Hull, he would know that the hon. member for Yukon is not speaking.

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. May I suggest to all hon. members—would the hon. member kindly resume his seat?

Mr. Moreau: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for York-Scarborough on a question of privilege.

Mr. Moreau: I should like first of all to apologize to the hon. member for Northwest Territories for referring to him as the hon. member for Yukon. I should like to point out that my conduct in going over the river to Hull, as the hon. member has just stated, requires no defence. My attendance in this house is as good as his.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Perhaps both the point of order and the question of privilege are not relevant to the matter under debate. I suggest we give the hon. member for Northwest Territories an opportunity to pursue his remarks.

Mr. Rhéaume: I accept the apology of the hon. member for York-Scarborough. However, there is no insult in being identified in this chamber, either purposely or mistakenly, with the hon. member for Yukon.

What I was attempting to say, Mr. Speaker, and apparently it was not obvious to the Chair, was not whether or not closure should have been invoked, because the house has already decided on that, but to ask why this government would be so anxious to institute closure. What is it with which they want to distract the attention of Canadians? I suggest that the new flag, the single maple leaf with which the ministry will hide its nakedness, is the reason for closure being introduced at this point.

In the short time left to me—and I do not know how much that is as there have been so many interruptions and points of order—I wish to put on the record a letter which I received today from a woman in Winnipeg. She may even live in Winnipeg South, but at any rate her name is Rose Cowan. In her letter she writes:

> On May 17th this year, we were guests at the memorial service for the war dead, in Winnipeg, when Mr. Pearson, instead of opening this convention...with a prayer and a few dignified words, unveiled his new maple leaf flag instead, causing much disturbance and upset feelings. My husband is a veteran of world war II and both of us have lost loved ones in that dreadful fray, so we felt really unhappy. I came away with tears in my eyes, and knew then that this flag issue should never never have been brought up. It is the kind of thing which splits a country from sea to sea, and does no good at all. It is an emotional thing—and emotional things inflame. Somebody has given Mr. Pearson very bad advice.

On the basis of a letter like that from a woman who is obviously sincere, I feel that if the Prime Minister and his cohorts use closure to stifle this kind of feeling, even

if expressed by only one citizen, they are depriving that citizen of something valuable, and it would be better had they never brought this divisive issue before the country.

Mr. Terry Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, the fight on the flag has been a long one, and we can see the end in sight. The amendment before us deals with the red ensign and much of the debate, as well as public comment, has been to the effect, "Why do you keep fighting on? Can't you see you are going to lose the battle? Can't you see you are going to have a new flag? Why hold up the work of parliament?" I think it is time something was put on the record to indicate exactly why we fight.

I have never been one of those who think the most important question in a fight is, how much strength have you got on your side? I think the question is, how much right is on your side? I am sure members of parliament are called honourable members because we all like to think our duty is to fight for the right, and to fight against that which we think is wrong. On many occasions we have said, and we continue to believe, that what is being done in changing our national flag is wrong, and the way in which it is being done is wrong. Therefore it is our duty to fight. I am sure the question is not how long are the odds against us, but how good and sincere is our cause. I am not concerned with whether defeat in the end is certain. I am concerned that we do not give up a fight when we are on the side of the right.

I am aware there may be a certain amount of ill feeling among certain sections of the public, and I am aware that the press has been dealing with what it calls our stubborn resistance to inevitable defeat. I am quite prepared to bear any punishment that public opinion may bring on me because members of the public fail to understand that I am not willing to give up a fight just because I may be defeated in the end.

Perhaps this is due to my Irish heritage and background. I am sure that if hon. members would only contemplate Irish history for a little while; if they would realize the years of battle, the number of lives lost, the amount of persecution, the fearful odds, the innumerable defeats, they would begin to get some comprehension of why we on this side of the house think it is an honourable thing to fight, no matter how often other hon. members may believe we should realize it is a foolish battle.

I hope my constituents will be able to look beyond the writing in the newspapers, which seem concerned only with the fact that this is a long fight. I hope they will realize it is a fight that must be carried on. I am aware that public opinion seems to have forgotten it is the government which could have broken off the fight at any time. We are in the position, I think, of being deceived that there is no honourable retreat and that if we are defeated we go down fighting.

Perhaps I am a little preoccupied with the idea of fighting and keeping on fighting because the parliament of Canada has today lost a truly great fighter. The dean of the parliament of Canada, Senator Byron Horner, died in hospital in Saskatoon today, and I am sure anyone who knew and loved him as I did knows of his long and valued service to the parliament of Canada, and knows that one of his predominant traits was to fight. He was a great and gallant fighter, and I think it can truthfully be said that we have all lost a very inspiring example, now that he has gone after so many years of service.

I am sure I echo the sentiments of all hon. members of this house when I extend to our two colleagues, the hon. member for Jasper-Edson (Mr. Horner) and the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Horner), our heartfelt sympathy on the loss of their father, and our sympathy to Mrs. Horner and the rest of the family. I am sure that his 32 years of dedicated service to parliament is one of the noblest and most gallant records of public service we have seen in our lifetime, or are likely to see for a long time.

I think it was when I first met him when I came to parliament that I realized how necessary it is for members of parliament to have courage. Perhaps sometimes some of us get a little too stubborn, but we are always too apt to be swayed by public opinion, by early, adverse reports in the newspapers, and by the contemplation of occasional fearful odds against us. I think I owe a deep debt of gratitude to Senator Horner because very early he convinced me that one of the greatest attributes a member of parliament could have is personal courage to stand up for what he believes.

I would like to refer to one or two comments made in the house today. I think it was the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue who mentioned the word "democracy," and the hon. member for Winnipeg South said let democracy have its way and bring the matter to a vote. There is something I believe people in this country are often

prone to forget. I do not deny that rule by majority is what is commonly thought to be the essence of democracy, but those of us who treasure personal liberty, those of us who feel we have a right to be personally indiscreet sometimes in our talk, if we so wish, realize that rule by majority is one more way of rule by force.

That is how rule by democracy came about; the masses, because of their great weight of numbers, were able to bring sufficient force to bear. I think we should realize this and remember it from time to time. I like to mention once in a while that in my opinion the crowning glory of democracy is not just rule by the majority; it is respect for the rights of minorities and for personal liberty. In this case, in this flag debate fight, I have never been convinced that the majority wants the new flag; I have never been convinced that the majority wants any new flag at this time. I have not seen enough evidence to be sure there was any public outcry or demand for a change in our national flag. I am not sure I would have chosen to continue to battle against the proposal of the government had I been so convinced.

The red ensign is a symbol which means so much to so many people in this country that I firmly believe those who wish to retain it have a right to have their views expressed and fought for. I believe that any member who wishes to speak out in defence of this right has a duty to make sure that he fights for it to the best of his ability.

My own personal view on the flag was expressed in this house two or three years ago, when I said I was not very greatly concerned; I was satisfied with the Canadian red ensign and could see no great reason for changing it, but did not think I would fuss too much if it were changed. If my attitude in this regard has altered I can only say it is because of the manner in which this issue has been handled. I am confident that the most ardent red ensign supporters could have been won over to a great extent; that most of them, if they had been properly approached and if the matter had been handled in a diplomatic way, would have been willing to make a great many concessions.

It has always seemed to me that the argument as to whether or not this question was handled properly can be settled by merely taking a look at the way in which the matter was handled in 1945-46. At that time the issue was not introduced in a political way, and the report of the committee which was set up was almost unanimous; 23 out of 24, I think. Remember, this was at the close of a great war, at a time when we had every reason to believe that the patriotic feelings of Canadian citizens were still at a high pitch and when our people had every reason to feel proud of the contribution this nation had made in maintaining democracy and securing freedom for so many countries of the world. One would have to look hard to find any more honest expression of Canadian opinion at that time than the unbiased, soul-searching work of that committee.

This record alone is enough to explain why we on this side have fought so long and sometimes so bitterly over the different flags which the government has from time to time suggested we approve. Who can say that we are now just being stubborn? Who can say that we do not have good and sufficient reason for feeling bitter about the flag which the Prime Minister has so eloquently said should be the symbol of national unity? I wonder why we could not have allowed this question to stand for a while, even after the initial mistake had been made, until tempers had cooled, until the people had had a little time in which to get used to the idea. I for one have not been in any hurry to see forced upon this country a flag which, initially at least, can only stand as a symbol of political manoeuvring, or of political bungling on the part of the government; a proposition which obviously shows a determination to ram down the throats of the electors of this country a flag which no one even on the government benches brought forward as an idea more than a month or two ago.

I suggest that the method used in seeking the adoption of this flag cannot easily be separated from the design which has been chosen. It is not a question of what we are asking the people of this country to do. It is a question of human frailty, of human understanding and, perhaps, our understanding that Canadians are human. I am sure that most loyal Canadians when they look at the flag will not wish to remember the method by which it was brought in, the ill conceived strategy and the bludgeon used to make sure they got it. But I am sure most people will not be able to dissociate these things from the flag when they look at it. It is the eleventh hour, but I suggest to the government that the damage is not yet fatal. It is still not too late for them to put this motion aside and think it over for a while.

There is an editorial in the Winnipeg *Tribune* which I think should be read by other editors across Canada. No matter what else

is done, all newspaper editors in this country should try to set the people straight on what the fight is about in this house. The question is not whether Canadians should get another flag. Nor is the question whether parliament should get on with other business, at least as far as the opposition is concerned. What is causing the unease and dissatisfaction in the public mind based on the oft repeated assertion that parliament is wasting its time because the opposition is filibustering? The point is that if you have a duty to fight what is wrong, you have a duty to keep on fighting.

If the government persists in a course of conduct which is wrong, it is difficult for me to understand why the newspapers have not told the simple truth over and over again. It is that the government has control over the order of business; the government can bring in any other business which it believes to have priority at any time it wishes to do so. If there has been a day wasted, or spent, in this house, as you choose to look at it, on the flag question it is because the government chose to spend or waste that day.

When I finally get a chance to get back to my constituency I intend to make it clear to my political supporters or foes that our so-called filibuster in this house did not take place just because our party leader wanted to retain the red ensign, or because people on this side of the house wanted to talk. I intend to take my full share of credit by saying I wanted that fight kept on because I refused to quit when I felt I was on the side of the right.

Mr. D. R. Gundlock (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, in rising this afternoon to participate in this debate and speak to the amendment, may I say how happy and proud I am to take part in the debate at this time. May I say too, Mr. Speaker, that I have enjoyed your guidance throughout the debate and I hope you may continue to occupy the chair for a few more hours.

With regard to the amendment to substitute the red ensign, as it is commonly called, for the single maple leaf flag, may I say that I realize the hon. member who moved the amendment, the hon. member for Middlesex West, did so sincerely and proudly as a last ditch stand, fighting for something he thought entirely right and for which many of us have fought in the days, weeks and months past. I think there may also have been in his mind, and in the minds of others in this chamber, the thought that there still might be a chance for a compromise to be made.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the reason I rise once again to speak in this debate. I know it is late, and in the face of closure our hours are numbered and our debate is limited. But I still think there is some hope for a compromise, and in this connection I should like to set out my reasons for thinking this is the case.

Much has been said throughout this debate, and many people have said there is nothing new to be said. I do not pretend that I have anything specifically new to offer, but in the course of my remarks I do wish to call attention to some aspects of the symbols we are discussing under this amendment. Speaking of symbols, this is a particular time of the year when we honour certain specific symbols; it is a time when we are particularly aware of certain symbols.

Today we are facing closure in this house, this having been brought on by the government. If I may wonder a little for a moment, the other day I heard the Prime Minister emphasize the fact that his entire cabinet approved of this step. I wondered at the time whether that was so, because only a few days earlier a representative segment of the press had this to say:

> Surely never again will the Prime Minister have quite the same confidence in them as he did before. The face of power, shown above, is now a partisan political face, far removed from any face that can speak for country above party.

I do not want to detail what has been said previously, but when speaking before about the red ensign I did say that when a government has the record this government has, surely the Canadian nation should not be made to accept a new flag by this means, albeit a distinctive flag which many of us have previously admitted we should like to see. To me, closure is not democratic.

As I said at the outset of my remarks, I should like to say something about emblems. Before this debate terminates, as I have said, it is still my hope that it is not too late to reach some compromise; but if not, when the time comes to haul down the flag of which so many of us have spoken and for which so many of us have fought, having received piles of correspondence from people in every area of the country, then will be the time to think of symbols.

As I said earlier, this is a certain time of the year when we are particularly prone to symbols. Some of us have wreaths on our doors. Nearly all of us embrace some symbol of this time of year, a tree or a cross. But do we forget that our so-called ties with

Britain go deeper than any symbols related to a specific country? I need not remind the members of this house or the Canadian public that the crosses on their flag are Christian symbols. So I emphasize that we should try once more to reach a compromise. Compromises have been reached before in democratic parliaments. I ask, where are those parliaments today, Mr. Speaker?

Some people have said that democracy cannot work in this way. In my opinion this is the way in which democracy must work or it cannot survive. That is what I meant a moment ago when I tried to point out that some countries in this world have forgotten about the past and even the present, and have looked only to the future, and as a result today they do not exist as autonomous bodies. I am not drawing any inferences in this regard, but I would ask the question whether, by destroying this present symbol, which is what we will do if this amendment is not accepted, we are sure we will not destroy our national unity.

If the procedure now suggested is carried forward by this house, will we be doing something to enhance national unity and the national economy? Frankly I seriously doubt that we will be doing that.

The Prime Minister is a man well noted for compromise and for his ability to settle contentious issues. Has he suddenly changed his method of operation? I followed his actions very closely when he was acting in the role of a statesman and mediator, and often commended him for the headway he was able to make. Why does the Prime Minister now, in spite of his enviable record for compromise, resort to this kind of action?

I have not been successful in finding one member in my constituency who is not willing to accept a truly distinctive national flag. I have not received one letter from an individual in Canada who is not willing to accept such a flag. Nor do I believe there is one member in this chamber who would seriously oppose the adoption of a distinctive Canadian national flag. Therefore, the only real question to be answered is, what shall be the distinctive Canadian national flag?

Many Indian people live in my constituency, and there are a great many others living in various other sections of this country. No one can refer to these people as other than truly Canadian. What do they think about the flag proposed at this eleventh hour? One need only talk to one or two in any section of the country to discover what they think about this flag. Without relating my remarks specifically to the union jack as being the commonwealth flag, or the flag of Britain, I must state that past Canadian emblems and symbols have a different meaning for Indian people—who possess a greater degree of sensibility than apparently some of us here in this house possess—than they have for the rest of us. The Indian people remember the solemn promises made at the time of the signing of treaties, and associate these symbols with an allegiance to the Queen, the great white mother. They hold the same feelings today, and one can well imagine what they will think about a government which, by force or by any other means, tears down these symbols and casts them aside. The government should give serious consideration to the thoughts of these Indian people about the flag they intend to tear down.

Some time ago I attempted to point out that the relationship between a national flag and the feelings of the Indian people is not something which can be associated with the commonwealth or with Britain itself, but is directly related to symbolic feelings and treaties. The crosses on the flag are not merely crosses or symbols of a country, but Christian crosses which many of us do not want to see removed and replaced by a mere symbol, and I refer to the maple leaf. One can well understand what the Indian people will think about this government and this parliament in its action to remove this flag as a symbol of allegiance and promise.

I hope someone will correct me if I am wrong and the record shows otherwise, but I believe on the very first day of this debate a proposition was put forward by the Leader of the Opposition, and repeated again several days ago as a last ditch stand, in favour of compromise. Before moving to bring down the symbols which mean so much to the people of this country, I urge the Prime Minister and the government to give serious thought to the results of that action.

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, on this historic occasion when we are debating an amendment to a motion concerning our flag it must be obvious to us all that we are under the pressure of closure. This puts a bad taste in our mouths which will remain for a considerable period of time. The Prime Minister, while speaking to this amendment now under discussion, said it was parliament's right to make a decision on this issue. I think his words were that this is an issue which the government and parliament

must decide. I should like to place clearly and unmistakably on the record our reaction to the government's procedure on this issue.

Politics involves the art of getting along, and the art of governing lies in the ability to bring together divergent groups. In this regard the Prime Minister and the government have failed the country. This issue has not been brought along in that way so that the people of Canada are united. We have all been aware of the various groups with various opinions which exist in this country, and we as a party have tried to give the right to every individual to have a voice on this issue. Having failed in that regard, by failing in our attempts to persuade the government to settle the issue by plebiscite, we commenced to move a series of amendments to the main motion in order that there may be some indication of the divergence of opinion on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that in the very early stages of this debate, in my own case on August 20 at a time when I knew there had been discussions at the leadership level as to the advisability of referring this matter to a committee of the house, four basic conditions to the sensible completion of the work of the committee were put foward. Those four issues were ignored and, as I suggested earlier during another stage of this debate, the members of that committee voted as party members. They did not make an effort to bring the main parties together, and that was a necessary ingredient to the compromise.

Now we have the amendment respecting the red ensign. The vote on the amendment will indicate to the house and to the country that there are a number of members of the house who are willing to vote for what has been our distinctive national flag for a good many years.

On that point I should like to say that a flag is meaningless until people have done something for that flag. I for one should like to give testimony to the fact that during the war I belonged to a group that did its best to make it stand out in the minds of people who were our allies and those who were our enemies that the red ensign was our distinctive flag. When I heard the Prime Minister say the other day that Canadian troops had not fought under that flag, or that he had never seen it, I wished he could have been where I was during the war.

In the latter part of the war I happened to serve with one of two Canadian squadrons in a group composed mainly of R.A.F. and American squadrons. I served under an American general, and when you are in a mixture of squadrons doing the same type of work one squadron matches itself against the others. Some of us had served with R.A.F. squadrons, but because of the great difficulty that there was among the Canadians, Australians, New Zealanders and people from the United Kingdom it was decided to pull out of the R.A.F. squadrons all crews containing a majority of Canadians. Thus two Canadian squadrons were formed in the summer of 1944 to serve in the close support work being done by the allies for the 14th army in Burma.

I think I am right in saying that it is tough to take orders from a sergeant at any time, but when you have to take orders from a sergeant who is of another nationality, whether he be British or American, I think members here can understand how resentful we felt and how glad we were to serve in a Canadian squadron. The essence of my little anecdote is that serving as we were in the same area, crowded on a small island with all squadrons working from the same base, naturally there was rivalry among us. If you look at the official squadron records for that theatre you will find that the average tonnage per month carried by squadrons doing this particular type of work was about 3,200 tons a month delivered on objective. During the same period of time the Canadian squadrons averaged over 5,000 tons a month. No American or British squadron came anywhere near what the Canadians were doing.

Why did the Canadians do so much under such great difficulties to demonstrate that they were the best in that particular group? We did so because we knew the Americans thought they were the best in the world and told everybody about it, and the R.A.F. thought they were the best in the world and kept quiet. The only way we could show we were the best was by doing the job. So we set a record of tonnage carried to objectives that no other squadron could match.

On each of our planes was the red ensign. There was also the official roundel with the maple leaf on it, but the red ensign was carried on our planes. When we returned from operational sorties we drew up our planes in the assembly area right opposite an operations tent flying the red ensign as well as the air force insignia outside the tent. As we completed these missions each of us knew we were demonstrating to our allies that the Canadians were an effective part of the war effort, and we were trying to earn

the right for Canadians to be recognized by their flag, the red ensign.

I have no apologies now for speaking in support of this amendment, because those of us who were emotionally involved in trying to demonstrate that this was our flag felt, when the then prime minister, Mr. Mackenzie King pointed to the red ensign at the end of the war and said to General Crerar "You have made that Canada's flag", that we had been a part of making it Canada's flag.

I could go on and talk of other things of a more personal nature. In our particular group we had no defence except high flying fighters, and our orders were to use camouflage on our aircraft. In spite of those orders the Canadian squadrons painted on the sides of their aircraft the maple leaf as well as the red ensign. We did so because, with a million and a half troops on the allied side engaged in a mighty struggle with the Japanese empire, when we flew low over the troops in that area they all knew, our allies as well as the enemy, that these were Canadians who were getting through to their objective.

I well recall an occasion when the troops were advancing south down the Salween river to Rangoon. The hard pressed tank troops were without supplies and short of all amenities. A Canadian plane flew in at low level with such mundane things as big bags filled with cigarettes, dumped them on the road behind the forward element and gave the troops the chance to smoke an American or Canadian cigarette for the first time in many months. I recall too a little box story on the front page of "SEAC", the southeast Asia command newspaper, saying "Thanks, Canada". The officer commanding the tank corps said "If you had flown 10 feet lower we would have thanked you personally".

We took our flag everywhere to let those people know that it was our flag. Some of us, possibly a minority, think we earned the right for Canadians to fly that distinctive national flag with pride. It seems rather odd to me that the minute the last amendment was moved the government decided on that day to apply closure. Did they not want a debate on the red ensign so that people across the country could be made aware of the testimony in favour of that flag? The government has given us little chance to put forward alternatives.

I should like to refer to an editorial that appeared in the *Globe and Mail* on September 11, 1964, dealing with the question of closure. At that time the house had decided to refer the flag question to a committee, and in approving this move the editorial stated in part:

> What is more important, any flag adopted under such circumstances—
>
> By closure.
>
> —would have been an object of contempt and scorn.

Today the same *Globe and Mail* says closure is all right. What is the significance of this? It simply means that this newspaper, with no sense of responsibility to minorities in Canada, said in September that to bring in a flag by closure would lead to contempt and scorn, and today says that closure is all right.

My mind goes back once again to an event that happened before you and I were in the house, Mr. Speaker. I refer to the use of closure in 1956, when closure was applied before debate occurred. What are people going to think? In their minds they are going to associate this new flag not only with closure as it will be applied tonight but with closure as it was applied in 1956. So I checked the debates of that time. One thing that came to light at that time was that United States companies were being asked by the government to come into Canada and finance a pipe line that should have been a Canadian undertaking of great pride. The house was told that it had to get the legislation through or construction could not start right away, and that Canadians could not possibly support such a huge undertaking. So these American entrepreneurs came into Canada and set up companies so they could buy Trans-Canada Pipe Line Company shares. If my memory serves me correctly they did not even obtain them at the opening market value of the stock, $10, but got them for $8 a share.

I hold in my hand today an offer to purchase shares of common stock of Canadian Delhi Oil Ltd., which is a subsidiary company of the Murchisons from Texas, one of this group of entrepreneurs who came in and convinced the government of that day that they and they alone could handle such a great undertaking, even though when some shares were put on the market in Canada the issues were oversubscribed seven to ten times. Here, under date of November 25, 1964 is an offer to purchase which will remain open until the close of business on January 8, 1965. At this very moment this company is prepared to strip these Trans-Canada shares from its set-up and sell the balance of the company back to another

United States company. They will now be selling for more than $40 those shares which they bought for $8 because this government applied closure. This will mean that for those shares for which they paid $3.5 million they will now receive $35 million.

At the moment I cannot help but get the taste in my mouth of this graft ridden government, not being aware that it is graft ridden, coming in and applying closure on a subject like this; particularly on a day when, as everyone knows, we are honouring the eighth anniversary of the selection of the leader of the Conservative party who fought closure in 1956.

It is not only my mind that comes to this conclusion. On the editorial page of this morning's *Globe and Mail* there is an article by Mr. Scott Young, who tells a very interesting story. This story concerns cabinet ministers who had not previously considered hara-kiri, and asks them to consider it now. What does he say about this search for a flag? He says it has caused us to lose face in Japan, and I quote:

> Partly this is because we have such plausible cabinet ministers (some days). Recent ministerial meetings between Japanese and Canadians left the Japanese with the firm conviction that what Paul-san Martin and Walter-san Gordon want, they get. So when their leader, Lester-san Bowles-san (Mike-san) Pearson said in Winnipeg last spring that he had an idea for a flag, factory whistles blew shrilly and Japan rushed to get in on the ground, or even basement, floor. They didn't make only those little auto-aerial flags, but mighty silk and nylon flags built to last as long as winds blew over the barren lands.
>
> I learned this the other evening when Mr. Gordon and I happened to be sitting across a dinner table from one another at Massey College. He thus was absent from a night sitting in the Commons during which the flag debate was in progress. I asked if he were not afraid of missing something that he had not heard before. When he recovered from this preposterous suggestion, he said affably that he personally was having more trouble with the Japanese over our flag than he was with the Commons. The sad story came out.

Here is a report in a newspaper in our country ridiculing this flag as an effort to increase trade with Japan. Some of the members of the house, including members of cabinet, rushed out ond bought these flags. I heard that they were on sale in cities like Vancouver and Toronto for $1 each. They took thousands of suckers and high pressured them into buying this three maple leaf flag. Now they say, by closure, they are not going to get the three maple leaf flag; they are not even going to get a vote. We are going to be forced to take the single maple leaf flag.

This whole question of a flag—I have to watch my time for obvious reasons—brings me to some statements I have kept in my files for a long time. This one is from the Victoria *Daily Colonist* of August 8, 1964, almost five months ago:

> The assumption is that the Commons will then recess—

This is after we had passed interim supply for three months instead of two at our suggestion.

> —and prepare for a new session. That is, once Mr. Pearson has rammed his new flag into the statute books. He acts like a schoolmaster who won't let his form go home until it bows to his wishes.
>
> In the present impasse that hamstrings parliament and sees it sitting through the hot months of an eastern summer the Prime Minister displays the petulence so often associated with persons of weak character. He seems to imagine that a show of authority is an indication of strength, even when a diplomatic way out of dilemma is offered him.

We offered the Prime Minister an honourable, diplomatic way to bring this matter to a successful conclusion. We would have liked to get a vote of the house on this red ensign, and we will. We would have liked other votes which would have indicated to the house that there were other suggestions by way of compromise that we think might have united the whole house, if not the whole country. However, on this very important matter we are forced to our knees by a closure vote that applies tonight. I should like to suggest to members opposite that by so doing not only have they tied themselves up with the closure imposed in 1956 but have tied themselves up with the type of action in parliament that shall ever disgrace the name of modern Liberalism.

Closure is a device that has been used in Canada several times already, but as Laurier protested and as the Leader of the Opposition protested, it was something that no government should ever use in the future. As one hon. member said when he was in opposition, it would not be used by a government that did not lose its senses. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this government has lost its senses when it imposes such a doubtful type of regulation as closure on us on such an important matter.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): I do not believe there is a better example of the condemnation of the government's attitude toward the issue that is before the house than the fact that in order for the government to secure the approval it knew parliament

would give for one reason or another, whether the country as a whole was in accord with the majority view within the house, we are now debating for the last time in this parliament what our national flag should be.

It is indeed significant that at the moment we have a choice between two alternatives, a maple leaf flag that could well take on significance in the future if our nation continues to prosper and expand, and a flag that is more representative of our past than any other symbol in our nation, the Canadian red ensign. It is indeed unfortunate that we must face the fact that we are going to have to agree with the majority vote in the House of Commons as to what our nation's flag will be, without knowing with certainty the opinion of the majority of our people. Surely, sir, this is the crux of the whole matter, the fact that this government was willing to put this question forward last April or May without determining with any degree of certainty what were the views of the Canadian people with regard to our national flag.

If, as the hon. member for Qu'Appelle pointed out, the government had moved in the same direction as the government of the late Right Hon. Mackenzie King did in 1945, it would have endeavoured to produce a flag by determining in a non-partisan way what the people of Canada felt the flag design should be. Had it done that we would not have seen the House of Commons become a debating society on symbols at a time when it should have been taking action that would be of material benefit to our citizens in the many areas where the government promised action would be taken.

Instead of that we saw an ill conceived, poorly handled flag design placed before the house, a design that later went into the trash can where it belonged because of the method used by the government in endeavouring to inflict it upon the Canadian people without giving them any choice in the matter. Today we are almost back where we started. We have a flag which the government embraces wholeheartedly, although there is one unique member in the Liberal party, and we still have a flag which has flown over this nation for 97 years. After almost six months of debate we are told we must now make the same decision the government asked us to make originally, without any real change in the attitude of hon. members because they are no better prepared today to speak with certainty on the views of the Canadian people than they were six months ago.

[Mr. Coates.]

When 1 a.m. on Tuesday morning comes, when the guillotine falls, when the words stop and the votes are taken, will any of us be any more certain than we were last April of what the Canadian people want in the way of a flag design? Since last April many polls have been taken. Most of them told us what the people did not want, but few of them told us what the people did want.

You may talk to an individual who will say "I think we should have a distinctive Canadian flag." But when you show him the three maple leaf design, or the present design which was agreed upon by a majority of members in the flag committee, he will say "Oh, no. I don't like those flags. I don't think that is the type of flag we should have for Canada." He does not know what he wants, but I say without fear of contradiction that there is a large majority in this nation who do not want the flag design that is now being proposed by the government. There is also a substantial group, indeed I would say the largest group, who know what they want, and what they want is the Canadian red ensign. They want no other flag, although I have always found those people quite willing either to abide by the wishes of a majority as shown in a plebiscite or to accept an alternative flag embodying the symbols of our past, the symbols of the founding races and of the contributions they made to the building of this nation.

More than anything else the problem we face in parliament today, and the problem we have faced during the six months this question has been before the Canadian people, is a problem of mishandling and mismanagement in the way this matter was placed before the country, the absolute and unbelievable carelessness of the government in endeavouring to give the people the impression that it is decisive at least on the flag issue, if on nothing else.

Members of the government have finally made a decision to bring in closure, and what a grand decision that is. I can think of nothing worse; I can think of nothing more undemocratic than to tell the Canadian people they are going to have a flag, born of division, flying from the flagpoles of this nation; for certainly when the vote is taken tonight there will be division and that division will be as indicative of the nation as it is of the House of Commons.

What will they have after the vote is taken? If the other house is kind and considerate—something the upper house in South Africa

was not—they will have a flag that is as colourless, as nondescript as any flag produced by any of the emerging nations in the world in which we live. They say the maple leaf is an emblem of the nation, and with that I have no argument. As I said earlier, it may come to mean something in the future; but for a nation 97 years of age it is a sad looking flag, produced by a sad looking government for a sad looking people, for that is certainly what they will be tomorrow morning.

The flag design, Mr. Speaker, is typical of the picture this government has produced ever since it took office. One can well understand why members opposite finally embraced it and agreed, with one exception, that it should be the flag which will fly over our nation. I think we should have been better off as a parliament and as a nation if the government had moved to set aside the whole question. Surely no one will get excited about the design now in question, and I consider there will always be a segment in this nation which will feel that the flag design chosen by the government should be replaced whenever the government is replaced. I cannot feel that any future government will find many arguments to use in opposition to the view held by many people in this country that some action should be taken to determine what the Canadian people as a whole believe should be involved in any flag which is to represent a nation which in 1967 will be celebrating its one hundredth birthday.

I regret more than anything else that a decision was made last April to move in this direction. It was known by the government that they would receive a measure of support from the province of Quebec for a flag design of this type, support which would not be available in any other part of Canada. One would have thought that in the light of other developments which are occurring and which have been occurring in the past few years hon. gentlemen opposite would have been forewarned about the type of animosity which would be created and developed by moving in this direction. It would have been more sensible to have decided that in the interests of national unity it would be better not to plant seeds of doubt in the minds of people in other parts of Canada. They should not have risked doing something which Canadians in other provinces might describe as nothing more than a concession.

I do not think the people of Quebec have much interest in whether we should have a maple leaf flag or whether the red ensign should continue to fly from the flagpoles of this nation, so long as there is a government in Ottawa which is making an effort to solve some of the serious economic problems which face that province. It would have been much more sensible to have sought solutions to these economic problems before trying to find new symbols for this nation.

Mr. Laniel: We are doing both.

Mr. Coates: You are not doing both, and the hon. member knows it. It is all very well for him to say the government is doing both, but let him tell me about one piece of legislation which has been presented to this house and which has reached any degree of finality in the last six months to deal with the problems of agriculture in his own province of Quebec. His problems are the same as those of the maritime provinces and of the area which I represent. They are problems of economics, not of symbols. We should seek solutions to these questions before getting into a fight over what the symbols of this nation should be or should not be. These are things we could all face together; we could deal with them in a united way. This is what we should have been considering and attacking since April instead of discussing maple leaves or other symbols.

When one o'clock tomorrow morning comes we shall still be faced with the same economic problems that face us today. There will be no divergence of opinion as far as they are concerned. Instead, I must resume my seat, I suppose, and see the red ensign come down—a flag which represents much of our past history—to be replaced by a maple leaf flag which may represent a great deal for the future but which represents absolutely nothing to me or to anybody else living in this nation today.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will not rule me out of order if in my introductory remarks tonight I mention something which I know you will endorse. Eight years ago tonight the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) was made leader of this party. Prior to that time, as a young and struggling lawyer in Saskatchewan—I was living in Saskatchewan

then—I got to know the Leader of the Opposition very well. I am certain that his greatest contemporaries and also, if I might put these words in fine print, his political enemies will agree with me that since his election to the House of Commons in 1940 he has dedicated himself to public life, and that at no time, no matter what the issue, has he ever lacked courage.

It is strange that on this occasion he had to rise on a point of personal privilege in connection with some remarks which were made in a certain newspaper. I suppose when analysing the life of a leader of a party who takes upon himself responsibility regarding issues which may arise you can never assess his worth until history assesses it. One has only to read the life stories of past presidents of the United States, past prime ministers of Canada and past prime ministers of Great Britain to appreciate that history always places things in their proper perspective. I think that when history does record the facts with reference to our leader, who brought this party from 39 or 40 seats up to 116 and then to 208, and who now leads an opposition with 94 or 95 seats, it will prove not only that he served his party well but that he also served his country well. I have no hesitation in saying that on this particular issue tonight he makes no apology, and should make no apology, for the fight he has put up.

The newspapers have reported that at times there have been divisions among us. As one hon. member said, I think the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Kindt), thank goodness—actually I think his language was a little stronger than mine—the members of this party speak their mind, vote as they see the issue and stand and fall as they see the issue. We have never disciplined our thinking, because where everyone thinks alike there is no thinking.

Mr. Grégoire: Who said that?

Mr. Woolliams: I hear our little member who was recently hung up on a hook in a Conservative member's office. I hope he will give me a better hearing tonight than he gave the Leader of the Opposition, who after all is an officer of this house. I understand the hon. member was hung up for about 20 minutes.

Mr. Grégoire: When?

Mr. Woolliams: This is a most serious occasion, because at some time between now and 1 a.m., or after 1 a.m., a very important decision is going to be made.

I for one, as a Conservative, make no apology for the stand this party has taken or for the stand I personally have taken on this issue. I am from the city of Calgary, which is known for its friendliness, and I hope that, whatever remarks have been made in the early days of the debate or over the last ten days, we will rise to the occasion as Canadians and be friends. In this debate each one of us was seriously expressing his opinion as he saw the issue. Sometimes one gets a little too serious on occasions like this; but men in difficult circumstances, far more difficult than the situation we are in on the flag issue, have risen and set aside propaganda—and we have had a lot of that—and set aside their emotions and have been friends.

I have only to read some words of Havelock Ellis to make this point. He described the situation in the first war, in 1916 or 1917, I am not sure of the exact year, when—

Mr. Grégoire: You were not here then.

Mr. Woolliams: I was born in 1916. I hear our little choir practitioner interrupting again, and he will filibuster anything because he has no respect for this place or for the dignity of parliament. Before I quote Havelock Ellis I should like to say this. When one hon. member said he would like to retain his British traditions—I am one of them and I make no apology for that—the hon. member then scoffed and sneered. I would ask him to bear with us for once.

Mr. Starr: We have been bearing with him long enough.

Mr. Woolliams: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, in no man's land in those days there were the allies on the one side and the Germans on the other, and they were so close that at this time of year they heard each other singing carols and they joined together in the singing of those carols. This is what Havelock Ellis said in this regard:

> So we see, too, how simply the end of fighting might be reached. We have but to bring men together as human beings, either in imagination or in reality, and they are prepared to violate all the abstract principles of patriotism and war, to break any rule of discipline, rather than kill one another. We see it is not much to ask. It has been achieved on a single Christmas eve in men whose hatred of each other had been artificially excited to the highest pitch. Is it too much to expect that one day this process will be extended on the world's fighting line until so many men have had to be moved that there will be none left to replace them?

And so, Mr. Speaker, in that tone set by Havelock Ellis and under these difficult circumstances, I ask the government to bear with us tonight in the remarks we may make and the words we utter, even though they may hurt and even though they may penetrate the consciences of hon. members opposite. I would draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that in the only speech I made on this subject there were 22 interruptions in 35 minutes, and some of those interruptions lasted for two or three minutes. So as I say, I would ask them to bear with us and listen to the remarks which will be made before morning or whenever the vote is taken. As the saying is, "Lend me your ears".

After all, we are a real democracy. We heard a member of our party express today a view absolutely contrary to some of the views I will be expressing tonight. He has an absolute right to do that as a member of this party, and so have I the right to express my views. But I would say to him and to all those who share his views that when our views differ let them be as tolerant of, and as patient with, our views as we were with his. We listened to him seriously and we have listened to the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite seriously.

After all, as Myrtle Cook Jackson said recently:

> Democracy, guard well your sacred strength;
> Through blood and tears this priceless gift was born—
> This miracle, which brave men used at length
> To shape a crown for freedom none may scorn.

When we can bear with each other's ideas then we are being tolerant and giving each other a fair hearing.

I speak tonight and say this to parliament, at a time when the government has implemented once again a rule, which is still a rule of this house—closure—that I oppose this measure at this time, and I cannot endorse the attitude of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) who was the only minister of the crown who really spoke on this issue, the only minister of the crown who got off his love seat and stated his position, only to say that we are going to do so and so during this debate, and that if we do not do that there will be a general election or an implementation of closure. I may say that as far as I am concerned, as a Conservative, I fear neither.

I do not believe however that I could honestly have stood in my place today, as a minister of the crown and a long time member of this house, had I made the statement made by one minister on March 26, 1962, and voted for closure without having first made some reasonable explanation of my actions. That minister made a statement in 1962 at a time when we were considering the abolition of the closure rule. This is what that minister said then:

> I believe that no government in its senses—

I like that expression, "in its senses".

> —would ever again use the existing closure rule in our book.

The man who made that statement voted today for closure without giving any explanation or reason for changing his point of view. I suggest his reason is that he wanted to follow the discipline of the Liberal party, or did so perhaps for political expediency. The minister who made that statement is the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), speaking at that time as Mr. Pickersgill, as reported at page 2165 of *Hansard* of March 26, 1962. These are his words:

> I do not wish to be a purist.

No one expected him to be a purist.

> If I had been drafting such a motion I am not sure that the precise word I would have used would have been "desirability". However, that is an unimportant matter. I agree with the Prime Minister.

The prime minister at that time happened to be Mr. Diefenbaker:

> He may be surprised to find my saying this without any qualification—

I emphasize that statement, without any qualification or reservation; yet today without any explanation he stood in his place and voted against that espoused principle.

> —and I have no more desire or intention than he seemed to have to relive the past or to try to rewrite it or do anything of that sort—that, having regard to what has happened, I believe that no government in its senses would ever again use the existing closure rule in our book. I therefore do not see any sense in leaving it there.

And to use the minister's words, no government in its true senses should implement the rule of closure. Let those words be the minister's own sword, and let that sword be used at the minister's own hara-kiri, because this government has no sense of responsibility.

There are other matters I could mention, but because of the rules of debate I am not allowed to do so. However under other circumstances and under a different leader, ministers of the government party might well have resigned their positions. I am sure they might have had a sense of responsibility

and known that it was proper for them to quit. I am sure they might have known what was the decent thing to do in view of their responsibilities. However, they still sit in their places.

We had an experience in Alberta of this kind of Liberalism, involving two individuals. I make no apologies for giving their names. I suggest these examples are equivalent to the situation which has developed because of the statement made by that minister in 1962 and his action in voting for closure today. Because he still sits in his seat I must come to the conclusion that he has not measured up to his responsibility or his integrity.

The two Liberals in Alberta placed themselves in a similar position. One was a mayor of the city of Calgary, Don MacKay. As a result of his actions a judicial inquiry was held, and at the conclusion of that inquiry he moved to Phoenix, Arizona. The other one was a Mr. Hawrelak, who was re-elected as mayor but was involved in a scandal.

It seems strange to me that when dealing with responsibilities of debate and responsibilities for closure we should have a situation today where ministers of the crown, having been involved in this kind of scandal, are still sitting in their places and taking the position they take as far as this issue is concerned, voting for closure without having given any explanation.

The only minister of the crown who has made a statement is the Prime Minister, and he has accused us of making a great number of speeches, filibustering and prolonging the debate. On the other hand, during the same week he wrote a letter setting out certain basic principles of conduct which his ministers should follow, warning them like school boys to be honest. Our democracy has really reached a sorry position when the leader of the government and the Prime Minister of this country must warn his ministers to be honest.

While dealing with closure I should like to say this. There is a great deal of difference between implementing closure during the debate on a legislative matter and implementing closure on an issue such as the flag question, because legislation can be passed and repealed, but when dealing with traditions and past history we are dealing with the past, present and future which, taken together, provide us with our emblematic symbols, and we cannot repeal any action we take in this way. We cannot unfurl a new flag every day, or every parliament.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

The most cutting words of the Prime Minister in this regard were the words he used when he referred to people pointing out the fact that there might be some prejudice as far as the province of Quebec was concerned. I ask the Prime Minister, as I stand in my place tonight, outside of that province of Quebec —and the people there have an absolute right to believe whatever they wish to believe— what province of the remaining nine has a majority of people who would say that we want as a national flag any flag that does not have on it the union jack? Therein lines the question regarding whether this is a majority opinion.

Parliament has not always been right in its decisions. On one occasion an imperial parliament legislated the union of Ireland, but that union never took place because the majority did not favour such a union. I suggest that the government has a responsibility to explain its position to the people of Canada. They must prove to the majority of the population of this nation that they believe honestly that they have a mandate to change the flag of this nation. It is for that reason that we have carried on this fight in parliament on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, we have at all times been prepared to give a little. We have at all times been prepared to compromise and listen to what those with other beliefs have to say, but I ask this question of those people who have accused us of presenting the kind of arguments that are contemptible, and accused us of filibustering: When is it wrong to differ in opinion? I repeat that when all think alike there is no thinking at all and the moment we get to that stage there is no parliament, no democracy.

An hon. Member: There was a filibuster.

Mr. Woolliams: Somebody says "filibuster". As it came from the Liberal ranks I only have to remind him to read and live the pages of history in 1962 and 1963 when many times the word "closure" was mentioned because of the long debates and the filibustering that took place on that occasion. It was right for the Liberals then to oppose closure because they claimed they stood on principle, but now they wish to use closure to shove this flag down our throats. I say that the manner in which closure has been brought in shows contempt and arrogance. It is nothing short of dictatorship to bring in closure in this fashion.

Mr. Grégoire: Dispense.

Mr. Woolliams: My little friend says "dispense". I say to him that if parliament dispenses with him it is one "dispense" with which we will certainly all agree. I made reference to the letter the Prime Minister had written. I would ask this question, because we have not had questions for a number of days. Many of us can hear the wheels grinding now somewhere in Canada or maybe in another nation—Mr. Scott of the *Globe and Mail* had something to say about this—producing the hemp or silk for the new flag. The Liberals are so arrogant and so indifferent that they are going to ram the new flag down the throats of the Canadian people and somewhere, either in Canada or elsewhere, these flags are being manufactured to fly over the buildings of this country, if they can get it through the institutions of parliament.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Mr. D. V. Pugh (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, closure has been brought in and may I say at the outset that in a debate such as this closure should never have been applied. There is no place in the House of Commons for closure on a subject such as the flag, a subject that touches the hearts of each and every member of the House of Commons as well as the hearts of each and every citizen throughout Canada. The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) said during the debate that he wanted the flag question decided after full and free debate. That statement and the statement made by the ex-leader of the house over there just do not jibe. In other words, if you are going to have full and free debate you do not cut it off and there is no reason why the flag debate should have been cut off.

Let me make a couple of points. First of all, with regard to the cutting off of the debate I say without fear of contradiction that we have had 10 days of debate, with today being the 11th, on one flag and one flag only. No one can deny that. The house has had a preoccupation with the flag since last spring which lasted all through the summer. This preoccupation has plagued the people of Canada and has driven them to the point where they feel that no work is being done in the House of Commons. In many respects I am inclined to agree with them but I do not agree as to the cause. Many in the house as well as outside have said that the cause is obstruction. I say to them once again that nothing is further from the truth because the cause is not obstruction. The cause is the failure of the government to bring forward the business of the house in an orderly manner.

I have used the word "preoccupation" and I will emphasize that point as I continue my speech because it is the Liberal preoccupation with the flag which has strangled all reasonable and orderly conduct of the business of the house. Without going into too much detail I ask them this straight question. What business of the house has been obstructed? The answer, of course, is none. They refer to the pension plan and say that we have to clean that up and get rid of it. They name another dozen very small items and a few major ones like the labour legislation and they say that this is the business of the house which is being held up. Nothing is further from the truth, Mr. Speaker. The business or the house has been held up purely and simply because the Liberal government in office today has not seen fit to bring forward their legislation.

Why have they not seen fit to bring forward their legislation? They have tried time and again to bring bits and pieces of legislation before the house. I would mention the pension plan again. Last November, over a year ago, the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) stood up on her two feet and said: "This is it; we are bringing it in now". What happened? They had to revamp it, just like they have had to revamp a lot of their other legislation. Then they made another false start. But when they start something do they keep at it? From the point of view of the orderly conduct of the business of the house they could keep at it if they wished to do so if they did not have this preoccupation with the flag. But do they carry on? No, they do not. I will tell you why they do not carry on. It is not because of their preoccupation with the flag but because of the fact that their legislation has been downright lousy from the beginning and subject to withdrawal all along the line. Nobody in the house can deny that from their very first budget this has been true.

So far as preoccupation with the flag is concerned, there is talk about spending a lot of time on it and not getting on with the business of the house, but the simple fact of the matter is that we members, who normally should be back in our constituencies finding out the views of our constituents, were kept here for part of June, all of July and August and part of September for the flag debate and a few other little things. This is the longest session of parliament on record now, Mr. Speaker. We

started in February and we went through March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November and into December. We have been here 10 months. Do not let anybody say that the flag has kept us here that long.

What legislation has the government brought forward? I will hand it to them for a few bits and pieces but, believe me, when I am handing it to them I will at the same time ask any Liberal member or anybody else in Canada to compare, month by month, year by year and session by session, the legislation they have brought in with that introduced by the last Conservative government which had the best record in this regard in history. At this stage of the game the Minister of Transport is reading his newspaper—I am sorry, it is the house leader. The Minister of Transport is not here. Last Friday the house leader rose in righteous indignation and said that circumstances were such that closure was warranted and necessary. Well, I am not so sure. He said it was necessary because we were making a mockery of parliament. I would not comment on his interruptions, because they were not worth much. In fact, I recall when I was making a speech he got up and interrupted, then he apologized and said he did not know what was going on. It was a lousy interruption I might tell you, Mr. Speaker.

He is the house leader and I say say to him this: You, sir, know what the orderly business of this house is and should be; you have not one, single solitary answer because it is within your jurisdiction to demand of the government that they will bring before this house business which is essential to the consideration of legislation that is necssary for the well being of Canada. I say to the house leader that it was his duty. I know he is a man of integrity. I cannot understand why he sits there and has to take a waffling position, why he just shrugs his shoulders and indicates that the whole ruddy troop of ministers have not got legislation ready to put before the house. Therefore, ladies and gentlemen—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pugh: There are still some in the house, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, let us not hear any more of these rather stupid Liberal charges that have no meaning to the effect we are holding up the business of the house. It is not true.

Mr. Grégoire: Then sit down.

[Mr. Pugh.]

Mr. Pugh: I should like to refer to the preoccupation with the flag. I am glad to see that little man back in his seat; I missed him. He is the best interrupter in the house.

Mr. Grégoire: I did not say a word.

Mr. Pugh: He says that he did not say a word; that is what I like about him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the preoccupation with the flag. I know I am on solid ground here because this government has been preoccupied with the flag, preoccupied with a false mandate and they have been preoccupied all down the line, when they should have been considering legislation which is so necessary and important to our dominion. They are the ones who are responsible and they should have seen that legislation was brought forward. There has been this preoccupation, and now closure. May I just button up that one thing? There is no question about it. We are on our eleventh day of consideration of this flag. The time we have spent heretofore on the flag, and this no one can deny at all, we have spent on a flag that was produced by the Liberal government or the leader of that government. Now, it has been tossed in the ash can.

I am not making any disclosures when I say that all the Liberal members of the flag committee voted against this three maple leaf design and indicated their preference between the two flags. I know what I am talking about because I was a member of that flag committee. The Liberals were preoccupied with that flag which divided the feelings of the people of Canada, the feelings of members of parliament, and all that time which was used up was used up on a flag which the Liberals have now tossed aside. All during the summer, they said, you will take this or leave it; if you do not take it, we will have an election; if it is turned down, we will have an election. Where is that flag today? It is not here with us. I want to say again that all these charges of holding up the business of the house, of obstructing, of filibustering, all those charges which were made up until ten days ago, were made on a flag which even the Liberals were glad to get rid of.

Were we filibustering when we talked against that flag in this House of Commons? I think the facts have proven that the answer to the question is, no. What we said at that time was right. For the benefit of other parties who might be interested, I should say that every party voted against that flag. Where, then, is this holding up of the business

of the house? All we were debating was a flag, the creature of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and his cabinet; it had no status whatever and has been proven to have been just another bit of dishcloth. I believe it was on Friday that the Prime Minister told us they were not going to bring forward this flag. I say to you, was there a filibuster? The answer is no. How can we have closure at this time on the motion to adopt a flag design about which we have been talking for only ten days?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pugh: Hon. members across the way laugh. Well, I should like to mention something else since they are so happy. I am just wondering whether or not instead of closure there should not be disclosure in this debate. When I listened to that happy woman speaking today who comes from Winnipeg South (Mrs. Konantz), I heard her say that everything in the flag committee was wonderful. I have forgotten her exact words, but she indicated everything was rosy and she said that there was no partisanship. I have never heard so much baloney in my life, and any member of that committee will know what I am talking about. She made a nice speech. She talked about history. She said that in her view we should have one history in Canada. I will agree with that. My questioning during the meetings of the flag committee was directed toward that. She said that the people of Canada were ignorant about history, and so were many members of parliament.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will go a long way toward agreeing with that and I believe that every member of the flag committee, including the Créditistes, said the same thing. We should have had a study of this. Today we are talking about national unity. I say this, that no flag is going to produce national unity. I say that a study of history from each other's point of view—I am talking about French Canada and the rest of Canada—might well produce unity because from education and study comes understanding. This is what we lack in Canada today. How I should like to see some of these Liberal members get up and make a speech telling us precisely what is going on.

An hon. Member: They are not allowed to do that.

Mr. Pugh: They are not allowed to that. I must say I was extremely happy to hear the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) get up and talk, and talk with a purpose. I recommend that speech to every Liberal member in the house. I urge them to search their consciences because I am amazed when I see hon. members opposite who have not spoken, hon. members from ridings with which I am familiar.

I have a paper here in my hand which was written by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Francis). It is called, "Report from parliament hill," and some of the things which have crept into it are funny. In it he says that he has not spoken in the flag debate in the house and does not intend to do so. Why did he not speak? People on this side have stood up on principle and talked about our flag, our present Canadian flag. We have fought not only for that flag but also for a modification of it.

I am not giving away any secrets when I say that I myself moved a motion in the flag committee that, in addition to its present symbols it should contain the maple leaf. The Conservative members were quite prepared to go along with that. We are not strictly Canadian red ensign, but to return to the paper written by the hon. member for Carleton, he says that one member of the Liberal party has gone so far that it is hard to see how he can stay within the party. My goodness, is that your view over there? How many other Liberal members say, "He spoke against the party, therefore drum him out"?

I am amazed that hon. members opposite approve closure being introduced just because they have been too darned well afraid to get up on their feet and say what their constituents want them to say. They sit there with grins on their faces and say nothing. This is what the hon. member for Carleton says at the end of his report:

> Frankly, I believe the country is sick and tired of the whole affair. Parliament should settle the issue and its members can then answer for what they have done to the people at the next election—

Are they going to adopt a flag and then answer for it at the next election? Why do they not give the people an opportunity to decide first whether they want our present flag changed and, second, what new design they would like to have?

I have a great many more things to say but I think I have used almost my whole time.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent, Ont.): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity tonight to

support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Middlesex West (Mr. Thomas)—

Mr. Woolliams: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the dignity of this place certain hon. members may not want debate but sometime between now and 1 a.m. they are going to have a vote, and surely members from this party should receive a hearing. Surely what is taking place in the house is improper and I ask you, as Speaker, to bring the house to order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: About the point of order, I would say that no Conservative member can complain that he has not been heard, because the hon. member who now has the floor will set the unbelievable record of speaking six times on the same matter. On the contrary, everyone should congratulate that hon. member (Mr. Danforth) on that feat, namely that of speaking six times on the same matter.

[*Text*]

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Speaker, just as I opened my address there was placed on my desk a little hat with a red maple leaf on it. Knowing the size of some of the heads in the house it is not hard to guess where it came from.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Danforth: This is a deeply emotional issue and I do not intend to let a desire for newspaper headlines stop me from saying what I wish to say tonight. As I stated at the outset, I am supporting the amendment moved by the hon. member for Middlesex West because I want recorded on *Hansard* the names of those hon. members who are so eager to haul down the red ensign.

This debate has been ridiculed over and over again by all means of communication in this country, but history will tell the value of it, and I suspect it will go down in history as one of the great debates. I am proud to be recorded as having spoken four times, as honestly and sincerely as I can, representing my riding on a matter of principle, rather than going down on the record as being responsible for catcalls, jeers, interruptions and objections such as we have been subjected to over a thousand times in the last ten days.

The history of this flag will go down in headlines, and I would like to repeat some of them, "The flag by July," "The Canadian flag by the Queen's visit," "The flag by Christmas," and now, "The flag by closure." I am sure hon. members opposite can be proud of their record.

An hon. Member: Yes, we are.

Mr. Woolliams: Oh, go back and be an undertaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Monteith: Well, stop them.

Mr. Speaker: There is very little time left in this debate and I mean to ensure that each one has the proper opportunity of expressing his or her true sentiments.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Speaker, I am being accused of repetition. I ask you, is it wrong, where our country is concerned, to keep asking for reason? Is it wrong to keep asking for fairness? Is it wrong to keep asking for justice? Is it wrong to keep asking for an end to the project that is spreading disunity from coast to coast? No, Mr. Speaker, it is not wrong. This is not repetition. This should be the aim and object of all members of the house, not just those in the Conservative party.

Mr. Caouette: It is wrong to have no reason.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Speaker, I hear the interjection, it is wrong to have no reason, and I sympathize with the hon. member.

Mr. Caouette: To have to sit with you.

Mr. Danforth: The other day the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) rose in his place and put forward the aims, objectives and views of the government with respect to this very important matter. We had been asking him for days to do so, and we are still asking hon. members on the front benches opposite to do that very thing. The Prime Minister said he was speaking for all members of his cabinet in putting forward his views. Here was a golden opportunity for the leader of this great country to propose a plan, to put forward a compromise, to take action in a manner which would bring credit to a great statesman. Instead of seizing this golden opportunity, however, he delved into party politics to such an extent that he tried to place the blame for this political holocaust on the Conservative party.

Why could he not have left this entire measure out of partisan politics? Why did he embark on a course which plunged this country into political division? Why did he have to use our flag as barter on a partisan party platform? This is why we are in trouble today. It is sheer hypocrisy in my mind to

say this flag will bring national unity. How can it do so when there is division in this house as well as across Canada? We have been criticized for the fight we have put up in this chamber for the Canadian red ensign. If we do have a new flag let us hope that the government will be prepared to put up as much of a fight for that flag if the need should ever arise. The Prime Minister asked the opposition to join with the Liberals in putting up this glorious new flag which will mean the unity of Canada. I want to join wholeheartedly with my hon. friend from the Northwest Territories (Mr. Rhéaume) who said this afternoon that he would take no part in hauling down the red ensign. I will have no part in taking down Canada's flag. We are told we cannot have a plebiscite —that the people cannot make their wishes known. We must accept this position. This has been decided by the House of Commons. And now we have closure, so that the opposition cannot make its wishes known. Is it not a sad day indeed in Canada's history when we must have disunity in the country as a price for one man's desire for a new flag before Christmas? What a mockery of Canadian justice.

I have been criticized because I have dared to stand up and speak for the fourth time on this question. Would that I had the opportunity to speak four more times until this parliament returns to reason and sanity and allows the Canadian people to decide what flag they wish to have in the future. I am proud to be a member of a party which feels the Canadian people have the right to make Canadian decisions where the emotions of every single Canadian are involved. This is what we are fighting for, not a piece of cloth. The people of Canada will be asked to salute the flag on that flagpole and surely they should have the right to choose the flag they should salute. This is not a state; it is a democracy. We have tried, and we are continuing to try, to resolve this question in the best possible way. We have offered to compromise. From time to time we pointed out avenues along which the government could approach this question in a logical way. Instead members opposite approached this question from a partisan point of view. It was they who interjected this question into the business of the country, not us. It was they who gave it priority in the list of business to be completed by this house, not us. It was they who imposed closure, not us. Now they expect us meekly to submit to their will. We cannot do this. Representing the people I do, I cannot accept these measures without fighting to the extent of my ability.

This is not a matter to be treated with the levity which we have witnessed. This involves the Canadian flag, and in my estimation the decision of this parliament will be final. Surely no other government in the future would dare to interject a flag question again into the work of a Canadian parliament. This is why the issue before us is so serious. This is why we must be so right in our decisions and deliberations. This is why we must be sure that what we are doing is right. I feel the government is making one of the biggest blunders any government could make because I believe that instead of unity it is actively promoting disunity in this country, as never before.

Mr. Speaker, the people will know who is responsible. It is not us: It is the government which brought this measure into being.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): In the closing hours of this debate I intend to speak only briefly because I believe there has been too much talk already. The attitude of the public as I sense it in my travels across the country and through my correspondence is simply that most people are fed up with this subject.

Whether we agree or do not agree with the method being used to close off this debate; whether we agree or do not agree with the report of the flag committee on which we shall be voting tonight, the simple fact remains that nothing positive will be gained from a continuation of this debate. There is no place in the life of our country at this time for any further rocking of the boat. After some 260 speeches in the House of Commons, most of them from members of the Conservative opposition, any further debate on this flag issue would be redundant, superfluous and unnecessary. I do not believe that after all these hours of debate one opinion has been changed in this House of Commons. I do not think it is necessary to hash and rehash the arguments which have been raised by those who hold opposing opinions.

However, I am likewise convinced that the government has handled this flag situation very poorly right from the beginning. I think it is recognized by most Canadians that that is the case.

Mr. Woolliams: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Olson: You have made your speech.

Mr. Woolliams: I was wondering how the hon. member would have handled it.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. member can ask his questions when I am through. However, democratic government will never function, in fact it will not survive, if a filibustering minority is permitted to paralyse the majority. Nor, on the other hand, will it ever function effectively or survive if the government continues to stumble into and out of one crisis after another. At the present time this parliament is plagued by both situations. It is now imperative that a decision be made through a vote which will express the will of the majority of the members of this House of Commons. In my opinion, there is no other alternative at the present time.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that I feel that a flag by closure is far from the ideal. Ever since a distinctive flag was called for in the election platform of the Social Credit party it has been suggested that the problem could best be worked out through a national referendum, and we have advocated this. However, I am convinced that in the way this flag situation rests at the present time any referendum would simply serve further to divide the country. We must face up to the reality of the situation.

This is the ninth time that closure has been invoked by the Canadian House of Commons in its 97½ years of history. Six times it was invoked by a Conservative government and three times by a Liberal government. It is a legitimate and an effective tool of a democratic legislature and the parliament at Westminster uses it often.

Mr. Herridge: Not in this way.

Mr. Thompson: I suggest that other parliaments use it, and for the same reason it is being used now. The situation we have in the house tonight is something which can have nothing but an adverse effect on the nation as a whole, and even though we do not like it and it is unfortunate that this is the means by which a decision will be made on the flag, I can see no other alternative.

Four months late the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) suggested an all party flag committee. The resulting committee, made up of 15 members, subsequently held some 45 sittings. At the time when the names of the members of this flag committee were announced—

Mr. Rhéaume: You were in Africa.

Mr. Thompson: I suggest that hon. members in the Conservative opposition give me the same opportunity to speak that I have given them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Thompson: At the time that these 15 names were announced it was my thought that 15 capable, honest and trustworthy men had been chosen. It was a remarkable group of individuals who represented the rest of us on the flag committee. I want to thank them for the way they went to work and for the tremendous number of hours they put in. I am convinced they did their work conscientiously, carefully and thoroughly. Their final recommendation was decided by a majority vote of ten to four, not counting the chairman. We are now considering their report, and the purpose of the motion now before the house is to enable us either to accept or reject this report. It is that vote in which we are expected to take part tonight following the vote on the amendment, which to me is contrary to the decision made by the flag committee.

As one of those who agreed to the setting up of this flag committee I am convinced that it is my own personal obligation to support the report of the committee and I intend to do so. I say this even though I personally do not prefer the design which they selected.

Mr. Woolliams: What would you like?

Mr. Thompson: It is not a question of what I personally like. We entrusted this responsibility to these 15 men, and in view of the fact that they did submit a strong and substantial majority report I think it is our responsibility to support them. I believe this is the general opinion of the majority of the Canadian people.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that this is the opinion of Canadians living abroad, which after all is where a flag perhaps serves its greatest use, because it does represent Canadians who are abroad. I was in France and Germany in June and I spoke to many members of our armed forces. I intentionally asked them their opinion about a flag, and not one dissenting voice did I hear to the proposition that it was time that Canada, in her unique role in foreign affairs, had its own distinctive symbol. I found this opinion expressed in my recent trip to Africa, where I met hundreds of Canadians who were doing a worth-while job in the countries they were serving. They were doing a magnificent job representing our country, and once again I heard not one dissenting voice to the proposition that it is time Canada had her own distinctive flag. In

fact, I believe that the reports of the goings on in this house which have been carried by the world's press have lowered the image of Canada in the minds of a lot of people who look to Canada, a small nation, as a leader of other small nations. They are wondering just what is taking place in this house.

There is one further aspect I should like to mention in connection with this entire issue. It seems to me that the elected representatives of the Canadian people should have more concern for our country than for their own partisan or personal convictions regarding the winning or losing of a single point in debate in this house. It is our responsibility and our privilege to demonstrate to the people of the world—yes, people of diverse backgrounds who do not know unity, or have the heritage we have in Canada—that together we can solve our problems in such a way as to meet the needs of every individual in this country, and thus prove to the world that the democratic form of government is best.

A question we might ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker, is: Have we grasped the significance of our own destiny as a nation? If we have, then we should not continue focusing our attention on such an internal matter as the flag, but should be looking to much wider horizons—to the world outside.

In presenting the concept and image of unity, how much more important is it that we show that we can settle our difference in an amicable and democratic fashion? It could mean a great deal to the world if we as Canadians could set the example of solving the problems of our own country. I think this is most important at this time, and it should be remembered that it is not a flag which makes a country, it is a country and its people which make a flag.

I am convinced that the deficit picture, with which we are faced now, following these 33 days of debate, has brought us to the point where it is now our responsibility, particularly as members of parliament, to get on with the job before us which we are expected to perform. That is why my own decision is a very simple one about this debate. I believe there is only one alternative open to us, if we look at the situation objectively.

Many have spoken about the past, and let me say that I respect the past. In fact, one of the lessons I learned early in my lifetime at home is that we should respect the past and those who have been part of it, as well as the institutions for which they have fought, not only to help survive, but to perpetuate for us. In closing I should like to say that while that respect for the past must remain, our responsibility is to the future because we, our children and their children are going to live in the future.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, since this debate will close tonight I think it is appropriate for me to recapitulate the position the New Democratic party has taken on this question.

On June 16 when this debate was opened on the flag question I said that our party had three main objections to the proposal which was then placed before the house by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson). Those objections are still valid. Our first objection was toward the design which the Prime Minister proposed at that time. We said that we were prepared to vote for it because we wanted to see a distinctive national flag adopted, but that we would prefer another design.

I must say that we are pleased that the Prime Minister was prepared to send this question of a design to a parliamentary committee, and I should like to commend that committee for its work. The Prime Minister deserves commendation because of the fact that he was prepared to forgo the design he submitted to the house, and because he is now prepared to accept the design recommended by the committee. It takes a big man to adopt that position.

At least the majority of the members of this group are prepared to support the recommendation of the committee, but I am frank to say that the design the committee selected would not have been our choice. We would have preferred the design of our original suggestion, the red maple leaf on a white background with blue vertical bars denoting, as does the Canadian motto, from sea to sea. The committee voted on that design and turned it down. We live in a democracy, and no group living in a democracy can obtain all the things it wants. The committee has brought down a design, which I think is a good design and the design which ought to commend itself to the great majority of the Canadian people.

The position we have taken in this group on the flag question is that there should be a free vote. We take that view because the flag issue involves personal judgment and is a matter of one's own feeling. It has nothing to do with political ideologies or philosophies, and is not a partisan matter. One or two of our members will vote for the amendment. The majority will vote against the amendment; not because we are against the red

ensign, but because we believe that the majority of the people of Canada want a flag which symbolizes Canada's independence and Canada's role in world affairs.

I can understand those who have deep attachments for symbols of the past, since I have them myself, but I think we must recognize that Canada has moved from being a colony to a dominion, and from being a dominion to being a self-governing autonomous member of the commonwealth. As we have progressed toward being an autonomous nation, our symbols must also have changed to represent that change. We must have faith in the future of Canada, and I believe that our children's children and their children will see the day when Canada will have a bigger population and larger gross national product than the motherland which gave us birth. I think this will be one of the two great countries of the North American continent within the next century.

If we are to keep our rendezvous with destiny we must have a flag which denotes our faith in that destiny and our sense of national identity. I believe we can do this best by adopting a flag which does not constantly remind us of the things which have divided us too often in the past.

The second thing we objected to about the government's program was the method by which this whole question was brought before us. I am not going to labour that point, but I do want to say that I think the government could have saved itself and this country a great deal of heartache by sending this question to the committee in the first place without any time limit, and could have given Canadians a chance to attempt at least to work out some consensus, obtaining the support of the majority of Canadian people with a minimum of dissension and bitterness.

The report of the parliamentary committee of 1945 put forward a recommendation which, if I remember correctly, was voted for by 23 to 1. That is close to being a unanimous vote. If I remember correctly, that committee sat for 18 months. I do not think 18 months is too great a price to pay for general support for something such as a flag. The great tragedy of that period is that the flag recommended was not adopted by parliament. Had it been adopted by parliament we would have been saved a great deal of trouble during this session.

As I have said, I commended the Prime Minister on June 16, because of the fact that he picked up this thorny nettle which all his predecessors carefully avoided. I think he is to be commended that he has undertaken this matter, but I suggest that the method which was adopted has brought a great deal more dissension and some degree of bitterness which I believe could have been avoided.

The other thing which we criticized at the beginning of the debate was the government's timing. I suggested on June 16 that by introducing this question at the time it was brought into the house the government was going to paralyse parliament and obstruct its own program. After all, there had been nothing in the speech from the throne about a flag. Early in June the Prime Minister was asked if he would outline the business for the remainder of the session and if I remember correctly he read out 38 legislative items, all of them important. Then, about the middle of June came the flag debate, with the result that we spent all of the summer months without discussing legislation. It obstructed the whole legislative program completely with the result that when this session of parliament is prorogued probably more legislation will die on the order paper than has been passed during the session. I think that is unfortunate.

When the government finally agreed to send this matter to a committee I thought the government had an excellent opportunity to redeem its mistake. It would have been a good thing to let the committee's report lie there, go on with the legislative program and let the flag wait until the end of the session or even wait until next session. But the Prime Minister, in one of his more pixilated moments on the C.B.C., promised that he was going to have a flag by Christmas. Why? It was not a matter of life or death. No one was going to suffer if the decision on the flag were delayed until January or until next spring or until next summer. What was the urgency in this matter? Many more urgent matters affecting the lives, the welfare and the well-being of the Canadian people are on the order paper that are not being dealt with because the flag has preoccupied our time. What was the hurry? What was the urgency?

Only three weeks ago I asked the Prime Minister on the orders of the day if he would agree to leave the flag debate until we had at least dealt with the national labour code, which after all affects the welfare of 650,000 workers in Canada who come under federal jurisdiction. The Prime Minister said no, that we had to deal with the flag. What we have had is one blunder after another and now

the supreme folly of all, in my opinion, the forcing of a decision by means of closure.

I am not opposed to closure when it becomes necessary on legislation whose passage means improving the lot of the Canadian people. If the Canada pension plan or the national labour code or a medicare plan or some other plan upon which the Canadian people were waiting were involved, if there had been adequate time for debate and expression of opinion by all groups in the house, and if some obstreperous minority was holding it up, I would support closure. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that closure on a flag, closure on something about which there was no urgency, closure on something which is an emotionally charged issue that touches people's lives and beliefs and faith, is a totally different thing. After all, a nation only selects a flag once in its history. Surely it ought to be allowed to take time to make that selection after due reflection.

In respect of the navy bill in 1913 and the pipe line legislation of 1956, both of which have left scars on the political life of Canada, there was at least the excuse that there was a deadline to be met, but on the flag question there was no deadline at all to be met except the deadline established by the Prime Minister's own promise that we would have a flag by Christmas. The only real issue at stake was that parliament had to conform to the Prime Minister's timetable in order to maintain the Prime Minister's reputation and enhance his vanity.

I do not mean by what I am saying that I condone the filibuster which has been carried on by the Progressive Conservative party over a long period of time. I respect their point of view although I do not agree with it. I think they had adequate time to express their opinions repeatedly, and they did so. But I think there comes a time when there ought to be a decision and I think they would have been wise to have allowed parliament to make a decision long before this. But the sad thing, Mr. Speaker, is that we have had in this parliament the spectacle of the present Prime Minister saying "we are going to have a flag by Christmas" and the former prime minister of Canada saying "you are not going to have a flag by Christmas".

An hon. Member: What do you say?

Mr. Douglas: My friend says "what do you say". I think Canadians deserve something better than this from their two major political leaders. That is what I think. I think the spectacle we have witnessed in recent weeks has reduced parliament to a farce. It has been a childish exhibition that has done this country no good.

The thing that concerns me most, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure it must concern the Prime Minister, is that the two things he was hoping to accomplish by introducing this flag have been destroyed by the method which has been used to bring the matter to a decision. The first thing the Prime Minister was hoping to accomplish was to establish national unity. I do not think that the action taken today will do anything to enhance national unity.

Last week the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer) and the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) were suggesting closure. I make an appeal to my French Canadian friends. I say to them very frankly that we English speaking people in Canada have too often and too long been callously insensitive to the susceptibilities of the French Canadian people. We acknowledge that and we ought to apologize for it. We ought to try to rectify it. But, Mr. Speaker, it must also work both ways. I ask the French Canadian members who are crying for closure to stop and ask themselves this question. If the committee had recommended the union jack or the red ensign and the members from Quebec had been speaking out vigorously against it, as I am sure some of them would have, would they have asked for closure or supported closure? I do not think so.

I am not one of those who thinks this flag is a concession to Quebec. As a matter of fact, I am convinced that the great bulk of the English speaking people in Canada will support this single maple leaf design. However, I would remind the French Canadian members that there is an English speaking minority, with whose views I do not concur, but I respect those views and I am prepared to fight for their right to have those views; and it seems to me that imposing closure is not likely to improve the feeling between the two founding races and is not going to promote national unity.

Mr. Balcer: I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question. Does he consider that the French Canadian members are restricting the freedom of speech of the English speaking members when, after 200 speeches, they ask for an opportunity for the house to take a decision?

Mr. Douglas: Well, my hon. friend ought to have more influence in stopping some of those speeches than I am likely to have. However,

I agree with him that when a debate has gone on a long time everybody gets sick and tired of it. I am suggesting when you are trying to select a flag, which you select only once in the lifetime of a nation, you will be far better to put the matter aside and let the idea become familiar, to see if you cannot find some basis upon which you can get a greater consensus than that which obtains at the present time.

I have only two minutes left, Mr. Speaker, and I want to make my last point. The other purpose the Prime Minister was hoping to accomplish by introducing this flag was to get general acceptance across Canada. I think that the government had a golden opportunity to have introduced a flag that would have given voice to Canadians' sense of pride in their country. Instead of that, we are in danger of having a flag which is going to be launched in bitterness. I hope not.

An hon. Member: Why mention it?

Mr. Douglas: The hon. member says, "Why mention it?". I fear for the reaction to a flag that is hoisted by closure.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; I must bring to the attention of the hon. member that according to the information received from the table his time has expired, unless he has unanimous consent of the house to continue.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Douglas: If I may have two minutes; I was interrupted a great deal.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Perhaps the house would allow the hon. member two additional minutes to compensate for the interruptions.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Douglas: I wanted to say that in my opinion only a government which had lost its sense of values, which had become obsessed with a political death wish, would have compounded its long list of blunders by the supreme folly of invoking closure on a measure so emotionally charged as the flag. I hope I am wrong. I hope that any bitterness or any rancour that has been aroused will be forgotten. I pledge myself and the party with which I am associated that we will not only vote for this flag but we will do everything in our power to get the Canadian people to support it—to support it as their flag. We will do all we can to get people persuaded to put any bitterness or enmity behind them and to push on to the future, to build the kind of country over which that flag will fly as a symbol of Canada's greatness, its peace and its prosperity.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the remarks made by the leader of the New Democratic party (Mr. Douglas) and to those of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) concerning the adoption of a distinctive national flag.

The hon. member who just resumed his seat said a while ago that the understanding between English speaking and French speaking Canadians must be effected in relation to—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret that I must interrupt the hon. member, but according to the information which has just been handed to the Chair, the hon. member for Villeneuve already took part in the debate on the amendment when he spoke Friday afternoon, December 11 last. According to standing orders, he cannot speak twice on this amendment.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, may I ask you if we are on the amendment or on the main motion?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. We are on the amendment. The hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) now has the floor.

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet had the opportunity to speak on the amendment under consideration but I feel that our party's point of view must be put forward on this last night of the flag debate.

I would say that one sentence in particular caught my attention, if not several, in the speech the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) has just made. He asked us to be patient; he said that a flag is chosen only once in a lifetime, that a decision must be postponed if there is not unanimous agreement in this house. And yet, a few minutes before, the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam had congratulated the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) for taking today a step which none of his predecessors had dared take about a distinctive national flag.

Talk of a distinctive national flag is nothing new. Henri Bourassa brought the matter up in this house in 1910 and 1911, but, at that time, they did exactly what the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam proposed a while ago. The issue was put aside for lack of unanimity.

How many times, under the R. B. Bennett administration, from 1930 to 1935, did hon. Senator Pouliot say he himself had introduced, before the war, a motion for the adoption of a distinctive national flag? That was 30 years ago, and his resolution was shelved until there could be some degree of unanimity.

How many other members of this house, in 1944, 1945, every year for the last 20 or 30 years, have put forward a motion in this house for the adoption of a distinctive flag? But such a motion was never agreed to in the past on the grounds that there was not enough unanimity.

Today if the Prime Minister were to withdraw his motion or shelve it, I ask every member of this house, and particularly the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas), when we would ever have this distinctive national flag?

The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam said that this is something which is given but once in the life of a nation, but how old must our nation be before we can fly this flag? Must we wait until we become more deeply mired in old traditions before we adopt this flag? We have been oblivious about this flag long enough. I do not approve the Prime Minister on many other points, but I do not hesitate to say that I support him unreservedly on this point, since he was courageous enough to introduce his measure, resist all pressures and maintain his intention to give the people of Canada a distinctive national flag.

Our attitude in this respect is very clear. These eternal discussions have lasted long enough, even too long, putting off until tomorrow a distinctive national flag and a national anthem for Canada, because we are convinced that such feelings reflect a true Canadianism, and we want this to become a fact.

The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam and others before him have made a pathetic appeal in favour of good relations between English and French speaking Canadians. But how can English Canadians and French Canadians endeavour to understand each other? This understanding must work both ways.

Mr. Grafftey: That's right, it must work both ways.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, here is a question I want to ask all members of this house: Which of the two groups has done more toward good understanding? The English Canadian group or the French Canadian group? During the 17 years the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam was premier of his province, during the 17 years he held that post, how were French Canadians treated in his province, with regard to the school question, as compared to English Canadians in the province of Quebec?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. May I be allowed to suggest to the hon. member for Lapointe that the comments he is now making are beyond the limits of our discussion?

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, if my comments are not within the ambit of this debate, then why was the matter brought up a while ago? Since I am only speaking about objections raised earlier, I think my remarks are in order. If a previous speaker was allowed to express his views on the subject, I feel I am also entitled to voice my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, understanding between English Canadians and French Canadians must work both ways, because this is essential in order to come to an agreement. It must be like the wheels of an engine on railroad tracks; they must turn in the same direction, not one in one direction and the other in the opposite direction.

What has happened since confederation? Can the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam tell me that French Canadians have not made every effort in the province of Quebec to co-operate with and understand the English element? I claim that they have done as much and even much more than the English Canadian governments in the other provinces, including the Saskatchewan government during the 17 years when the member for Burnaby-Coquitlam was premier. Had he asked the French Canadians in his province if they were treated as well as the English Canadians in our province, I do not think he would have made that pathetic appeal a while ago, because I think we have done more than our share and I think we have worked for Canadian unity. If the question comes up today, it is not because we have not done our share, but perhaps because efforts have not been made for Canadian unity in all parts of the country.

Maybe there have been some extremists on one side, but there have been some on the other also. We are asked this question: Had the committee proposed the red ensign or the union jack, would you have supported it or would you not have fought to the death? In answer to that objection, I would say this: We have had it for 97 years, we have accepted it for 97 years. Today, English speaking Canadians are not being asked to

become French Canadians but to become just plain Canadians. We are prepared to fight so that each and every one of us may become Canadians. We have been lukewarm Canadians long enough, Canadians too closely connected with other countries, while we believe that Canada must be really independent, as mentioned by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam.

I admit that objections have been raised regarding the selection of a flag design. But when have you seen a country select a flag by means of a national referendum or a vote of members of parliament? Canada would be the first country to do this. The value of a flag does not depend on its colour, on what is on it or on its design, but on what it symbolizes. A flag represents a country where you feel at home, for that is the definition of the motherland. The motherland is where you love to live, where you feel at home. That is what a flag should represent. It is not a picture, a photograph or a drawing, it is something representing the motherland, and I have just defined what is the motherland.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the selection of a flag we should not pay too much attention to unimportant details, but rather try to design something which we will fly as a symbol of the motherland where everybody will be glad to live, that is in an independent Canada constituted by Canadians of different races, but races getting along with one another. And it is true that races can get along together.

Since the beginning of the debate on the flag, I had the opportunity of talking with Conservative members who rose in the house to express opinions which were flabbergasting to a genuine Canadian citizen, but when I had a friendly chat with them, understanding was possible. How is it that understanding is possible between two individuals of different races but that this understanding becomes practically impossible when one takes the floor to speak on behalf of a political party in the house? That is the whole question. To answer that question is answering the important question of Canadian unity.

When she was last in Canada, Her Majesty the Queen said that one's own patriotism should not keep one from understanding the patriotism of others.

Mr. Speaker, I quite understand that many Canadians will see with regret, even with sorrow, the red ensign lowered to be replaced by a new flag. However, Mr. Speaker, if they truly love their country, they will understand that they are saluting more than a flag, that they are indeed saluting the country in which they live. I admit and understand the grief, the sorrow they will feel; still, emotions and feelings must not always dictate our conduct. They should rather try to look to the future of Canada, without forgetting the past, our forefathers' heritage.

We should think in terms of a great country, a country that wants to develop itself, in short a country, as the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam said—and I agree with him on this point—which may become greater than those which contributed to its foundation and development. But, if we are to vote once in our lifetime on a flag, let us do it, at least, while we are still alive.

Mr. Speaker, we do not consider this matter as a quarrel between French Canadians and English Canadians, but we believe that the debate on the flag will have been a tremendous test concerning the future of mutual understanding and unity in Canada. It will have been a test of understanding between our Canadian citizens, in short, between the two main races which make up this country.

And if one wonders about the success of this test about the mutual understanding which may exist in Canada, there is certainly no cause for rejoicing, because we find that, before thinking as statesmen, too many members tried to play politics with this matter. Therefore, I think that the test of the flag debate is a lamentable failure and only served to point out that there was still too great a divergence of opinions in this country.

But we shall have a flag. It will be perhaps unfortunately voted in by applying closure. But if the closure rule had not been imposed, when would we have had this flag? Perhaps never, and it would have been shelved once and for all.

But, the flag once adopted by parliament, we hope that everybody will say: This is now Canada's flag, let us now work for Canada's growth and development, so that we, and the future generations can be proud of it.

This will promote throughout the country a better Canadian spirit and, therefore, a better understanding between Canada's two great races.

[*Text*]

Hon. H. J. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Today we have seen most unusual and, I believe, unfortunate developments in connection with the question of our national flag.

The amendment we are presently considering, as proposed by my hon. friend from Middlesex West (Mr. Thomas) reads as follows:

That the sixth report of the special committee be not now adopted but that it be referred back to the committee with instructions to strike out in paragraph 7 all the words after "Canada" and substitute "be the Canadian red ensign."

Acceptance of this amendment would mean that paragraph 7 of the committee report would read:

Your committee therefore recommends that the flag to be designated as the national flag of Canada be the Canadian red ensign.

I do not think it will be any news to hon. members of this house when I say I have no hesitation whatsoever in favouring paragraph 7 as amended.

I wish now to refer to the speech which was made by my hon. friend from Middlesex West on Friday, because I feel he outlined in that speech the objective of every member of this house. I have no hesitation in saying he represented my views to the fullest possible extent. I quote from his remarks as reported on page 11023.

The party to which I have the honour to belong, in common with all other parties in the house, is doing, I believe, whatever it can to promote national unity in this country. Opinions may differ as to how national unity can best be promoted. There are honest differences of opinion regarding the procedure which should be adopted with this end in view. Our party has taken the stand that for the government to impose a flag by a vote of this house is not the best way to promote national unity. We have the right to present our view and to urge our view upon all hon. members of the house. We wish national unity—

In my opinion the proposition that we shall have national unity in the present circumstances, especially in the circumstances of closure, is a misleading one and the action now being taken by the government will not bring about the result which is generally desired. I wish to quote from today's copy of the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* in support of this view. The writer is a distinguished member of the press gallery, Mr. Eric Dennis, and he has this to say in connection with the whole matter of national unity and what is likely to happen if the committee's report is accepted. He says:

What will be the reaction when the maple leaf flag is hoisted over the peace tower, over every federal building, every military installation, every military cemetery in which Canada's war dead lie buried, at the United Nations, every Canadian embassy abroad and at NATO, as will be required once the new banner is officially proclaimed?

Will there be the embracing of it from sea to sea which Prime Minister Pearson so eloquently pleaded for in his final speech on the issue Friday?

Will there be, as Holmes said "one flag, one land, one heart, one hand?"

The writer has certainly asked a most pertinent series of questions. In the same article he proceeds to answer them. He says:

British Columbia Premier W. A. C. Bennett already has promised that four flags will fly by official sanction over the legislative buildings at Victoria—his province's own banner, the maple leaf design, the red ensign and the union jack.

Quebec is certain to keep the fleur-de-lis flying for years to come despite the insistence of its federal representatives that it did not want even this emblem incorporated in the new Canadian flag.

It will take a good time before the red ensign comes down in the maritimes and many other parts of Canada.

And Newfoundland's Premier J. R. Smallwood has made it plain the full union jack will not be pulled down over his island.

If this is an indication of what is expected should this motion pass, and we assume it will, it seems to me the government has taken a tremendous responsibility on its shoulders.

Some members may be wondering why I should reiterate my support for the red ensign, a stand I have taken many times in this chamber. This evening my hon. friend and next door neighbour here, the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue (Mr. Martineau) quoted from Abraham Lincoln, the great emancipator. I intend to quote the same great statesman. Abraham Lincoln at one stage in his career uttered these words—they are very short but they are very potent and most pertinent to this subject. He said: "To sin by silence when they should protest makes cowards out of men". I do not propose there should be any doubt in the minds of anyone in this chamber or in Canada about where I stand on this particular question.

The recent development to which I referred a few minutes ago was this decision to use closure which would put an end to the debate on the amendment favouring the red ensign. Hon. members may properly ask: do you favour closure? I find myself saying that I do not favour closure when it has the effect of discarding a flag which has been used as the national flag of Canada to a greater or lesser degree for almost 100 years. This is one time when I do not think closure is justified. I agree with my hon. friend from Bow River (Mr. Woolliams) that there are times, when important legislation is being held up with an ulterior purpose in mind, when closure may be justified. I find myself in agreement with the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) who said that this was a time when closure was not justified, especially in view of the amendment now proposed. I do not question the advantage of

closure when used in the national interest, but in this case I think—and I say this advisedly—that the contemplated action does not qualify under the general heading of what is good for Canada.

I said in a previous speech that the changing of the flag of a country was in the same category as changing its constitution, and I repeat those words. This action should never be taken on a mere majority vote. I also said in a previous speech that changing a flag which has been in use for something like 100 years is a responsibility which should not be taken as a result of a majority vote taken of 265 members of parliament. I know there is a great deal of difference of opinion on this matter, but I think the reasons for not changing a flag without a great deal of consideration and deliberation cannot be challenged.

I am one of those who listened to the speech of the Prime Minister on Friday last most attentively, but I found myself taking exception to many of his conclusions. He quoted words attributed to Mr. Speaker Lemieux and he acknowledged they were a moving illustration of what is best in our history. But he also stated that they were an indication of how history changes and that we should not ignore the lessons of history when we support Canadian symbols for Canadian nationality. My contention in this connection is that we do not eliminate historical symbols in the process of incorporating what the Prime Minister referred to as Canadian symbols. Surely there is no need to eliminate all that is good and which we treasure in the past in order to incorporate something into our flag.

In this connection I want to quote an editorial which appeared in the Montreal *Gazette* for this morning which talks about the division of the country. In speaking of this division the editorial says:

> It recalls the saying of Mr. Louis St. Laurent, when he was prime minister, that he would not introduce a new flag until he was satisfied that it would do more to unite than to divide the country. To be ready to divide the house but not the country suggests an embarrassment over the issue. Yet it remains true that in avoiding a flag election the government is acting wisely. Whether the government was as wise in getting itself into its present position is another matter.

That, Mr. Speaker, is where I say the government has made a tremendous mistake. As I have said many times, and as other hon. members have said, it is the government's handling of this whole question to which we object.

[Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton).]

I should like to draw the attention of the house to the order in council which was passed in 1945, and I do so only to refer to the second paragraph thereof, which in my opinion is a vital paragraph. After the usual preamble the second paragraph states:

> That the Canadian red ensign was employed by Canadian forces during the present war;—

That was one of the reasons for carrying into operation this order in council by which the use of the Canadian red ensign was made legal within and without Canada. That reason has stood for the last 20 years and still stands today.

What has happened, Mr. Speaker, to bring about this change? In view of the special mention which the Canadian red ensign received in that order in council, this house should hesitate for a long time before interfering with the aims and objectives of the order in council itself. According to the Prime Minister, as reported at page 11032 of *Hansard* he said:

> It was not until 1945...that the union jack was replaced by the red ensign as an official flag for Canada. At that time we all remember that a great many sincere people in Canada opposed that change. Many who are now worried about the change from the red ensign were worried about a change from the union jack, but I think we all agree now that this was a desirable and an inevitable stage in our national progression.

I am sure everyone will agree with that; there is no question about it. But, Mr. Speaker, how can we ever justify the discarding and destroying of the symbols in our flag under which the same progression to which the Prime Minister refers has been made? Why do you throw something away under which you have made great progress, and substitute something else for it? Why should it be eliminated?

Then the Prime Minister went on to say that the order in council was made pending only a decision of the committee which had been set up at that time. I do not know how long the committee took to report; one of the hon. members who spoke this afternoon stated it took a year and a half. However, it did report following a majority vote of 23 to 1. It recommended that a golden maple leaf replace the Canadian coat of arms.

I would draw to the attention of the house the fact that the prime minister of that day, Right Hon. Mackenzie King, did not implement the report of that committee. The house never had before it a motion for concurrence in that committee's report. I am one of those who think the prime minister of that day had good reason for not doing

this, and I give him full marks in that regard.

Then in 1948, after allowing the red ensign to remain the national flag of Canada and to fly at home and abroad, Mr. Mackenzie King was replaced by Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent as prime minister of Canada. Mr. St. Laurent continued in office until 1957, a period of nine years, and Mr. St. Laurent did not change the Canadian flag. And I have no doubt that Mr. St. Laurent also had good reason for leaving it alone.

We now find this government coming into office, and one of the first things it does is to bring before the house this motion, and it does so in such a partisan way that it seems as though it is going to have a very adverse effect upon the unity of our nation. The government presented a motion for a design to this parliament last spring consisting of three maple leaves conjoined on one stem. It was presented to the house by the Prime Minister in an eloquent speech. Many speeches were made from this side in opposition to it. There were a few speeches in support of it. Many points were made in connection with it. Then agreement was reached to refer it to a committee. A majority report of the committee did not favour the three maple leaf design as approved by the Prime Minister, his government and their supporters, but recommended another design. Now the government, the Prime Minister and his supporters seem to be quite willing to concur in the report of that committee, even though that committee did not concur with the original submission made by the government to this parliament. They changed their ideas completely and seem today apparently to have lost interest. They discarded the three maple leaf design as quickly or quicker than they discarded the Canadian red ensign. They have now become enthusiastic about the one maple leaf flag. There has been a complete right-about-face which leads us properly to interpret their main intention as being to eliminate the union jack from its place on our flag. We have been using that union jack in an official capacity for almost 20 years, and for almost 100 years to a greater or lesser degree.

In the course of the Prime Minister's remarks, as they are recorded at page 11036, he said:

> Unfortunately there has been a great deal of depreciation and sneering about the maple leaf as an emblem on a flag. I do not understand why hon. members opposite take that attitude toward this symbolism of Canadianism. I suggest it is unfortunate that the impression has been created in certain areas and quarters that the maple leaf is not worthy of being a national symbol of Canada on a flag, and I hope that when the dust of the debate has cleared away, if this recommendation carries, we will all be proud of the fact that the central feature of our flag is a red maple leaf.

In connection with the modified red ensign I should like to refer to the fact that when the committee was voting on different designs one vote related to a design which had a maple leaf in the centre. That flag had the very thing incorporated in it about which the Prime Minister said in his speech there was some prejudice. The committee did vote on a motion to support a flag with a maple leaf in the centre, with symbols of French and English heritage on either side, but that design did not carry in the committee. I mention that fact simply because it refutes the argument made by the Prime Minister that there is some prejudice against the red maple leaf as such.

Mr. Speaker, I see you nodding your head, and you have been very kind to me, so I will bring my remarks to a conclusion. I should like to refer to many other things, but I appreciate the attention which I have received from all hon. members of this house and will now take my seat.

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): I should like to refer to one or two things which have been mentioned earlier by preceding speakers. The hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Pugh) referred to the fact that there had been 22 days of debate on the previous resolution and 11 days debate, including today, on the present motion to concur in the sixth report of the committee. I should like to stress very strongly that the 22 days of debate took place on a resolution to adopt the three maple leaf design. The present debate is related to the one maple leaf flag. I do not understand why we should be criticized for debating this issue to the extent we have debated it, and I admit it has been rather a long debate, in view of the fact that we believe this is the most serious subject that has come before this parliament for consideration.

Certain editorials across this country have criticized us for delaying the adoption of a flag. They have pointed out that we have debated 22 days on the first flag and 11 days on this motion for concurrence. The two debates dealt with two flags, both sponsored by the government. We ask the question: Which flag does the government want? It is obvious that the government has no answer to that question.

I believe the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) said this evening that it was very important to have something overseas

which could be recognized as Canada's own distinctive national flag. I am sure the Canadian red ensign is known abroad as Canada's national flag. In relation to that which people in embassies and other places overseas think about a national flag, what do the 19 million Canadian people who live in Canada, and who might never have the opportunity of travelling abroad, think about the national flag? It is those people and their opinions about which I am concerned. I feel very strongly that we are dealing tonight with an issue which affects the hearts and souls of every Canadian. There are different points of view on this subject and I appreciate the points of view of those who do not agree with me. However, I cannot understand why we who stand for what has been Canada's national flag should be entirely deprived of any semblance of that flag on any proposed flag.

Tonight is the third time I have taken part in the debate on the flag issue. Perhaps I should receive one of the hats given out by that pinhead down in the corner; however, he is not in his seat at the moment. He took part in the debate a short time ago and I presume that he feels, having said what he did say, everything of importance has been said. As a consequence of that feeling he has left the chamber.

I make no apology for taking part again in this debate on the amendment to the motion to concur in the sixth report of the committee. I spoke first on August 24, at which time I outlined clearly my position on the flag issue. I would like to repeat some of the statements I made on that occasion, but unfortunately time will not permit me to do so. I do not back down from any statement I made on that occasion, and I state again that my position today regarding the whole national flag issue and the Canadian red ensign is as I stated it to be on that occasion.

Having sat as a member of the committee, which worked arduously for six weeks studying the whole situation, I had the honour to speak again on November 30 and move an amendment which called for a plebiscite. I do not intend to go into the pros and cons of holding a plebiscite, as they have been clearly set out on many occasions. All I can say in that regard is that the amendment was defeated, and we accept that fact. At the moment, Mr. Speaker, we are discussing an amendment moved by the hon. member for Middlesex West (Mr. Thomas) to the same motion to concur and the vote on that amendment will in effect decide whether or not we are going to continue to have the red ensign.

[Mr. Monteith.]

Those who vote against this amendment are going to vote to tear down the red ensign; let there be no mistake about that.

My main reason for speaking now at all is that we are now going to lose the red ensign which this country has known in so many emotional circumstances. I have to agree that from the sense of the house tonight this is what will happen, no matter what may be said. We know their minds are made up. They are sitting stony faced across the way. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. McIlraith), the Solicitor General (Mr. MacNaught), the purveyor of bumper stickers—there are not too many of them on the ministerial benches at this moment—they are all going to vote us down. I know that. However, I think we should be entitled to our last plea and our last fight. I do not think we should be chastised for putting up that fight.

I am going to be very frank and say that I do not think enough has been said in the press media about where the real fault lies for the present situation. Let us say that those who wish a new flag have every right so to wish. I am not quarrelling with those who wish a new flag. I am not quarrelling in the least with those who promote it. But surely others have the right to disagree. Surely those who have grown up with and have known no other flag have a right to disagree with respect to a new flag. Surely we have the right simply to maintain what we have now. What is wrong with that?

I claim that generally speaking the press has not been fair in fixing blame on a particular party for having caused disunity in Canada. Let us face it. We certainly have greater division and disunity today than we had last May when the flag question was introduced. There is no question about that. The government, Mr. Speaker, is completely responsible for this situation. All that the President of the Privy Council does is to get up and move closure. Let him get up and make a speech as to what he thinks of the whole situation.

They are responsible for the whole situation, Mr. Speaker. Surely when they first raised this question, particularly in the manner they did, they must have realized what would happen. They could have introduced this question in a more reasonable manner. We know that. They must have realized what would happen, but they just did not care. It is the same old arrogance dating back to 1956. I should like to refer to an editorial in today's Montreal *Gazette* to which the

hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming) referred a little while ago. I should like to read one sentence:

> It recalls the saying of Mr. Louis St. Laurent, when he was prime minister, that he would not introduce a new flag until he was satisfied that it would do more to unite than to divide the country.

This is the point. You know very well, Mr. Speaker, that this whole flag question has done more to divide than to unite. Mr. St. Laurent knew that and so did his predecessor in office. They were very well aware of the situation. I should like to make one other reference. I trust I am not taking too much of the time of the house. I should like to refer to an editorial in the Ottawa *Citizen* of last Saturday.

An hon. Member: Order.

Mr. Monteith: I do not know who yelled "order" over there, but get up on your feet and make a speech like a man.

Mr. Greene: If it was anything like yours I would sit down.

Mr. Monteith: You are much better sitting down.

Mr. Greene: So are you, but you do not know it.

Mr. Monteith: I should like to refer to this editorial because it accuses me as one of the Conservatives on the flag committee of having abandoned the red ensign. It reads in part as follows:

> The committee rejected the red ensign. Even the Conservative members of the committee abandoned the ensign and suggested a modified maple leaf flag—

This is an absolutely false statement. Today the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) had reason to rise on a question of privilege about an editorial in the Toronto *Globe and Mail*. I suppose I might well have got up on a question of privilege and raised this matter at that time. This statement is absolutely false. We never at any time abandoned the Canadian red ensign. When the matter was put to a vote we were defeated and after we were defeated we then tried to come up with a compromise which certainly was not acceptable either to the group across the way or to those down in the corner to my left.

I have read that there were only three choices open to the government, depending upon the viewpoint, I suppose. Some say two and some say three. The first was to abandon the plan, the second to impose closure and the third to have a plebiscite at the next election. We have discussed the matter of a plebiscite and as I said earlier I am not going to pursue that subject any further. The house has made its decision on it and I am willing to accept that decision, much as I dislike doing so. As a matter of fact, I believe the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) made some reference tonight to the fact that the matter might have been best decided by a referendum. If he said that, then I accuse him of at least some ambiguity in his thinking because he did not vote for a plebiscite when he had the chance to do so.

I come back to the point that some say there were two choices open to the government and some say there were three. However, the government has made its choice and has imposed closure. I claim it has done so only to save the government's face because this vote will cause much more disunity in Canada than anything that has happened before in my memory. I am quite convinced that if the government could see its way to abandon the matter even at this late date it would do a great deal of good. I know they are not going to do so, but I just cannot say strongly enough how much good I think such an action would do for Canada.

The argument over the flag has been going on over the last several months, though I agree in a somewhat spotty manner; but at the same time I strongly believe that the only solution is for the government to withdraw its proposal so that more disunity will not be created, because that is where we are heading when the vote takes place tonight. We started out with three leaves and we spent 22 days on that flag. Now we have the one leaf design and we are on the eleventh day. This is not compromise. Let us be reasonable. Positions have hardened. Sure, the Prime Minister has said this is supposed to be an open vote. What kind of an open vote is this? Do not let us be ridiculous. He declared it was not an open vote many long months ago. The other day during the debate he suggested perhaps it could be an open vote.

Positions in this House of Commons have hardened, Mr. Speaker. There is no possibility of an open vote today. There is no doubt about it that parliament and the country must now accept an imposed verdict, an imposed flag. This is all there is to it. It is as simple as that. There are not too many members here even on the backbenches of the Liberal party, and very few on the treasury benches, who had the actual experience as I did of going through closure back in 1956.

I know the government wishes to forget that. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) has indicated he would have liked to forget it. At one time he would have been willing to dispose of it. We have a new crop here today with the same mentality. They simply feel they have a divine right to rule. They will never learn.

I claim, Mr. Speaker, that this is our last stand for the Canadian red ensign, this flag which has been our country's flag for so many years, which has meant so much to practically everybody in Canada. I do not care from where they come, this flag has still meant a great deal to practically everybody. I come back now to an earlier statement I made. This government has done more by this particular manoeuvre, by bringing this whole question up as it has at the time it did, and in the way it did, to create disunity in Canada than anything else that could happen in this country. I only make a plea for those who do have some feeling for our past. I heard these views expressed by members from the other side in the committee. Could we not get together, could we not have something of the past as well as the present? I heard this view expressed. It has all gone by the board. We have nothing left that we can remember of our traditions, our heritage, part of our lives.

If this government had only waited. Sure, they ask, why do you want to wait? The Prime Minister said, what do you want to do, wait one year, two years or three years? I say, wait ten years until all the old codgers like myself are dead and gone, and then this question could be readily settled. Today it is causing a great deal of trouble. I see, Mr. Speaker, you have just received a slip suggesting that my time is up so I will resume my seat.

Mr. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Restigouche-Madawaska): Mr. Speaker, as the two previous hon. members who spoke, it was my privilege also to serve on the flag committee. I should like to take part in the final stage of this debate. First of all, I wish to state that working on the flag committee was an experience which I will not soon forget. You cannot associate yourself with 14 other members of the house for a period of six weeks, meeting two or three times a day, without gaining some knowledge, making new friendships and leaving something of yourself behind. These 14 members, Mr. Speaker, represented widely different areas of the country. They expressed their feelings and the aspirations of a cross section of Canada. We learned to respect, if not to share entirely, our individual views. We spoke freely. I feel that I came out from the committee richer for the experience and in knowledge. I believe we all came out better Canadians.

It had been hoped and even expected, Mr. Speaker, that we should come from the flag committee with a unanimous report. It is unfortunate that we did not come out with a unanimous report. Under the circumstances, I feel that it could not be so. To insist on a unanimous decision or a virtually unanimous decision, or to insist on an 80 per cent or 90 per cent majority, in my opinion, would not be democracy; it would be a virtual minority dictatorship. I say that if only the members of this house who were elected with 80 per cent or 90 per cent majority had been allowed to speak in this debate the filibuster would have been very short indeed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we were very surprised, and indeed saddened, to hear some hon. members opposite say that the members of the Liberal party on that committee were under instructions to carry out the orders and signals received from the outside. This is not the case. Speaking for myself, I entered the committee with an open mind. I left at the door both the government's model and the red ensign. I started from scratch. My worry was not to find ways and means of preserving the red ensign. My ambition was not to impose the government design. My sole desire was to learn, to secure knowledge in heraldry, in history, and to try to end up with a design which would be technically correct, beautiful to see and truly Canadian. This is what we did.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the task assigned to us seemed very difficult at first. But after listening to the opinions of experts in heraldry, history and economics, we soon began to grasp the essential characteristics a truly Canadian flag should have. Three basic principles were established:

1. We found that, according to the royal proclamation of King George V, in 1921, the two national colours were white and red, and in support of this first principle, let me quote from the royal proclamation itself, as it appears in this booklet published by the Department of the Secretary of State and entitled "The Arms of Canada".

[*Text*]

A Proclamation Declaring His Majesty's Pleasure Concerning the Ensigns Armorial of the Dominion of Canada.

[*Translation*]

Now, Mr. Speaker, allow me to refer to the proceedings of the flag committee of 1945 and to quote a short excerpt from the testimony of a witness, Colonel Duguid D.S.O. an army historian of the Department of National Defence. Colonel Duguid read the royal proclamation of George V of which I have just read an excerpt and he then explained those excerpts as follows:

[*Text*]

And upon a Royal helmet mantled argent doubled gules the crest, that is to say, on a wreath of the colours argent and gules a lion passant guardant or imperially crowned proper and holding in the dexter paw a maple leaf gules.

That is the full verbatim text. It may sound like nonsense but it enables anyone who understands to draw and colour a picture, complete in every detail. It resembles a doctor's prescription. It is either understood or it is complete nonsense. Cleared of confusing terms and items, and written in plain language, with argent translated as white and gules translated as red, the vital part of the proclamation would read: "The King, at the request of Canada, assigns to Canada the national colours white and red."

[*Translation*]

Moreover, on February 5, 1963, that is the very day the previous Conservative government was defeated, the following answer was given to question No. 1,449 which asked:

Does Canada have national colours and, if so, what are they?

Answer: Yes, Canada has national colours, which are white and red.

Therefore, as a first principle, the two national colours are white and red.

We also reached our decision on the basis of this second principle: the only really Canadian symbol is the maple leaf. Besides, the great majority of designs submitted to us included either one or three maple leaves; and those designs came from every part of the country, mostly outside the province of Quebec.

The third principle by which we were finally guided to decide on the flag design is that heraldry does not allow the juxtaposition of colours or metals, that is one colour cannot be put on another and one metal cannot be put on another. Moreover, the only metals recognized in heraldry are gold and silver, that is yellow and white.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it was a matter of applying those principles to the problem submitted to us. The conclusions can be found in the committee report, and I quote the main conclusions which were finally reached by way of elimination.

(a) The three maple leaf design was retained by a vote of 8 to 6.

(b) The single maple leaf design was retained by a vote of 13 to 1.

(c) The design containing the union jack and/or the fleur-de-lis was rejected by a vote of 9 to 5.

Then, the committee had to choose between the three maple leaf design and the single maple leaf design, and another vote was taken. As we know, the single maple leaf design was retained by a vote of 14 to 0. However, it should be added that, on a last vote to determine whether or not the committee accepted finally and definitely the last design, the result of the vote was 10 to 4.

Mr. Speaker, shortly after the committee on the flag had done its work, I had the honour and privilege to lead the Canadian delegates to NATO on a visit of the Canadian military bases in Germany and then to the NATO parliamentary conference in Paris; later on, we were the guests of the Berlin government. Before leaving, I took great care to place in my pocket a model of the flag chosen by the committee. And wherever I went, I showed it to the officers, the soldiers and the Canadians in Paris. On every single occasion, without any exceptions, the servicemen, from high ranking officers to buck privates, as well as Canadians in Paris, expressed their delight with the design chosen by the committee and all were happy to have a Canadian flag.

[*Text*]

Mr. MacInnis: Would the hon. member permit a question?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dubé: Certainly, as soon as I have finished my speech.

Before I left, Mr. Speaker, I met a high ranking officer in the Canadian army who told me that if the Canadian troops in Cyprus had a Canadian flag, many of their difficulties would be eliminated. In fact, in several instances the Canadian troops in Cyprus had to paint the word "Canada" on the walls which surrounded their encampments in order to avoid the shots which were intended for others. This means that the members of this

house who claim that our soldiers do not wish a new flag should obtain their information at the true source.

Mr. Speaker, I know that four members of the committee, who proved so by their vote in the house, preferred the red ensign. It is their right, it is their privilege, and I respect their intentions. But they must respect the decision of others.

I also know that about 60 and perhaps more members in the House of Commons have preference for the red ensign. It is their right and their privilege, but they must take into consideration the wishes of the other 200 members. By their persistence in delaying intentionally the adoption of a new Canadian flag, I feel they throw our democratic mechanism out of gear, they make a mockery of parliament and they will have to answer for their actions before the people one day.

Mr. Speaker, the flag debate has been going on for 34 days. A committee was set up at the specific request of the Leader of the Opposition. This committee sat during six weeks, for a total of 45 hours. The question has been exhausted.

It seems to me the time has now come for all of us, and especially for those who have been telling us for weeks that they want to safeguard national unity, to support in this house this truly Canadian flag design and to salute it with pride when it becomes our new Canadian flag.

[*Text*]

Mr. MacInnis: I just want to take time enough to ask the hon. member whether he would now answer a question. I understood him to say that while travelling overseas, showing the design which was the choice of the flag committee to high ranking officers and other employees of the Canadian government in Europe and soliciting opinions on it, he had received favourable replies from those high ranking officers. I wonder if I understood him right. Did the hon. member say he had received favourable replies from all those high ranking officers and others down to the simplest privates. Is that what the hon. member said?

Mr. Dubé: Does the hon. member ask me whether all those to whom I talked about the flag and all those to whom I showed the design approved it? That is the case. They were all in favour—unanimous. I have not met a single person who did not like the model and who was not happy with it.

[Mr. Dubé.]

Mr. MacInnis: Such being the case, does the hon. gentleman not think that his reference to Canadian privates serving overseas in the Canadian army as "simple" is a disgraceful one and reflects a ridiculous attitude on the part of the hon. member?

Mr. Dubé: The only ridiculous comment is the one we have just heard.

Mr. Ralph Cowan (York-Humber): I realize that the guillotine of closure has been raised and is ready to drop but I rise nevertheless to speak in favour of the amendment which has been introduced whereby we would instruct the flag committee to report back in favour of the retention of the Canadian red ensign as Canada's national flag.

In rising at this time I also wish to protest against the imposition of closure by a vote of the house which does not represent the majority of the voters of the Dominion of Canada. I voted against the imposition of closure this afternoon because I do not feel that closure should be applied by a government aided by the supporters it can find elsewhere in the house when the members of parliament themselves do not command the majority of the voters behind them. We have been told there is a mandate out for a Canadian flag. There has never been a plebiscite placed before the people asking them to express their views on Canada's national flag. We are simply told we have a mandate to change the present flag.

No practical politician would desire to lay too much stress upon the mandate theory of a general election. There are men who have been elected to this house because they are residents of the ridings in which they ran. Others have been elected because they have advocated some diversion of waters in British Columbia to the prairies; others because they had promised additional authority for the Department of Fisheries. There are 265 members of this house and there are 300 or 400 reasons why they are here. There is no underlying mandate given to the 265 members to impose a flag on this nation.

When you analyse the vote and see how few have been elected on majority votes it will be realized definitely that there is no mandate. In April, 1963, the Liberal party got 41 per cent of the national vote. The Conservative party got 33 per cent, the Social Credit party 12 per cent and the New Democratic party 14 per cent of the total national vote. That does not look like any mandate to anybody on the question of a national flag. A mandate is defined as a

clear instruction, authorization or direction. How anyone can call a 41 per cent vote a clear instruction and authorization or direction is beyond my comprehension, particularly when there are scores of seats where the question of a flag was never even raised. But in August of this year, as I said in the course of some previous remarks, we were advised that the flag question had all been settled. The country had decided, and the three maple leaf flag was "it". A member of the cabinet was speaking in British Columbia when he made that flatfooted statement in August. That was the three leaf flag. In November, the same cabinet minister, speaking in the maritimes, said that 90 per cent of the country was in favour of the one leaf design. That was only three months later. What loyalty is there to suggested national emblems when you see people switching from the red ensign to a three leaf flag in August and to a one leaf flag in November? There is no loyalty there.

When it comes to the subject of closure and a free vote, three times in this house within the past two weeks we have had the opportunity of adjourning the debate to enable us to get off the flag question and proceed to some necessary government business. On all three occasions I voted for the adjournment of the debate. You know how the others voted in this house, Mr. Speaker. That was a free vote of course. Always voting the same way, but a free vote. Now, when closure is introduced we have a free vote. And notice how the vote went. It was again a free vote, of course. There was no control in that regard. I want to emphasize the fact that it was a free vote.

The statement was made in this house on Friday that although this is a minority government it is not a minority parliament. That is a very fine, mouth-filling phrase. But what are the facts of the matter? We are not a minority parliament, it has been said. I propose to give some figures which have taken me some time to analyse. I have had mathematical specialists undertaking this analysis for me. I would point out that the 129 Liberal members of this house did not receive a majority of the votes of the electorate in the ridings which sent them here. These figures have been compiled so as to include all by-elections held from April, 1963 up to and including Waterloo South and Westmorland. To continue, 129 Liberal members have 2,060,000 votes behind them. The same members have 2,082,000 votes against them. The Social Credit party has nine members in this house who were elected on the basis of 120,000 favourable votes with 166,000 votes against them. The nine Social Credit members gathered 41.9 per cent of the votes cast in their constituencies. The 18 members of the New Democratic party are here with 251,001 votes behind them and 356,879 votes against them. The 18 members of the N.D.P. in this house collected 41.2 per cent of the votes of the constituencies who sent them here. The Ralliement Créditiste, with 13 members, have 147,936 votes behind them and 168,725 votes against them. They gathered 46.7 per cent of the votes in the 13 constituencies which sent them here. I would point out that the Liberals, the Social Credit party and the Créditistes from which the closure votes came are a minority in their own constituencies, let alone a minority in the house. I have mentioned this point before and I can only mention it once again. I do not see how anyone can conscientiously support the application of closure when this government does not have a majority behind it. I am in favour of closure and it should be on the statute books; but it should only be used by a government which has an absolute control of the house and an absolute control over the constituencies for which its members sit. That is only fair and proper. When you have a majority government representing the majority of the voters, then it should have a free hand to impose objectives which it has stated to be its political intentions. But when you have a government which is only here, you might say, on sufferance without a majority vote behind them, closure should not be applied because it means that a minority of the voters in the country are applying closure to a majority of the voters in the country, which is the denigration of democracy.

I have been reading the remarks which were made in this house on Thursday and Friday last. I was absent from the house on Thursday last because I was sitting in the police court in Cooksville with the 12 taxicab operators whom the Department of Transport is persecuting—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Cowan: I mean prosecuting—in connection with having picked up taxicab fares at Malton airport despite a ten year contract which the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer) gave when he was minister to Air Terminal Transport without tender. We sincerely hope to get this matter on a legal and proper basis where there will be tenders for that government contract requested, and we

hope that this ten year deal can be broken. That deal is for a longer period of time than the normal span of two complete parliaments. However, we are making progress on that. We had a good time on Thursday in front of Magistrate Andrews.

Then last Friday I was out of the house and I was paired with the seconder of this motion on the flag. I could not have had a better pair, unless it had been the chairman of the committee himself, and I thank the seconder for the pair. While I was out of the house a certain statement was made. The criticism was offered that, "as a result of some kind of deal with one part of Canada, with Quebec, and that somehow this is Quebec's flag. Mr. Speaker, nothing, could be more malevolently designed to stir up division and controversy in this country. It is untrue and it is unworthy". I regret that that matter was ever brought forward and I am glad I am not the one who brought it forward.

In this regard may I refer to a statement made by the hon. member for Outremont-St. Jean (Mr. Lamontagne), our Secretary of State, on June 13 in Toronto, which is reported in the Toronto *Daily Star*. The Secretary of State made this statement to the press:

> The M.P. for Outremont-St. Jean conceded the new flag would be more widely accepted in Quebec than in the rest of Canada.

I wonder why, Mr. Speaker, it would be more widely accepted in Quebec than in the rest of Canada if it is not particularly desired in the province of Quebec?

Then we are told by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), as reported on page 11038 of *Hansard* for Friday last:

> If, Mr. Speaker, the absence from our national flag of symbols which to a large part of our people seem to represent early differences...is the absence of those earlier symbols from a Canadian flag too much of a sacrifice for the rest of us to make in the interests of unity in this country.

Who is being asked, Mr. Speaker, to make these sacrifices, and what are they being given in return? Why must one element of the community everlastingly be asked to make sacrifice, sacrifice, sacrifice in the interests of unity?

Now, Mr. Speaker, analysing the vote which took place in this house on Thursday I find that there were 45 Liberal members from Quebec who voted against holding a plebiscite. It is quite interesting to note that those 45 Quebec Liberals who voted against holding a plebiscite captured 622,230 votes in the April 1963 election, with 654,666 votes being cast against them. Where is the mandate there? Twelve of the Créditistes voted against the referendum. Those 12 Créditistes from the province of Quebec captured 133,235 votes, with 158,565 against. Five of the Social Credit members from Quebec voted against the referendum. They held 76,227 votes, with 87,600 votes cast against them. There were 99,489 votes for those seven Social Credit members of parliament when they were elected, and 118,367 votes were cast against them. With regard to the 12 members of the New Democratic party who voted against the plebiscite, there were 154,334 votes behind them and 219,089 votes against them. I give you those figures, Mr. Speaker, to show that a majority of the voters is not behind these people who have voted against holding a plebiscite.

The next question which comes up—

Mr. Scott: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Cowan: —is this: Why was this question raised in the first place? There was no need to bring it up.

Mr. Scott: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Cowan: I have mentioned before, and I repeat, that on the front page of the Ottawa *Citizen* for March 13, 1963 there is a headline with reference to the then leader of the opposition who was running for parliament. Perhaps the hon. member for Vancouver Centre was right when he said that statements made when running for parliament do not have to be put into effect once you are elected. But on the front page of the Ottawa *Citizen* four weeks before the election we read the headline "Pearson doesn't reject red ensign as our flag". Then follows a report by Southam News Services datelined Sherbrooke:

> Liberal leader Pearson said today he had "never rejected the red ensign as Canada's flag and do not do so now".
>
> Commenting on reports out of Winnipeg last week that he wanted to see something other than the red ensign as Canada's national flag Mr. Pearson said that he merely wanted a distinctive Canadian flag...
>
> To reject the red ensign would mean the rejection of a British symbol, the union jack, which means much to so many people who have served and fought under it, and this he did not advocate.

That statement was made, as I say, within four weeks of the election. That statement has never been denied, and there are men sitting in the press gallery who were in

Sherbrooke, Quebec when that statement was issued to them. We cannot call them as witnesses from the press gallery, but I have been talking to them and I can identify them quite readily.

Now, I take it that the word of that speaker was to be trusted. He said on August 5 last, on a C.B.C. television network program:

I say that as one who honours the red ensign—

Therefore he will vote for its retention and not for its disappearance. Then he went on to say:

I hope that parliament will be able to decide this matter with a minimum of bitterness and rancour. I believe that when parliament does decide, the people of Canada will accept the decision of parliament.

If this parliament has a majority of the people behind it when it votes, then it is expressing the will of the people. Why does the leader of the government say:

I believe that when parliament does decide, the people of Canada will accept the decision of parliament.

I want to see a government which represents the decision of the people and the desire of the people when it votes. I do not like to see a parliament deciding something and then "believing" that the people of Canada will accept later the decision of parliament.

If we have to get rid of our old flag because of its historic connections, because it is not distinctively Canadian and not typical of this country, then why do we not get rid of our system of weights and measures? I find pints and quarts and bushels and pecks disturbing. And when it comes to gills and rods and poles and perches and acres and cubic feet, it is really upsetting. This does not belong to Canada. This is an English system, so why not have a purely Canadian system? Why do we bother with the English language?

Why do we speak in the English language? Why do we not get a language of our own? Why do we stick to the use of the French language, it does not belong to us? The French language belongs to France and the English language belongs to England. Let us have a language of our own.

I say, let us stick with the red ensign if we are proud of our history. Surely there is not one member of this house who would not say that the majority of the people of Canada believe as we do. When we vote let us vote in a manner to indicate our support for the retention of the red ensign, within the next two hours.

Mr. Nicholas Mandziuk (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to follow the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) who has just made a very eloquent address, in spite of the fact he is a member of the Liberal party. If we read the weekly report to the weekly press by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Francis) we might be led to believe that the hon. member for York-Humber will be run out of the party if he continues to express himself with that intestinal fortitude, which is not possessed by other members of his party. I congratulate that hon. member and take my hat off to him.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the address of the leader of the N.D.P., the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas). The Indian bands in my constituency very often honour individuals by making them members of the band and giving them names which relate to their characteristics. I am sure if that hon. member were honoured by the tribes of my constituency they would name him "Chief Two-Voice Tommie", because he spoke for us and against us; he combed the Liberals against the grain; he took a crack against the Conservatives hoping to create a vacuum, with the idea that he and his party in the long run would become the benefactors. In the long run I think the people of this country will understand that he is still preaching socialism.

I did not intend to speak during this debate.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mandziuk: But I intend to speak now, so you need not applaud too hastily. I hesitated to take part in this debate because I felt it was moving in the direction of an Anglo-Franco dialogue, becoming louder as the time passed. It was creating disunity, I admit, but it was started by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) who was bound and determined that this flag should be placed foremost on the list of things to be done by this parliament, above important pieces of legislation. It was my feeling that a member who was of neither French nor English origin should act like a good neighbour when a common law husband and wife are fighting, and stay out of it.

I felt like staying out of this debate, but I was prompted to take part by the impressive speech of that sweet young lady, the hon. member for Winnipeg South (Mrs. Konantz). She made a tremendous impression upon me, as I am sure she did on this house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mandziuk: You perhaps will not applaud after you have heard the rest of what I have to say.

That hon. member discussed the history of Canada, told us about Mennonites, Germans, Ukrainians and Icelanders, but she did not tell us under what flag these people came to this country. She very deftly skirted around that fact.

She informed us that she was a member of the committee that studied the flag issue. I know how the Liberal members of that committee voted. The Prime Minister did not make any announcement to the members of his party as to how they should vote, and I do not suggest that the Liberal members were told how to vote. However, they knew what the Prime Minister wanted.

The Prime Minister during his outright speech in this house said, among other things, that there must be just one national flag. We do have another resolution on the order paper and, although I am not allowed to discuss it or even mention it, I should like to know why this debate is a two flag debate.

The Prime Minister also said that he had agreed to a compromise. I agreed with the Prime Minister when he said that the three leaf design was more attractive than this one maple leaf caricature which we now have before us. I agreed with him when he said that the three maple leaf design was a more attractive and beautiful flag than the design chosen by this committee. I support the amendment which, if adopted, would send this issue again to the flag committee.

We should give some consideration to the red ensign under which those people referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg South came to this nation. Those people were guaranteed certain freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of religion—as well as British justice and fair play.

An hon. Member: They were guaranteed there would be no closure.

Mr. Mandziuk: They were guaranteed there would be no closure, yet we certainly have closure in this house.

An hon. Member: Your time has expired.

Mr. Mandziuk: During the 30 days of this debate, which I admit is a rather long period of time, few if any of the members who continually interrupt us have had guts enough to stand up on their feet and ask questions. All we have heard them say is "order, order" and "question, question". When I have completed my speech I will be glad to answer any questions, but I have the floor at this time.

I am pleased to know that there is one member on that side of the house who has the courage to stand up, but as far as those members who shout "order" and "question" are concerned, I must state that I am ashamed of their attitude and ashamed of this government and those who support it. I think the people of this country should be made aware of the fact that the members on the government side of this house have been glued to their seats, nailed to their seats, pinned to their seats, and by whose orders? They have been pinned to their seats by the orders of a man who, by the actions of some of his ministers, has been forced to send out a code of ethics. That man does not happen to be in the house at this time, but I suggest that if the division bell rings he will be here posthaste to vote for this flag which he suggests is the only one for this nation. He is the man who has said that he has compromised in accepting the one leaf design recommended by the committee rather than the three leaves design. Of course a member of parliament cannot make or take bets on the actions of the House of Commons, but I would bet that if the Créditistes, Social Crediters and members of the N.D.P. had not committed themselves to supporting that man, the right hon. gentleman who leads the Liberal party would not have pushed this flag through. Am I right in that or not?

He knows he has a majority in the house but he does not know whether he has a majority in the country, and the hon. member for York-Humber has said so plainly. I had an over-all majority over my three opponents of over 50 per cent. Yet I do not say I have a mandate. I am expressing my own opinion. I know the feelings of a lot of people. The government has no mandate but a majority has been guaranteed to these people who want to bury the past.

There is another matter I should like to bring up, the question of the founding races. The subject of the founding races is beginning to wear pretty thin. I too have studied Canadian history and I am not a member of either of the founding races. I am one of those who Mr. René Lévesque says have to become either English or French or—well, I am not going to say the rest. But, Mr. Speaker, out of me and the likes of me and all those mentioned by the hon. member for Winnipeg South (Mrs. Konantz) you can make darn good Canadians but you cannot make English or French people out of them

but only good Canadians. The founding races? It was a marriage of convenience. I would say it was a common law marriage of the conqueror and the conquered. You might as well admit it. You cannot rewrite history, and I have studied Canadian history as much as you people have.

What of the conquerors? Most of them were United Empire Loyalists who came here after the revolution when the United States broke off from England. They wanted to live under the British flag. What did those in Lower Canada want? They were afraid that if they ever joined the United States they would be absorbed as the French have been absorbed in Louisiana, where there is no trace of the French language or culture. I do not know about the religious part of it. So it was a marriage of convenience, a common law marriage and the two parties are fighting today. Who started the fight? Not the English speaking segment of Canada at all, Mr. Speaker. That is the way I see Canadian history.

The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith) said this was the last chance. I believe this will be the last time I will ever speak in favour of the red ensign. It will be the last time I will have the opportunity of doing so, and that applies to all other members.

An hon. Member: Let us vote.

Mr. Mandziuk: Oh, yes, I know you have got a guarantee that others will vote with you.

Mr. Woolliams: You were a Conservative once.

Mr. Monteith: He does not know any better.

Mr. Woolliams: You have said you never voted Liberal until you ran as a Liberal, Harry.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair would like to hear the interesting historical summary.

Mr. Mandziuk: Mr. Speaker, I know there are people in this country and many of the members across the way and to the left of us who will cheer when they pull down the red ensign. It will become a foot wiper in the same way as some have already wiped their feet on it in certain parts of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Mandziuk: Yes, that has been proven.

An hon. Member: That is a stupid thing to say.

Mr. Mandziuk: That has been reported and never denied. There will be many foot wipers and some will cheer when the red maple leaf goes up.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mandziuk: I am going to tell you this, Mr. Speaker. I like to see a man get up and say something instead of yak-yaking and hiding behind somebody else. We have heard that for 30 days. The Liberals have been glued and nailed to their seats. I wonder why? I do not know. I think the man who established the code of ethics for the whole cabinet must have established one for the whole party. That is perfectly all right. That is his business. But, Mr. Speaker, there are going to be many people in this nation who will have heavy hearts. They are going to be sorry to see the ensign come down.

An hon. Member: You hope.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Mandziuk: Mr. Speaker, if any of these members of the Liberal party want to get up and ask me questions that is fine or if they want to speak after me I will be glad to give them part of my time, but they have not got what it takes.

An hon. Member: The guts.

Mr. Mandziuk: There are many who are going to have heavy hearts. Many are going to be sorry. We are not Africans, Mr. Speaker, and I am not insulting the Africans. I feel that if this parliament in its wisdom or ignorance, shall I say, adopts this flag, and I include the Senate and His Excellency the Governor General, I too will have to salute this flag. But I have one thing about which I am proud, Mr. Speaker. Two years ago the province of Manitoba enacted a provincial statute making the red ensign the provincial flag. I asked the premier of the province what he would do if the federal government relented and accepted the red ensign. He said, "Then we will just repeal our enactment". I do not think Mr. Roblin is happy. He would have been glad to repeal that act. I know where his sympathies lie. I know where Mr. Thatcher's sympathies lie and Mr. Manning's.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Smallwood.

Mr. Mandziuk: Mr. Smallwood too. Many people will look upon the hauling down of the red ensign with heavy hearts. I speak with emotion because emotion is natural for

those of my race. I am not trying to get into the family quarrel between those in the common law marriage, but so far as the people to whom the hon. member for Winnipeg South referred are concerned I want to correct the impression she left. They came here to live under a flag that gave them guarantees, that gave the people of Quebec the guarantees that enable them to speak and act as they do today.

Mr. Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Thomas) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken	Kennedy
Alkenbrack	Kindt
Bell	Korchinski
Bigg	Lambert
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)	Leboe
Cantelon	Loney
Cardiff	MacEwan
Chatterton	MacInnis
Churchill	MacLean (Queens)
Clancy	Macquarrie
Coates	MacRae
Cowan	McBain
Crouse	McIntosh
Danforth	Madill
Diefenbaker	Mandziuk
Dinsdale	Millar
Doucett	Monteith
Enns	Moore
Fairweather	More
Fane	Muir (Cape Breton
Flemming (Victoria-	North and Victoria)
Carleton)	Muir (Lisgar)
Forbes	Nasserden
Gundlock	Nesbitt
Hales	Nielsen
Hamilton	Nowlan
Herridge	Nugent
Horner (The Battlefords)	Olson
Howe (Wellington-	Ormiston
Huron)	Pascoe
Irvine	Patterson
Jones, Mrs.	Pugh
Jorgenson	Rapp
Rhéaume	Wadds, Mrs.
Rynard	Watson (Assiniboia)
Simpson	Webb
Smith	Weichel
Southam	Willoughby
Starr	Winch
Stefanson	Winkler
Stenson	Woolliams—80.
Thomas	

NAYS

Messrs:

Addison	Godin
Armstrong	Gordon
Asselin (Notre Dame	Grafftey
de Grâce)	Granger
Asselin (Richmond-	Gray
Wolfe)	Greene
Badanai	Grégoire
Balcer	Guay
Barnett	Habel
Basford	Hahn
Batten	Haidasz
Beaulé	Harley
Béchard	Hays
Beer	Honey
Bélanger	Howard
Benidickson	Howe (Hamilton South)
Benson	Jewett, Miss
Berger	Kelly
Blouin	Klein
Boulanger	Knowles
Boutin	Konantz, Mrs.
Brewin	Lachance
Brown	Laing
Byrne	LaMarsh, Miss
Cadieux (Terrebonne)	Lamontagne
Cameron (High Park)	Lamoureux
Cameron (Nanaimo-	Langlois
Cowichan-The Islands)	Laniel
Cantin	Latulippe
Caouette	Laverdière
Cardin	Leblanc
Caron	Leduc
Carter	Legault
Cashin	Lessard (Lake St. John)
Chapdelaine	Lessard (St. Henry)
Choquette	Lloyd
Chrétien	Loiselle
Côté (Chicoutimi)	Macaluso
Côté (Longueuil)	Macdonald
Crossman	MacEachen
Cyr	Mackasey
Davis	MacNaught
Deachman	McIlraith
Deschatelets	McMillan
Dionne	McNulty
Douglas	McWilliam
Drouin	Marcoux
Drury	Martin (Timmins)
Dubé	Martineau
Dupuis	Mather
Emard	Matheson
Ethier	Matte
Eudes	Mitchell
Favreau	Moreau
Fisher	Morison
Forest	Mullally
Francis	Munro
Frenette	Nicholson
Gauthier	Nixon
Gelber	O'Keefe
Gendron	Otto
Girouard	Ouellet

Paul	Rouleau
Pearson	Roxburgh
Pennell	Ryan
Pepin	Saltsman
Perron	Sauvé
Peters	Scott
Pickersgill	Sharp
Pigeon	Stewart
Pilon	Tardif
Plourde	Teillet
Prittie	Temple
Prud'homme	Thompson
Regan	Tremblay
Ricard	Tucker
Richard	Turner
Rideout, Mrs.	Wahn
Rinfret	Walker
Robichaud	Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Rochon	Webster
Rock	Whelan—162.
Rondeau	

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Groos: Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, as we enter the last and dying hour of this debate I consider it a privilege and an honour to participate once more in our discussions as the House of Commons reaches a very historic stage in the establishment of the flag which will be flown in Canada. A few days ago I had the pleasure, as I have this evening, of making a contribution to this debate regarding one of the amendments which was then before the house. At that time I laid before me on my desk four, five or six prominent daily newspapers from across the two main provinces of Canada, and I indicated the importance of their headlines for that day. None of the headlines made any reference to the flag debate which was taking place in the house at the time. There was a sinister warning made on that particular day to me and all Canadians by the reference to those things which are unsatisfactory in our Canadian political life. Those references had a bearing, in my opinion, on the words I used on August 12, the day I first participated in this debate. It is not my intention this evening to be as lengthy as I was on that occasion, but because of the close association of that warning with the words I used at that time, and the close association between the situation as it existed at that time and as it exists tonight, I should like to quote from that speech of August 12, at which time I quoted from a book known as "The Fight for Canada" by W. Wood, with reference to the time Canada was a colony of France. I said:

> We find that Vaudreuil was "—a liar, a backbiter, and a pettifogger, utterly unfit for his great position; and the best excuse that can be made for him is that he was almost as great a fool as a knave."
>
> Dealing with Bigot it says:
>
> "He deliberately set to work to create universal destitution in order that he might requisition help from France and make his commission on it."

Is there not a comparison to be found between the situation which existed at that time and the situation which exists today?

The government has chosen a very inopportune time to suggest that it has the right to present a national flag for Canada under existing circumstances. I think this is particularly true when one considers what might have been done during the long summer months, during the months of the fall, and during the months of the winter, to the greater advantage of the people of Canada than a debate such as we have had on a flag issue.

I think also of the situation which has faced the eastern farmers, and what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays) has said about that situation. That situation has grown worse at least in the area which I have the honour to represent. The Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé) stated that the farmers of eastern Canada were in a very sorry state so far as their economical situation is concerned. Many of my colleagues, as well as myself, have pleaded with the Minister of Agriculture to do something about this situation. What was his answer to this plea? It was simply that if we just keep quiet everything will look after itself. He stated that we were not rendering the farmers of eastern Canada any service by mentioning the situation. I guess this house did not do them any service by fighting this flag battle, because while we were debating the national flag issue the Minister of Agriculture forgot about the growing protest on behalf of the eastern Canadian farmer. Surely this house could have rendered some more beneficial service to the people of Canada than has been rendered them during the course of this debate.

I believe this night is an historic one. We are approaching Christmas, that season hallowed by the Christian world. I believe Canada is a Christian country, and that Christianity is part of our heritage. I believe that Christianity is representative of our way of life and, as I said on August 3, 1960, Christianity as brought down to us through English common law also forms a part of the laws

of this country and the laws of the United States. I quoted an authority at that time, Mr. Speaker, and that authority is still the one to which I refer in support of my argument today.

The purpose of my brief speech this evening is this. An hon. member who spoke earlier in the course of this debate made a very earnest and passionate appeal, and speaking as to the other side of the question he said that the adoption of the flag now before us for consideration would not have application in Christian heritage. He said the flag would have no application to those things we cherish in our legal structure, or our institutions.

When I returned home last Sunday and, as is my custom, I attended church service with my wife and family, the man who preached the sermon impressed on me very emphatically that the times in which we live are changing. He said that Christianity was not keeping pace with the increase in the population of the world. He said that all churches which regard themselves as Christian churches were tending to adopt Christianity as an easy thing, and treating it just like a club, rather than a religion. He said there was a tendency by this mode of life to remove symbols, such as the cross, from Christianity. He went on to say, as I indicated this evening, that if we remove the cross as a symbol of something which we who call ourselves Christians believe in, we are actually denying our Christian heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore the fact that all Canadians who find themselves in the situation with which we are faced tonight will grieve the denial of our Christian heritage under the flag which is proposed to be flown over Canada. I feel as sincerely about this as anyone who takes a different position.

As I present my point of view to the house tonight, I am not unmindful of the contributions which were made during the world wars, and while my contribution was insignificant, one of my colleagues lies beneath the ground somewhere in Holland. He died as a result of being shot down. That situation is not unlike the situations of several of our colleagues on the other side of this house, and I have particularly in mind a member of the family of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill).

With all sincerity I do not think we will ever live down the fact that we are removing something which men who have given their lives, honoured as part of Canada's Christian and democratic heritage.

[Mr. Winkler.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Ouellet (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, on September 2 I took part in the proceedings of this parliament in order to express my views in the controversial Canadian flag debate.

Let me say first of all that, in my opinion, a distinctive flag is not an extinctive flag. I wonder why Canadians of my province who, in many respects, show so much faithfulness to their origins, have ceased to believe in the mission assigned to them by Providence.

Unfortunately, I fail to understand why, in considering this delicate matter of selecting a flag, they admit so readily that the fleur-de-lis should disappear from our flag, even from our mind, and forever. Perhaps they agree with the remarks made last Thursday night, December 10, by the hon. member for Middlesex West (Mr. Thomas) who stated this, as reported on page 11023 of *Hansard*:

> I understand the feelings of our friends. They are quite willing to forgo any symbolism of our French heritage in Canada provided they can, at the same time, eliminate all the symbolism of the British heritage in connection with our country from our flag.

On second thought, those words seem to me strictly true. I knew before that the hon. member was living in an aura of wisdom. This reminds me of King Solomon's characteristic touch when he offered two women, who were quarrelling about the possession of a young child to cut the living child in two. The true mother then preferred yielding her child to seeing it die before her eyes. I leave it to each of you to draw his own conclusions from this excerpt of the book of wisdom.

Of course, I am in favour of a Canadian flag, but a single flag, representing, or comprising the symbols of the union jack and the fleur-de-lis, with a green maple leaf.

On this last point, I must say this. The hon. member for Vegreville, Alberta (Mr. Fane), this noble representative of a riding where 40 different nationalities are living together in harmony and who, moreover, has received a third mandate with an absolute majority, insisted upon the inclusion of a green maple leaf. I thank him for this.

Are you aware that a red leaf maple tree does not mean much to a maple sugar producer? I myself am a maple sugar producer,

so I have a knowledge of the facts. The good varieties of sugar and syrup maple trees have green leaves during the spring as well as in summertime; in the fall, the leaves take a yellowish colour, the same as that of ripe wheat, then they fall and return to the soil. The red leaf maple tree may be lovely to look at, but that is all that can be said for it, as far as its practical value is concerned.

In proceeding with my investigation on this point, I noted on page 11038 of *Hansard* in the left hand column, words that in my opinion, come from a true diplomat—from the Prime Minister's lips—about the maple leaf for our flag, and I quote:

> —it has become so deeply a part of our symbolic history. This is especially true when the other symbol of our past, which has appeared on our flags in the past, the union jack, is to be recognized in another way.

There is the core of the problem. I want to dispense with any comment.

Quite often I find I am asking myself questions; it seems I am looking at myself and at everything around me, and I have the feeling that we are at the crossroads.

At this time those nations who yesterday celebrated their independence with glee are plunged into days of agony. They thought that they must at all costs rid themselves of imperialists, Belgian imperialists, Dutch imperialists, French imperialists and British imperialists. Was it a decision based on a common desire to thwart materialism, injustice and hatred in order to follow in the path of love? I do not think so, Mr. Speaker.

I think it was a day of victory for facility, for licence, for materialistic forces over moral forces. In that regard, everyone of us has a responsibility, because we are interdependent in this world.

But however, is it necessary to insult our Queen, Her Majesty Elizabeth II, to declare our eagerness to lead the good fight against the abuses of capitalism, against famine, leprosy, nakedness and against corruption in the public service, sure symptoms of our despicable selfishness? No, no, no.

Those who know me are not surprised to hear me give such a testimony in this house today.

In the tradition of my family, I learned that in two different periods, several Ouellets gave their lives serving the king of France, here in Canada in the province of Quebec, and then later under the régime recognized by the Paris treaty, and today I want to be worthy of my ancestors. I recognize that England did make some errors in her colonial policy. I think, however, she did her best for us, French Canadians. In any case, we had not been spoiled by France.

In fact, each of us believes he is invested with undeniable powers, or at least with a fair possession of a political and legislative power.

Mr. Speaker, if our loyalty towards the French Canadians rests on the contempt or persecution of anything that is not French, whether it is toward the members of this house or of the other place, or elsewhere, then we put justice and charity on the rack.

I have always believed that when love and hate meet and face each other, victory goes to love. Our Canadian political history teaches us lessons to remember and, as a member for the county of Rimouski, a county which is inscribed in the golden book of Canadian democracy, here is why.

Indeed, we all learned that one day Sir Georges Étienne Cartier was elected in Manitoba, in the constituency of Provencher, Sir Wilfrid Laurier in Saskatchewan, in the constituency of Prince Albert—they are glorious, the constituents of Prince Albert—and before that, Robert Baldwin was elected by acclamation in Rimouski. These facts are on the record and do honour to us.

At present I am saddened when I see that at the very moment when there is a rift in the structure of the communist bloc, free men are destroying themselves by despising the principles they had cherished until the advent of a contagious materialism.

Before I take my seat, I must say that I believe in the future of Canada—a future resting on a glorious past where men and women with different languages and customs erected a country which history has already recognized as unwilling to die.

I quote from the third paragraph of our national anthem, the following words:

> Amour sacré du Trône et de l'Autel,
> Remplis nos cœurs de ton souffle immortel!

All of you, Canadians, let this be your watchword; carry on the fight on behalf of this troubled, patient and harrowed humanity. Noblesse oblige. Let us never forget that we carry a heavy responsibility on our shoulders. Our flag deserves all this attention.

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker—

[*Text*]

Mr. Rhéaume: Oh, here he goes again.

Canadian Flag

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: I hear the hon. member for Yukon saying:

[*Text*]

Mr. Rhéaume: Northwest Territories.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: I hear the hon. member for the Northwest Territories, and not the Yukon saying:

[*Text*]

It is true I am going again but not on so many occasions as the Conservatives have for the past four or five months.

Mr. Rhéaume: You have nothing to say.

Mr. Caouette: Nothing to lose, no.

Mr. Rhéaume: Nothing to say.

Mr. Caouette: Listening to you, no, nothing to lose.

[*Translation*]

A few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, we saw the hon. member for Grey-Bruce pose as a martyr.

Naturally, it was to be expected that those poor Conservative members would complain that they were not given the opportunity to express their views freely in this house since the resolution for a distinctive national flag was introduced. Well, the Conservatives—

[*Text*]

Mr. Winkler: I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question?

Mr. Caouette: Yes, I will.

Mr. Winkler: I should like to ask the hon. member if he would not feel more proud of his citizenship in Canada if he put forth as humble an effort for his country as I have?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, on this specific point, I just love to see the Conservatives applaud and, in this regard, I should like to remind them of what Her Majesty the Queen said in Quebec city, during the recent visit, a month and a half ago, and that is that some people's patriotism must not prevent them from understanding the patriotism of others. I have no hesitation in telling the hon. member for Grey-Bruce that I am just as much a Canadian patriot as he is, has been and ever will be.

[*Text*]

Mr. Winkler: Not if the statements you have made are true.

[Mr. Rhéaume.]

Mr. Caouette: Stand up and ask your question.

Mr. Winkler: I say to you, not if the statements you have made are true.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Could we have order, please? The hon. member for Villeneuve has the floor.

Mr. Rhéaume: You sold lots of cars.

Mr. Caouette: It is all right, I do not need you to sell cars anywhere in Ontario. I am not one to follow politicians that are more interested in their party than their patriotism to Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the Conservatives speak, in turn, again and again, and surely more often than not.

Last Friday the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) stated in the house that the hon. member for Villeneuve was ready to accept anything as a distinctive national flag, that he was ready to accept symbols of Italy, under Mussolini, that he was even ready to accept wartime Germany's swastika.

Mr. Speaker, from the time the question of a Canadian flag was introduced, I have always maintained in the house that we would vote for a flag which contained nothing else but Canadian symbols. We have never said what the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre repeated in the house: that I would be ready to accept anything on a distinctive Canadian flag. No, Mr. Speaker.

We took our stand at the very beginning of the flag debate. We have expressed our opinion, we have even suggested what would be our choice for a distinctive national flag: a flag with the red and white diagonals with a green maple leaf. That was our choice. However, at the same time, we suggested and offered to support whoever in the house would come up with a distinctive national flag, not a flag with the symbols of France or England, but a distinctive flag with Canadian symbols which would be our own and belong to us all, here, in Canada.

It is unfortunate to see how much division the flag debate has created, the gap it has put between the various nationalities in Canada.

We have heard about the French Canadian element, yes. We have heard about the English Canadian elements, very well. But when the Conservatives gave the impression or suggested throughout Canada that the distinc-

tive national flag was only a step to please French Canadians, then the Conservatives did a bad service to the Canadian unity and a very bad service to the understanding between the various groups which make up the Canadian society. We must not forget that there are in Canada Ukrainians, Poles, Italians. There are people of all nationalities in our country.

The Italians, the Ukrainians, the Poles are not interested in the French fleur-de-lis flag or the English union jack flag. But they are interested in a distinctive Canadian national flag, because they are real Canadians, in the same way as those who think as Canadians instead of English, or French, etc.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard all kinds of remarks on the part of the Conservatives and of a Liberal member. At this stage I want to mention that the only group in this house which was unanimous and voted unanimously, on several occasions, in favour of a distinctive national flag was the Ralliement Créditiste group which represents, to put it that way, the truly Canadian element, and not only the French Canadian, as it was suggested.

The leader of the official opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) has declared, in this house, that the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste is in the hands of the Liberals with regard to the flag. Two years ago the Liberals said exactly the same thing when the Conservatives banked on the support of the Créditistes to stay in power.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the flag is an issue which transcends political interests, political boundaries, which transcends even political parties as such. It is as Canadians that we support the proposal for a distinctive national flag.

The sixth report was presented to us by the chairman:

That the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday October 29, 1964, be now concurred in.

Mr. Speaker, we think that the time has come to accept a national distinctive flag, even if the sixth report recommends a flag that is not exactly according to our taste and even if its design does not seeem attractive.

We were even told that if the flag has red bars on a white field with a red maple leaf, it was—and this, for the information of the public—in order not to yield to the proposal of a member of the New Democratic party who was suggesting a red maple leaf with blue bars on a white field, which flag would have been more acceptable than the one now before us.

However, we will not stand against the vote on the national distinctive flag recommended to us by the committee.

The Conservatives referred to the fact that in 1945, by order in council, Canada had adopted the red ensign to replace the union jack. It was suggested that the Mackenzie King government had adopted the red ensign as the Canadian flag.

Today the Leader of the Opposition is asking us to add to the red ensign, besides the union jack now in the left upper corner, a fleur-de-lis in the lower part of the flag as a symbol of the heritage we received from our ancestors.

A few days ago I told the Leader of the Opposition, as I tell all Conservatives: We have the greatest respect for our ancestors and our forebears, for our great-grandfathers and great-grandmothers; however, not one Conservative today would put on the clothes or the shoes of his forebears who lived in 1867 or 1830. Everybody knows that, Mr. Speaker.

We are no longer living in the days of the catacombs of Rome or the beginning of Christendom; we are now at the point where we have to decide by ourselves, in Canada, whether we want to be a sovereign nation, an independent nation, a nation still part of the commonwealth of British nations, but we of the Ralliement Créditiste are not ready to adopt symbols which make us slaves and representatives of a foreign nation.

And I said many times, we are the first to recognize that, under the British laws, we have been able to exteriorize and become what we are today. However, it is time that, even though remaining members of the commonwealth of British nations, we have our own symbols, our aspirations and our will as a people and as members of parliament.

This afternoon, I heard the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) tell us:

[*Text*]

French and English speaking people should work together and this arrangement has to work both ways.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam to that point. The hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) did the same this afternoon. I suggest that if there is one part of the country where both elements have got along

together and understood each other, where the English and French elements have respected each other, it is actually the province of Quebec.

This afternoon the hon. member for Lapointe said that the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam had been premier of Saskatchewan for 17 years. This is a fact. I know what I am talking about, because I have relatives in south Saskatchewan, around Gravelbourg and Pontex, and I can say that in that province as in the others, separate schools—

[*Text*]

Mr. McIntosh: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Caouette: Definitely.

Mr. McIntosh: Would you volunteer to fight under this flag?

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Caouette: Would you repeat your question?

Mr. McIntosh: Yes. Would you volunteer to fight under this flag?

Mr. Caouette: I will volunteer to fight for security and freedom in Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to take a lesson in patriotism from any Conservative member in the House of Commons. I am even able to give them one in their own provinces.

When the other provinces of Canada treat their French minority the way we treat English speaking Canadians in the province of Quebec, the Conservatives can then afford to give me a lesson in patriotism.

I come from the Rouyn-Noranda area where there are English speaking people, Ukrainians, Italians, Poles, in short, people of all nationalities. We get along perfectly well.

In Montreal or Quebec city, we get along perfectly well also. Why in the other provinces, because we are French minorities do we have to pay double taxation for the administration of our schools in order to have our rights respected? That is what English Canadians do not understand.

Mr. Speaker, as long as I breathe I shall oppose any infringement upon the rights of the English speaking Canadians. But I shall fight so that no one will infringe upon my rights nor those of the French Canadians across Canada, not only in the province of Quebec.

It is on behalf of this Canada that we, of the Ralliement Créditiste, are prepared to support the adoption of a distinctive national flag, of a truly Canadian flag, neither French nor English Canadian, but a Canadian flag with Canadian symbols and something which represents Canada throughout the world, including the commonwealth of British nations. Let us be part of that society of nations.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Conservatives find it funny. We also found it funny to remain in the House of Commons for over four months to listen to stupid speeches, separatist speeches worse than those we heard in the province of Quebec.

The separatists are not in the province of Quebec. The separatists are the Conservatives sitting to your left.

Mr. Woolliams: You have your point mixed up.

Mr. Caouette: Certainly not. I am on the right track. I have my point right.

If the matter of the flag is not yet settled, the Conservatives are fully aware it is their fault. They have wasted the time of the house for weeks and months. I recently went to Toronto where I met some students.

An hon. Member: Why don't you go to Manitoba?

Mr. Caouette: For the hon. member's information, I might tell him that I intend to go to Manitoba.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member's time has expired. I now have to choose among three hon. members. The last three speakers have been the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Winkler) Conservative party, the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Ouellet) Conservative party, and the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) Créditiste, so now I will choose a Liberal, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson).

Mr. Woolliams: On a point of order.

An hon. Member: You are not in your place.

Mr. Woolliams: On a point of order, I move, seconded by my hon. friend from the Northwest Territories (Mr. Rhéaume) that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) be now heard.

Some hon. Members: Shame. Closure.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Woolliams) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Alkenbrack
Bell
Bigg
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Cantelon
Cardiff
Chatterton
Churchill
Clancy
Coates
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Doucett
Fairweather
Fane
Flemming (Victoria-Carleton)
Forbes
Grafftey
Gundlock
Hales
Hamilton
Horner (The Battlefords)
Howe (Wellington-Huron)
Irvine
Jones, Mrs.
Jorgenson
Kennedy
Kindt
Korchinski
Loney
MacEwan
MacInnis
MacLean (Queens)
MacRae
McBain
McIntosh
Madill
Mandziuk
Millar
Monteith
Moore
More
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nasserden
Nesbitt
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nugent
Ormiston
Ouellet
Pascoe
Pigeon
Pugh
Rapp
Rhéaume
Ricard
Rynard
Simpson
Southam
Starr
Stefanson
Stenson
Thomas
Wadds, Mrs.
Watson (Assiniboia)
Webb
Weichel
Willoughby
Winkler
Woolliams—72.

NAYS

Messrs:

Addison
Armstrong
Asselin (Notre Dame de Grâce)
Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)
Badanai
Barnett
Basford
Batten
Beaulé
Béchard
Beer
Bélanger
Benidickson
Benson
Berger
Blouin
Boulanger
Boutin
Brewin
Brown
Byrne
Cadieux (Terrebonne)
Cameron (High Park)
Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Cantin
Caouette
Cardin
Caron
Carter
Cashin
Chapdelaine
Choquette
Chrétien
Côté (Chicoutimi)
Côté (Longueuil)
Cowan
Crossman
Cyr
Davis
Deachman
Deschatelets
Dionne
Douglas
Drouin
Drury
Dubé
Dupuis
Emard
Ethier
Eudes
Favreau
Fisher
Forest
Francis
Frenette
Gauthier
Gelber
Gendron
Godin
Gordon
Granger
Gray
Greene
Grégoire
Guay
Habel
Hahn
Haidasz
Harley
Hays
Honey
Howe (Hamilton South)
Jewett, Miss
Kelly
Klein
Knowles
Konantz, Mrs.
Lachance
Laing
LaMarsh, Miss
Lamontagne
Lamoureux
Langlois
Laniel
Latulippe
Laverdière
Leblanc
Leboe
Leduc
Legault
Lessard (Lake St. John)
Lessard (St. Henry)
Lloyd
Loiselle
Macaluso
Macdonald
MacEachen
Mackasey
MacNaught
McIlraith
McIntosh
McMillan
McNulty
McWilliam
Marcoux
Mather
Matheson
Matte
Mitchell
Moreau
Morison
Mullally
Munro
Nicholson
Nixon
O'Keefe
Olson
Otto
Patterson
Pennell
Pepin
Perron
Peters
Pickersgill
Pilon
Plourde
Prittie
Prud'homme
Regan
Richard
Rideout, Mrs.
Rinfret
Robichaud
Rochon
Rock
Rondeau
Rouleau
Roxburgh
Ryan
Saltsman
Sauvé
Sharp
Stewart
Tardif
Teillet
Temple
Thompson
Tremblay
Tucker
Turner
Wahn
Walker
Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie.)
Webster
Whelan
Winch—155.

Division

Mr. Martin (Timmins): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Skeena. Had we voted, we both would have abstained.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there have been 270 speeches—

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Monteith: There were 118.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to standing order 33, which is the closure rule. The concluding part of that standing order reads as follows:

—and if such adjourned debate or postponed consideration shall not have been resumed or

concluded before one o'clock in the morning, no member shall rise to speak after that hour, but all such questions—

An hon. Member: Well, sit down.

Mr. Churchill:

—as must be decided in order to conclude such adjourned debate or postponed consideration, shall be decided forthwith.

In view of that rule, Mr. Speaker, no one is entitled to speak after the hour of one o'clock, and it is now—

Some hon. Members: Closure.

Mr. Churchill: —20 minutes after one.

The hon. members who are shouting "closure" are members of the Liberal party which imposed this restriction on the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: It is perfectly obvious from reading Beauchesne, who repeats this rule, that no member shall rise to speak after one o'clock. Therefore, under the circumstances I suggest that the debate has come to a conclusion, and that you should now put the motion which remains before the house to be considered, namely for concurrence in the sixth report of the committee. That is the only matter of business now before us.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, I should like to draw your attention to Beauchesne's fourth edition, citation 167 (2) which states:

If a member has taken the floor at 12.55 o'clock, he is entitled to speak for twenty minutes, but no member "shall rise to speak" after one o'clock.

It is my belief that the Prime Minister had risen in his place to speak before 12.55 o'clock, and the rule does not state that the 20 minutes shall be concluded by 15 minutes after one o'clock. The rule simply states that a member is entitled to speak for 20 minutes. The Prime Minister has not yet spoken for 20 minutes, and regardless of what the clock says, I contend that because he was on his feet and recognized before 12.55 he has the right to speak for 20 minutes.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, in reference to citation 167 (2) of Beauchesne's fourth edition, it states in part:

If a member has taken the floor at 12.55 o'clock—

If we accept the argument of the hon. member for Medicine Hat, we must then take into consideration the fact that two members had taken the floor at the same time, one being the Prime Minister and the other the Leader of the Opposition.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: They had both taken the floor to speak. May I suggest on that ground that the question now be put. When my friends talk about closure, they established the rule—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question before the Chair is both interesting and rather pressing.

An hon. Member: Take it under consideration.

Mr. Speaker: I do not propose to take it under consideration because I do not have too much difficulty in reaching a conclusion. I trust that the conclusion is right, impartial and correct. As the Chair sees the situation, the hon. member for Villeneuve, according to the note handed to me from the table, commenced at 12.31 a.m. and his time expired at 12.51 a.m., which is nine minutes to one. Right after that the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Port Arthur rose to speak at 12.51 a.m., which is nine minutes to one or if it was not nine minutes to one it was eight minutes to one.

Objection was raised by the hon. member for Bow River who proposed a motion that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition be now heard. We have had a vote on that motion. Therefore I now have before me an order of the house directing the Chair, according to my view, that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition be not now heard but that the right hon. Prime Minister be now heard. I must have regard to the effect and terms of citation 167, paragraph 2, of Beauchesne which is in these words:

If a member has taken the floor at 12.55 o'clock, he is entitled to speak for 20 minutes, but no member "shall rise to speak" after one o'clock.

The way I interpret this citation and the rules as I understand them is that the Prime Minister, who was on his feet eight or nine minutes before one o'clock and was recognized by the Chair, is entitled to speak at this time but not longer than 20 minutes.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, there was a famous incident on June 1, 1956, when an attempt was made to turn back the clock

with disastrous results to the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: I suggest that the clock is being turned back again and I appeal your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Under the rules of the house as given to the Chair this session there is no appeal from that decision. The right hon. the Prime Minister.

If I may have the indulgence of the house, I made a misstatement. There can be an appeal from my ruling but there can be no discussion of it.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Monteith: Bring in your furniture, too.

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, and the Leader of the Opposition was closed off, in addition to the motion for closure.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, if I may begin my 20 minutes, from which the hon. member for Bow River sought to deprive me, I should like to begin by calling attention to the fact that this debate which is now coming to an end has seen 270, plus, speeches in the house—

An hon. Member: How many on your side?

Mr. Pearson: —190, plus, of which have come from the official opposition.

Mr. Diefenbaker: And we successfully changed the thinking of the government on the first flag.

Mr. Pearson: I have been criticized in the house for not having spoken enough in the flag debate.

Mr. Monteith: You finally were flushed out.

Mr. Pearson: I wonder if my hon. friend could contain himself for about 20 minutes. He should consult the hon. member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Rhéaume) who makes a tally of all interruptions that take place in debates in this chamber.

Mr. Monteith: And they have been numerous on your side.

Mr. Pearson: His record is going to be very high unless he is careful tonight. However, Mr. Speaker, when I rose to conclude the debate as Prime Minister the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams), who has had a good deal to say about closure, rose in his place, as was his right, to prevent me from closing the debate. I have 20 minutes, Mr. Speaker, and if the house wishes to give unanimous consent I would be very glad indeed to take only half of that time and give the last 10 minutes to the Leader of the Opposition if he would like to have them.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, when the Greeks produce gifts we recognize what they mean. The Prime Minister is trying to explain away a situation in which he is throttling parliament and is tearing down the flag which has flown over this country for 100 years. He is trying to be facetious at a time like this.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I was trying to be courteous and co-operative and give half of my time to the Leader of the Opposition. I was offering to give him the last 10 minutes in this flag debate which began last June. Perhaps I should have learned from experience that offers of co-operation of that kind to that quarter usually do not get a very friendly reception.

This debate has gone on for a long time, Mr. Speaker, and in order to preserve to parliament the right of decision it was necessary for the government to invoke a rule which I hope will only be very rarely invoked in this parliament, the rule of closure.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: Otherwise we would have made a farce of parliamentary debate on this matter and the minority, the opposition, would have had the right to prevent a decision on a matter of the greatest possible national importance.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We accepted our responsibility.

Mr. Bell: May I ask a question?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Bell: How could we prevent this decision, Mr. Prime Minister?

Mr. Pearson: By the action you are taking now, by intervening to prevent discussion. The motion of the government was sustained, Mr. Speaker, by representatives of every

party in the house, including the deputy leader of the Conservative party.

Then, Mr. Speaker, when the right hon. gentleman talks about 1956 and closure, and when he realizes his deskmate, the deputy leader of his own party, voted for closure, how is he going to reconcile that? A decision was taken, and then we continued the debate. We have had a vote this evening on an amendment to the motion to concur in the report of the committee, which would have sent the report back to the committee with instructions to have the red ensign as the flag.

Mr. Monteith: All you want to do is to crucify it.

Mr. Pearson: I have too much respect for my hon. friend to pay very much attention to that interjection.

Mr. Monteith: I have a lot of respect for you, too, but not when you talk that way.

Mr. Pearson: On the vote this afternoon on the red ensign, a straightforward vote for the retention of the red ensign, the result, I believe, was 162 to 80, or two to one against that motion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the end of a long, hard and sincere fight by hon. members opposite for what they considered to be the right national flag for Canada. I have never denied them that right, nor have I ever denied them the sincerity with which they made the fight.

An hon. Member: You denied the people that fight.

Mr. Pearson: I denied the people no right. The people are represented in this parliament, and 162 of the representatives of the people in this parliament, representing every party, voted against my right hon. friend and his supporters. All right, Mr. Speaker, that fight in this parliament is over.

An hon. Member: That's what you think.

Mr. Pearson: This fight is over in this House of Commons. Now, Mr. Speaker, we approach the main motion and the main motion is a report of a committee, representing all parties in this house, a report containing a recommendation which was concurred in by the members of all parties in this house, recommending to this house a red maple leaf flag as the emblem of Canada. This is the flag for the future, but it does not dishonour the past. I hope that Canada can go forward as a united, strong and progressive country, with this flag as its emblem.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The right hon. gentleman has done everything to divide the country.

Mr. Pearson: Will the right hon. gentleman contain himself for two or three minutes longer, and then we will vote.

Mr. Diefenbaker: When the right hon. gentleman starts giving me advice, I say to him, you have done more to divide Canada than any other prime minister.

Mr. Pearson: I think we should be sympathetic to the right hon. gentleman because he is feeling the frustrations of failure.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Order, sit down.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I challenge the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) because she was the one who said, with exquisite femininity, "Shut up and sit down". I say to the Prime Minister, is he experiencing the happiness of having throttled discussion in parliament? Is that what he is experiencing at this time when a flag is being born?

Mr. Pearson: Before I was interrupted by the right hon. gentleman, that master of parliamentary procedure, I was trying to say that this is a good flag, and it is Canada's flag, an emblem of which we and our children can be proud and under which Canada can go forward, the red maple leaf flag. Surely, Mr. Speaker, when the dust of controversy clears away, when the bitterness of debate is over, we can all in this house rally around the red maple leaf Canadian flag. I know the atmosphere does not appear very propitious across the chamber for appeals, but I make an appeal even at this late date in the debate. I appeal for us all to forget divisions and differences of this debate and to rally behind this red maple leaf Canadian flag.

Mr. Diefenbaker: May I ask the Prime Minister a question?

Mr. Pearson: Yes.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He is telling us of the wonders of the red maple leaf flag. When did he change his mind, after saying the three maple leaf flag represented our heritage, and the one maple leaf had none?

Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a very easy question to answer. We submitted this matter, at the request of the right hon. gentleman, to a committee representing all parties in this house. This committee did not

see fit, by a majority vote, to accept the design I preferred. I accept the design recommended by the committee, and I ask my right hon. friend to do the same thing. Surely there is nothing disgraceful, Mr. Speaker, and nothing could be further from disgrace, than to accept as the emblem of our country a flag which has one red maple leaf on a white background representing what we have stood for in this country in war and peace. Why cannot my right hon. friend forget the passions, the prejudices and the bitterness of the fights of the past few months and rally around this Canadian flag and make it the emblem of unity in this country? Why can he not do this? I ask him to do what we would have done, if the amendment had been carried.

Mr. Diefenbaker: A flag by closure; imposed by closure.

An hon. Member: The great divider of Canada.

Mr. Pearson: All right, Mr. Speaker, there is no use making an appeal, that is obvious. I regret very much that a man who has attained such prominence in the public life of Canada for so many years would take this attitude at the end of this debate on a matter of this national importance.

I will make one final suggestion, Mr. Speaker, and that is that if this motion carries—and it is going to carry, that is clear, from the vote this afternoon; there is every likelihood of this motion carrying—surely hon. gentlemen opposite do not wish to be put on record as voting against a design which is going to be our national flag.

Mr. Monteith: Oh, nuts.

Mr. Pearson: I ask them, Mr. Speaker, that when you put this motion no hon. member in this house vote against the design which is going to be our flag. Mr. Speaker, I do not ask them to vote for it. I ask that there be no recorded vote so that we will not be in a position in this house of having hon. members vote against what will be our national flag.

Mr. Monteith: Don't be crazy; I am going to be recorded.

Mr. Pearson: I make this appeal to them. They can turn it down with insult and contumely if they so desire. On this side of the house there are Canadians as loyal to the past as any hon. gentlemen opposite, and they will vote for this flag.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: There are Canadians on this side of the house quite as loyal to our past and quite as hopeful of our future.

Mr. Nugent: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I consider the remarks of the right hon. gentleman an insult to members on this side of the house.

Mr. Pearson: All right, Mr. Speaker. We on this side have made the appeal. They have turned it down with jeering and insult. We on this side, and a good many on the other side of the house will vote with pride and confidence in the motion you are now about to put before the house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the resolution adopted at this sitting—

Mr. Churchill: I am rising on a question of privilege.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Churchill: May I speak on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, or will I be denied my rights in this house?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member knows perfectly well he will never be denied by this occupant of the chair any rights to which he is entitled. He should know that.

Mr. Churchill: I was asking to speak on a question of privilege and I was not being given the opportunity. My question of privilege is this: The Prime Minister of this country (Mr. Pearson) has said that we have turned down his proposed flag with jeers and insults. That is not true and I ask him to withdraw that remark. This is an insult to all members of the house. I did not say one word—I uttered no jeer, no insult—and I ask the Prime Minister to withdraw that remark, which is an infringement of the privileges of all hon. members of the house.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I shall leave it to you to judge whether my remarks have been greeted by certain hon. members on the other side with jeers and insults.

Mr. Monteith: Not by certain members: By all members.

Mr. Speaker: Is the house ready for the question? Pursuant to the resolution adopted at this sitting, and in accordance with the provisions of standing order 33, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forth-

with all such questions as must be decided in order to conclude this debate.

Accordingly, the question is as follows:

Mr. Batten, seconded by Mr. Scott, moved:

That the sixth report of the special committee on a Canadian flag, presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, be now concurred in.

Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion? Those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: Those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Batten) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Addison
Armstrong
Asselin (Notre Dame de Grâce)
Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)
Badanai
Balcer
Barnett
Basford
Batten
Beaulé
Béchard
Beer
Bélanger
Benidickson
Benson
Berger
Blouin
Boulanger
Boutin
Brewin
Brown
Byrne
Cadieux (Terrebonne)
Cameron (High Park)
Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Cantin
Caouette
Cardin
Caron
Carter
Cashin
Chapdelaine
Choquette
Chrétien
Côté (Chicoutimi)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Cyr
Davis
Deachman
Deschatelets
Dionne
Douglas
Drouin
Drury
Dubé
Dupuis
Emard
Ethier
Eudes
Favreau
Fisher
Forest
Francis
Frenette
Gauthier
Gelber
Gendron
Girouard
Godin
Gordon
Grafftey
Granger
Gray
Greene
Grégoire
Guay
Habel
Hahn
Haidasz
Harley
Hays
Honey
Howard
Howe (Hamilton South)
Jewett, Miss
Kelly
Klein
Knowles
Konantz, Mrs.
Lachance
Laing
LaMarsh, Miss
Lamontagne
Lamoureux
Langlois
Laniel
Latulippe
Laverdière
Leblanc
Leduc
Legault
Lessard (Lake St. John)
Lessard (St. Henry)
Lloyd
Loiselle
Macaluso
Macdonald
MacEachen
Mackasey
MacNaught
McIlraith
McMillan
McNulty
McWilliam
Marcoux
Martin (Timmins)
Martineau
Mather
Matheson
Matte
Mitchell
Moreau
Morison
Mullally
Munro
Nicholson
Nixon
O'Keefe
Otto
Ouellet
Paul
Pearson
Pennell
Pepin
Perron
Peters
Pickersgill
Pigeon
Pilon
Plourde
Prittie
Prud'homme
Regan
Ricard
Richard
Rideout, Mrs.
Rinfret
Robichaud
Rochon
Rock
Rondeau
Rouleau
Roxburgh
Ryan
Saltsman
Sauvé
Scott
Sharp
Stewart
Tardif
Teillet
Temple
Thompson
Tremblay
Tucker
Turner
Wahn
Walker
Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Webster
Whelan
Winch—163.

[Mr. Speaker.]

NAYS

Messrs:

Alkenbrack
Bell
Bigg
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Cantelon
Cardiff
Chatterton
Churchill
Clancy
Coates
Cowan
Crouse
Danforth
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Doucett
Enns
Fairweather
Fane
Flemming (Victoria-Carleton)
Forbes
Gundlock
Hales
Hamilton
Herridge
Horner (The Battlefords)
Howe (Wellington-Huron)
Irvine
Jones, Mrs.
Jorgenson
Kennedy
Kindt
Korchinski
Lambert
Leboe
Loney
MacEwan
MacInnis
MacLean (Queens)
Macquarrie
MacRae
McBain
McIntosh
Madill
Mandziuk
Millar
Monteith
Moore
More
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nasserden
Nesbitt
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nugent
Olson

Ormiston	Stefanson	
Pascoe	Stenson	
Patterson	Thomas	
Pugh	Wadds, Mrs.	
Rapp	Watson (Assiniboia)	
Rhéaume	Webb	
Rynard	Weichel	
Simpson	Willoughby	
Smith	Winkler	
Southam	Woolliams—78.	
Starr		

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Whereupon the members of the house rose and sang *O Canada* and *God Save the Queen.*

Mr. Speaker: It being 2.15 of the morning, this house stands adjourned until 2.30 today.

At 2.15 a.m., Tuesday, December 15, the house adjourned, without question put.

20220—704

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, December 15, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. GROOS—DECLARATION OF PAIR IN HOUSE VOTE

Mr. D. W. Groos (Victoria, B.C.): I rise on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday when the final vote was taken I was paired, but I was unable to advise the house of my pair because of events which took place when you declared the motion carried. Had I been able to do so, I would have voted in favour of the motion.

CANADIAN COMMONWEALTH FLAG

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SEVENTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Batten, seconded by Mr. Cantin, moves that the seventh and final report of the special committee on a Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964 be now concurred in.

Mr. Thompson: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Was there not an understanding last Thursday when the Prime Minister assured the house that between the two debates we would revert to the normal procedure and proceed with orders of the day? Is this not what the agreement was, and does it not still stand?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could deal with the point raised. On Thursday last, in answer to a question from the leader of the official opposition, the Prime Minister stated something about provision for a question period between the two debates. He pointed out that he had already made a proposal to that effect and hoped we could get unanimous agreement to provide for a question period between the two debates.

In accordance with that statement I called a meeting of the house leaders for Friday last. Unfortunately one of the house leaders was not able to come to that meeting, so there was no agreement on that day. This morning I sought to get agreement but have been unable to get agreement for a question period, and that is where the matter stands.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if, in the present circumstances, the government house leader or the Prime Minister would care to ask for the unanimous consent of the house so we could have a question period before proceeding to concur in the seventh and final special flag committee report.

I feel that in acting this way the government would show itself quite willing to cooperate. Besides, that would further the business of the house and make it easier for hon. members who have questions to ask today.

[*Text*]

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I hope the house leader would now be prepared to ask for unanimous consent of the house for a question period, even though it may be limited to something like 60 minutes. Then we could carry on the regular, routine proceedings, and perhaps if the government wished to go forward with concurrence in this seventh report it would not be well for the house to pass that stage of our routine proceedings at which motions are called. Perhaps unanimous consent could be requested to take questions now, and if it were not forthcoming there would be nothing he could do about it. However, the government would not then be in a position where they could not revert to motions without unanimous consent.

Mr. McIlraith: The government is quite agreeable, and if there is unanimous consent in the house we should like also to have a formal decision to transfer the two notices of motion on the order paper to government orders so that when we do come to them later on they would be in a position where they could be dealt with. The same situation would apply to the first reading of Senate Bill No. S-22. The government is quite agreeable, and I would make the request now for unanimous consent to proceed to a question period of, say, one hour.

Some hon. Members: Closure.

Mr. McIlraith: And I would request that we take the two motions under government notices of motions and the first reading of the Senate bill.

Canadian Flag

Mr. Fisher: May I ask the minister, is he agreeable to doing this every day that we are faced with this situation, so we can be assured of a regular question period?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, the government house leader has been rather anxious to get some kind of order to the business with a view to reaching what I am sure we all wish, some certainty as to the time of a recess. If we can get this one question period agreed to, I would like to call a meeting of the house leaders and see what arrangement can be made.

Mr. Howard: Don't you think it would be better to put the flag in cold storage?

Mr. Speaker: I would appreciate it if the house leader would recapitulate exactly what he wishes.

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent for the first reading of the Senate public bill, the calling of the two government notices of motions and then a one hour question period, after which we would revert to the motion that is before the house now, the motion for concurrence in the seventh report of the flag committee. I would also ask that the introduction of bills be called.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the unanimous consent of the house that we proceed in this manner?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: It is not agreed.

Mr. H. M. Batten (Humber-St. George's): Mr. Speaker, the seventh and final report of the special committee on the Canadian flag, presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, recommended:

> —that the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to provide that the royal union flag, generally known as the union jack, may continue to be flown as a symbol of Canada's membership in the commonwealth of nations and of her allegiance to the crown.

I move, seconded by Mr. Béchard, the hon. member for Bonaventure, that this report be now concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Before the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton speaks I wish to clear up one slight error. When I put this motion I said it would be seconded by Mr. Cantin. The seconder, as proposed by the hon. member for Humber-St. George's is Mr. Béchard.

Hon. H. J. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the motion for concurrence in the seventh report of the special committee on the flag question is something which I feel deserves and should have more than just ordinary attention by all hon. members of the house.

The fact that we have two reports of the committee before us is something which I think requires explanation. I think we have to acknowledge that it is a bit unusual for a committee to present two reports, and it seems to me it is altogether fitting and proper that the house be made aware of the reasons that were advanced in the committee for doing so.

I would advise the house that my purpose in rising today is not merely to make some brief remarks; it is to move an amendment to the motion for concurrence.

It seems to me the first thing we might consider is the paragraph which makes reference to the recommendation for a national flag for Canada. This matter was dealt with yesterday in somewhat unusual circumstances, as I said. I should like to draw attention to the fact that in reaching a decision on the recommendation for a national flag for Canada, one of the first questions to be discussed in the committee was whether we should have one flag or two flags in this country.

The decision of the committee was that we should have only one flag. Those were the words: "only one flag". I suggest that if I were so inclined I might even question the validity of the committee's report itself in view of the fact that this contradiction exists. The committee agreed unanimously in considering this question of a national flag for Canada that there should be only one flag.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): I suggest to those gentlemen who are shouting "no" that they read the committee's report, the report with which we dealt yesterday. They will find that "only one" is the expression used.

An hon. Member: Not so.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): All right. If the hon. member wishes to speak he will have his chance to do so when I am through. In the meantime I have the floor.

I submit that the committee agreed unanimously that we should have only one flag, only one national flag in this country. Those were the words used. Now we find ourselves considering another flag. I submit this is a negation of the motion itself for only one national flag and, as I say, I think the validity of the whole report might be questioned if I

were so inclined. However, I do not wish to press this point at the moment.

I should like to ask one question, though, and I should like to have this explained to my satisfaction because it was never explained to my satisfaction in the committee. It is, why do we in this country need two flags? We has not had two flags since the Canadian red ensign was the official flag of Canada, proclaimed by order in council in 1945. For many years prior to that date we got along and prospered very well under one flag. Why do we suddenly need two flags in this country?

I for one do not accept the proposition that we should have a first and a second flag. As far as I am concerned, whatever flags we have will be of equal merit and entitled to the same respect. I do not think we should have two flags, one superior to the other, any more than we should have two classes of citizens. We do not want first class and second class citizens in this country; we do not have them now. I do not differentiate, when flags are concerned, as to their status. If it is the considered opinion of this house that the report of the committee should be accepted, then I submit these flags must be of equal status. They must be of equal importance and equal significance even though the message which it is alleged they convey may be somewhat different. In this connection we might consider the message which this particular flag is intended to convey.

However, Mr. Speaker, before doing so I want to refer to the fact that, as I said previously, the flag which we have been using and which is still in use in this country has seemingly been able to transmit its message without help from any other flag. Therefore I think we might consider that the very fact we are being asked to have two flags in this country must suggest the general idea that something is now lacking in the design recommended by the committee in their report and apparently approved by this house yesterday. If I am correct in my opinion in this regard I would like someone to tell me what has brought about the necessity of having a second flag. It should not be the case, and I for one do not appreciate it and certainly do not desire it.

Let us consider the point raised in paragraph 3 of the committee's report. I have already mentioned that in paragraph 2 the flag recommended by the committee is intended to convey a message. This is the message. It is that it will be a flag to symbolize Canada's membership in the commonwealth of nations and her allegiance to the crown. That is the general message which the flag recommended in this report is intended to convey.

I suggest that membership in the commonwealth is not conveyed by any particular flag. The commonwealth has no flag as such. Commonwealth countries, however, generally speaking—this does not apply sweepingly across the board but it does apply in many instances—have inserted the union jack as part of their flags. However, generally speaking we find there is no such thing as a commonwealth flag. This flag is going to symbolize our membership in the commonwealth, according to this paragraph, and it will also symbolize our allegiance to the crown. I would like to think that the flag which flies over the tower of this building symbolizes our allegiance to the crown also.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that a flag and the things a flag symbolizes are more than just words which are put down on a piece of paper; it symbolizes what is in the hearts and minds of the people who are displaying and flying it. For that reason, if for none other, I believe it is proper for me to say that something must be lacking in the national flag which has already been approved and which is referred to in paragraph 2 of this report.

I said a moment ago that I was not able to understand the substitution. There are quite a few other things I am not able to understand, either. In order to make my point clear I must of necessity read paragraph No. 3 of the report:

It was moved—

That is in the committee:

—"That the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to provide that the Canadian red ensign may continue to be flown as a symbol of Canada's membership in the commonwealth of nations and of her allegiance to the crown".

The amendment which was moved was:

An amendment was moved to substitute the words "royal union flag, generally known as the union jack" for the words "Canadian red ensign".

In other words, the recommendation of the committee as it now stands presented to this house is:

That the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to provide that the royal union flag, generally known as the union jack, may continue to be flown as a symbol of Canada's membership in the commonwealth of nations and of her allegiance to the crown".

I draw your attention particularly to the words "may continue to be flown", and submit that the union jack has not been flown in Canada generally since 1945. The inclusion of that sentence which says, in effect, that something may continue to be flown which has not been flown for more than 20 years, is nothing more than an expression of ridiculousness. How are we going to continue to fly something that has not been flown continuously?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Hon. members opposite who wish to add something to this debate will have an opportunity to do so, and I suggest it will be novel if they add anything intelligent to this debate.

We continue to take the position, as expressed last night, that it is difficult or impossible to continue to fly something as an indication of our membership in the commonwealth of nations and our allegiance to the crown that has not been flown during the past 20 years. Perhaps someone with more comprehension of this situation than I have could enlighten me. I cannot understand how that could take place.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest there is an answer to this problem, and that answer lies in the understanding that a mistake has been made in the committee report. Someone might well suggest that I should explain how a mistake could have occurred. The answer to that question is that we tried to do something about the error but we were not able to obtain enough votes in the committee to accomplish this correction. We did attempt to correct the mistake but were unable to do so, and I suggest that is what I am attempting to correct now by the amendment which I propose to move.

In reference to the next paragraph of the report, a question might be asked as to why there were abstentions. It might properly be asked why we did not vote for or against this matter when it was brought before the committee. My answer to that question is that the amendment which was proposed was an amendment substituting the union jack for the Canadian red ensign, so the question was "Do you prefer the union jack to the Canadian red ensign?" The question was not one really involving a preference but a matter of voting yes or no to the question as to whether there should be a substitution of the union jack for the red ensign. Speaking for myself, I was in favour of the retention of the Canadian red ensign, but did not feel free to vote against the union jack. My action in this regard may well be interpreted by some as sentimentalism. I acknowledge that to be the situation, but I suggest that is the reason for the abstention. I hope to correct the situation by moving my proposed amendment, and I hope this amendment will be acceptable to this house.

I yield to no one in this chamber in my feeling of respect and sentiment for the traditions of this country. However, I do not believe that the union jack is a flag of Canada; it is a flag of the United Kingdom. The red ensign, which incorporates a union jack, has been and I think still is the national flag of Canada and should always be considered as such.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the point at issue, but I doubt whether the majority of the people of this country could be convinced that the flag of the United Kingdom, the union jack, should be flown in Canada as a Canadian flag. Can anyone visualize someone landing on the shores of Nova Scotia, after a shipwreck, wanting to know where he was and seeing the union jack being flown? That individual would perhaps believe that he was still in England, not knowing that the union jack was a flag representing different countries.

An hon. Member: What about the Nova Scotia flag? Stanfield would not like that.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): I am one of the first to acknowledge that the flag of Nova Scotia is a very beautiful flag, and I personally thought it was entitled to a great deal more consideration as a national flag than it received.

I suggest with great respect, Mr. Speaker, to the members of this house, and particularly to my colleagues on the special committee, that the substitution of the union jack for the red ensign in this report of the committee is unacceptable. Since there is a flag mentioned in this report, I think it should now be changed from the union jack to the red ensign. In order to bring this proposition before this house—and I hope the house will receive this suggestion with a reasonable degree of consideration—I propose the following amendment: seconded by the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Pugh):

That the seventh report of the special committee be not now adopted but that it be referred back to the committee with instructions to strike out in the recommendation the words "the royal union flag generally known as the union jack", and substitute therefor the words "the Canadian red ensign".

And that the committee for such purposes be revived.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to state my position on this seventh and final report of the committee in a very few words. We support the seventh report, as we supported the sixth report. I should like to express my appreciation for the work of the committee in producing the seventh report, as I did for their work in producing the earlier report.

This report, which I have before me, indicates that a motion was moved in the committee that the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to provide that the Canadian red ensign may continue to be flown as a symbol of Canada's membership in the commonwealth of nations and of her allegiance to the crown. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the amendment we now have before the house was before the committee during its sessions, but before that particular motion could be voted on in the committee an amendment was moved to substitute the words "royal union flag, generally known as the union jack" for the words "Canadian red ensign". That amendment was carried by a vote of seven for, two against and five abstentions. The motion as amended was then voted on and carried by a vote of eight for, one voting against and five abstentions.

I do not know whether I am doing my hon. friend who has just spoken any injustice, but I assume that he had the opportunity to vote against the royal union flag for the purposes of this motion and in favour of the Canadian red ensign, and he did not vote that way. He abstained. Now he moves in the house, Mr. Speaker, that the red ensign be substituted for the royal union flag, and no doubt he will take a position in the house on this matter that he did not take in the committee. He asks that the matter be referred back to the committee so he can now take a different position in the committee.

Mr. Rhéaume: I thought that the committee met in camera.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the position of our party in regard to this matter is well known and has been laid down in two election campaigns. In 1962 we stated as part of our policy that the union jack would be flown on appropriate occasions as a symbol of our membership in the commonwealth, and a similar pledge and similar commitment were made in the election of 1963.

My hon. friend who has just spoken began by talking about the illogicality of having two flags in this country; how absurd it was to have two flags even though one flag would be the national flag and the other would be a flag symbolizing our association in the commonwealth. He did not see any reason for that at all. But then he ended up by moving an amendment which would bring about that very thing. If it is illogical to have the royal union flag as a second flag symbolizing our association in the commonwealth, surely it is even more illogical to have the Canadian red ensign, which by order in council in 1945 was made the Canadian flag until parliament decided otherwise. Surely it is even more illogical to make a Canadian flag the second flag symbolizing our association in the commonwealth.

Then indeed, Mr. Speaker, we would have two national flags. Presumably this is what my hon. friend desires, two national flags, because that is what his amendment would do. It would accept the national flag of distinctive design which we decided on last night, and another national flag of Canadian design; and we would indeed then accomplish the result which he has considered as abhorrent to logicality, two flags of any kind in this country.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): May I ask the Prime Minister a question?

Mr. Pearson: Yes.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): I hesitate to interrupt, but is this not exactly what was contemplated by the two resolutions put on the order paper by the government last May in the Prime Minister's name? May I further say that every remark I made was based on the premise that the government had decided to have two flags.

Mr. Pearson: I congratulate my hon. friend on now having reached the view that we ought to have two flags because the government has decided that is the best thing.

An hon. Member: Don't twist words.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Prime Minister does not want to misquote me. I said "if the government had decided they should have two flags". I did not say that I favoured two flags.

Mr. Pearson: I do not want to do any injustice to my friend's reasoning, but if my hon. friend feels that way why did he not move an amendment rejecting the report of the committee? Surely that would have been the most logical course for him to follow, because he admits he does not believe in two flags. That was a problem that was submitted to the committee and they had to deal

with it because it was in their terms of reference, but the logical way for him to get out of that dilemma is to object to this report and do away with the second report completely. He does not do that. He says "Let us have a second flag and make it a Canadian flag because it is the Canadian flag today." Yet it is to symbolize our allegiance to the Queen and our association in the commonwealth.

I do not consider that a very reasonable position to take. My hon. friend in supporting it said how absurd it would be to have the royal union flag as a second flag because we should not have two flags in this country, especially a second flag which had not been officially in use for 20 years, I think he said.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Since 1945.

Mr. Pearson: Since 1945. When the order in council was passed in 1945 authorizing the use officially of the Canadian red ensign until parliament should make a choice of a distinctive flag, the union jack was flown with the red ensign, in accordance with the wishes of the localities concerned, over many buildings for at least two years thereafter.

Surely my hon. friend must know what the situation has been. I ask him what flag has been flying in recent years over the parliament buildings in Fredericton. It is this flag, which is no longer in use and has not been in use for 20 years. I ask him what flag flies over the parliament buildings in Halifax. The union jack along with the flag of Nova Scotia. I ask him what flag flies over the parliament buildings in Prince Edward Island. Until a few weeks ago it was the union jack, but because it is fashionable now to have provincial flags Prince Edward Island adopted a flag of its own and I believe both flags fly there now. The union jack is also flying in Ontario. You will see it flying over school buildings in Ontario with provincial sanction.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): May I ask the Prime Minister another question? Does the Prime Minister not consider that the very fact that the Canadian red ensign was made official by order in council in 1945 places that flag in an altogether different position from a flag which any provincial government may wish to fly over its own public buildings? I claim it puts the stamp of officialdom on that flag which has been there ever since 1945.

Mr. Pearson: I think that is quite right. That order in council undoubtedly did put the stamp of officialdom on the Canadian red ensign until parliament made another choice. There is no doubt about that. But some of the provinces refused to accept that stamp of officialdom. They refused to accept the Canadian red ensign for a good many years and continued to fly the union jack. But the hon. gentleman says we must not now officially recognize the union jack for a special purpose because it has had no official sanction in this country since 1945.

The fact, Mr. Speaker—and I will try to indicate my reason for stating this—that it has had no official Canadian national sanction since 1945 and that it is the royal union flag is in my view the very reason it should be used as recognition of our association in the commonwealth of nations, and why the Canadian red ensign, which has had official Canadian sanction, should not be so used. I repeat that if it was used—

Mr. Grégoire: May I ask the Prime Minister a question? Can the Prime Minister tell us if the union jack is officially known as the commonwealth flag?

Mr. Pearson: Of course it is not, Mr. Speaker, and that is exactly what we are talking about. I hope to come to that in a few moments if I am given the opportunity. We have felt, Mr. Speaker, that it is quite in order and indeed desirable, as we adopt a distinctive national flag without any of the symbols of our past political associations, to have a flag alongside our national flag which will symbolize our association in the commonwealth of nations and the very special relationship to the Queen. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is quite in order and quite reasonable that we should indicate in our national emblems today that there can be, in this day and age, a loyalty on various levels of associations.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Will the Prime Minister allow a question? At the time the Minister of Transport made his journey to the United Kingdom or since has Her Majesty the Queen been consulted as to whether the royal union flag would be acceptable as the embodiment of the commonwealth? And did the Prime Minister, on the occasion of the prime ministers' conference, secure from the prime ministers their consent or approval that Canada adopt a commonwealth flag, a flag that is not acceptable to many of the other commonwealths?

Mr. Pearson: I wish my hon. friend would allow me to deliver my speech in my own way, because I am coming to those various matters. He has brought up these two points, so perhaps I should deal with them now.

In so far as the first point is concerned, it was raised in the early days of the debate and I answered that at the time. There has been no change since that time. I said then, and I repeat now, that naturally when a resolution of this kind was before the Canadian parliament the Queen, through the high commissioner in London, was informally apprised of the fact that this resolution was before parliament. Her advice was not sought. It would have been quite unconstitutional to ask for her advice on a matter which had not yet been decided upon by the Canadian parliament. If I had done that I can imagine what my right hon. friend would be saying today. He would be accusing me of dragging the crown into politics. What we did, as a matter of courtesy, was to inform the Queen of the action or the proposal that was before the Canadian parliament, and indicated to the Queen that if that proposal were accepted she would be asked to take the necessary constitutional action, as Queen. This cannot be done, of course, until parliament has declared itself.

In so far as the second question is concerned, the question of a commonwealth flag, that was not mentioned at the prime ministers' conference at all. It did not come up in any way, shape or form, nor has it come up in any commonwealth meeting since of which I am aware. I have made informal inquiries of certain commonwealth leaders as to whether it may be practicable to consider the possibility of some emblem which would be common to all states of the commonwealth. However, it is quite impracticable at the present time and may be impracticable for a long time to come because of the very nature of the states within the commonwealth. There are monarchies in the commonwealth, are monarchies that recognize the Queen of England, the Queen of Canada or the Queen of Australia. There are republics in the commonwealth. But surely, in this day and age, it is not either wrong or unusual to have emblems flying in a country which denote different forms of association of the people of that country with different international or national organizations.

I believe, therefore, it is logical and desirable to retain in this country an emblem of our association with the other members of the commonwealth. Even though it is not a commonwealth flag, it is a flag which would denote Canada's association with the commonwealth. I will try to explain later why I think the royal union jack is the most logical and best emblem for that purpose.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Will the Prime Minister say whether the United Kingdom has consented to have Canada use her flag here in Canada?

Mr. Pearson: I will go ahead with my statement, and if the right hon. gentleman has any questions to ask at the end I will do my best to answer.

This is the emblem, Mr. Speaker, that is recommended by the report to denote our association with the other members of the commonwealth through the Queen. At the moment this is the only constitutional link, the only formal constitutional link, between the various members of the commonwealth, through the Queen. There is no other formal link. I remember very well when that link was first constitutionally recognized. In earlier days before the commonwealth achieved its present organization, it was not necessary because all members were linked by their allegiance to one queen. They were all monarchies inside this association.

In 1948, at a commonwealth conference which I had the honour of attending, the commonwealth was faced with the problem of trying to absorb within its association a republic, a state which owed no allegiance to the Queen and was republican in character. The commonwealth has proved itself, over the years, to be a very adaptable institution indeed. It was able to accommodate itself to this alteration in constitutional structure in one of its members by a formula which has been found to apply to all the new members of the commonwealth since, most of whom are republics. This was done by the official communiqué of the conference which included this sentence, and this is an important sentence because it does indicate why I believe the union jack is the right emblem for commonwealth association.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: My right hon. friend laughs, but perhaps instead of laughing he will listen.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That was years ago.

Mr. Pearson: It was, indeed, years ago. It was 1948, and it has stood the test of every acquisition to the commonwealth since. This is why it was such an important formula on which to agree at that time, because it has not required any change since that time and there have been a great many changes take place in the commonwealth since that time. The date was April 20, 1949. The communi-

qué states that: "The government of India have, however, declared and affirmed India's desire to continue her full membership of the commonwealth and her acceptance—that is the republic of India—of the king as the symbol of the free association of the independent member nations—thus the head of the commonwealth."

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me if we are to have a symbolic mark of this kind, an emblem of our association with the other nations of the commonwealth, that emblem should be associated with the Queen—not the king now, the Queen—as head of the commonwealth. Therefore what could be more appropriate for this purpose than the royal union flag, which is the Queen's flag?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Completely specious.

Mr. Pearson: My hon. friend is an authority on specious arguments.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Grégoire: Is the Prime Minister aware of the fact that the Queen has her own flag, and it is not the union jack?

Mr. Pearson: Indeed I am aware of it. Of course the Queen has her own flag which only the Queen, herself, flies and only the Queen can ever fly over any building in which she happens to be residing at the moment, and which nobody else has any right to fly in any circumstance. This could hardly be used as a flag to signify our association in the commonwealth. Perhaps my hon. friend would consider that a specious argument too.

Mr. Diefenbaker: No, you have really got near the facts at this point for the first time.

Mr. Pearson: I believe the majority of Canadians wish to have a Canadian national flag which cannot be mistaken for the flag of any other country, and the majority of the members of this house certainly decided that last night. I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that the vast majority of Canadians wish to recognize our membership in the commonwealth and our allegiance to the Queen as head of that commonwealth, as we do to her as Queen of Canada.

Some will argue, and indeed I think my hon. friend took the position this afternoon even though his amendment does not seem to me to support that position, that we do not need any special flag to provide such recognition or that, if we do, the union jack is the wrong flag for the purpose. As I have already indicated, I would disagree with that position both in regard to the need and the nature of the flag denoting the relationship, and I would like to point out that other members of the commonwealth, that we call the older members of the commonwealth, have made provision for this recognition. The Australian flags act of 1953, section 8, provides:

> This act does not affect the right or privilege of a person to fly the union jack.

There is no requirement, but there is a recognition of the desirability of maintaining that emblematic association which we provide for in our recommendation. In the statutes of South Africa while South Africa was a member of the commonwealth—this does not apply now because she has withdrawn from the commonwealth—there was in volume 2, chapter 2, section 7(1) (a) the following:

> The flags of the union shall include the union jack to denote the association of the union with other members of the group of nations constituting the British commonwealth of nations.

It is interesting in this connection to recall some words used in this house by a man who passionately advocated a distinctive Canadian national flag, without the emblems of any other association on that flag. I am referring to Mr. Bona Arsenault, who is now a member of the government of Quebec. This is what he said in 1946 when he was passionately arguing in this house for a distinctive national flag. On March 21, 1946, as recorded at page 154 of *Hansard* for that date he stated:

> All nations of the world at all times have used different flags for different tactical purposes...
>
> Since Canada is a member of the British commonwealth, united to her sister nations under the constitutional authority of the same king, I cannot very well see why anyone in this country could reasonably object to the full-sized union jack being officially recognized by this parliament as the official symbol of our partnership in the commonwealth, the finest example in history of mutual friendship between nations and one of the strongest means of maintaining peace in the world in these trying days.

Mr. Bona Arsenault, a very good Canadian nationalist in the right meaning of the word, went on to say:

> Too much is involved to try to put forward any sort of narrow nationalism in the face of the distressful conditions that we find in the world today. Not only should we help to maintain the British commonwealth of nations, we should have a commonwealth of all the nations of the world based on the same principles of mutual friendship and collaboration.

We also believe in that, Mr. Speaker, and on occasions in this country, indeed over this building, we fly the blue flag of the United Nations as well.

I believe that the most fitting emblem for this association is the royal union flag, the flag of the Queen, the flag of the monarchy since it was first established in the seventeenth century, the flag which is peculiarly identified with the monarchy and, as such, identified with the commonwealth because the Queen is the head of the commonwealth.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): May I ask another question? I would like to ask the Prime Minister if it is not true that the flag known as the union flag, to which he has just referred, is the flag of England, the flag of the United Kingdom?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the union jack, the royal union flag, is the royal emblem, and it has been adapted and adopted by the government of the United Kingdom as the flag of the United Kingdom; but is a royal flag any the worse because of the fact that it is the flag of the United Kingdom? It is the royal flag and as such stands for the Queen as head of the commonwealth.

My hon. friend takes exception to the use of the union jack, the royal flag, as standing for our association in the commonwealth whose head is the Queen, but in his amendment he puts forward as the emblem of our association in the commonwealth, under the Queen, the Canadian red ensign, which he admits for 20 years now by order in council has been adopted as a Canadian flag. How can we have a Canadian national flag, and a former Canadian national flag as the flag emblematic of our association with the commonwealth?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has made a series of statements that are historically unsound. I ask him—

Mr. Pearson: You will have a chance to speak afterward.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I ask him a simple question—

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, if the right hon. gentleman will just contain himself for about two minutes he will be able to get up on his feet and give me a lecture on history.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I simply ask—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Will the Prime Minister allow a question? His followers say no. I thought he would not be afraid of a question.

Mr. Speaker: Order. It appears to be time to recall to the attention of hon. members citation 126 in Beauchesne's fourth edition, which once again comes to our assistance:

> If a member desires to ask a question during debate, he should first obtain the consent of the member who is speaking. If the latter ignores the request, the former cannot insist, even if he thinks he is being misrepresented. He cannot make a denial during the speech, but he must wait until the member has resumed his seat and then he may ask leave to make a statement, or he must wait until his turn comes, to address the house. Standing order 12 is compulsory. No one has a right to interrupt a member who is addressing the house, by putting a question to him or by making or demanding an explanation. A member may allow interruptions through a sense of courtesy, but it is entirely at his option to give way or not to an immediate explanation.

Further on, paragraph 2 states:

> The rule is well known, that interruptions should not be tolerated.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, may I immediately rise on a question of privilege. You found this rule in the last while. You did not apply it when I was speaking, and let that be perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker. On every occasion when I was speaking, when a statement was made that was challenged from the opposite side, hon. members rose on speeches, privileges and questions. Your Honour was not so careful then, and I say that advisedly and with great regret.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I believe you yourself must deal as you see fit with the interruptions of the right hon. gentleman. You have read out to him, quite rightly, the rules regarding interruptions. He spoke for an hour and a half the other day and I was never on my feet except once when he asked me a question, but he has been interrupting me repeatedly, and when you read out the rule against interruptions he attempted to browbeat the Chair. I think that is unbecoming.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: On a question of privilege, all I have to say to the right hon. gentleman is that that statement is as false as the allegation he has made that the union jack is the Queen's flag.

Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Speaker, you will have to deal with the falsity or otherwise of the allegation. So far as the latter part of the statement which my right hon. friend made is concerned, I am very glad he made it in the way he did, as a straight statement of fact that I had made a false statement regarding the nature of the union jack, the royal union flag. I bring to my assistance in

this regard the head of the College of Arms in London, who ought to know about these things. Conceivably he might even know more about this than the right hon. gentleman, although that is only conceivable.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: This is what Sir Gerald Wollaston, Garter King of Arms and head of the College of Heralds has to say about this, and I am very glad I was able to put my finger on it at this moment—and without any help, either:

> The union flag is a royal flag...it is one of the royal badges, and has been since Stuart times. ... It is a royal flag.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Perhaps I could say this—

Mr. Speaker: May I ask the right hon. gentleman whether this is a question of privilege or a point of order?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes, Your Honour, it is.

An hon. Member: What is it?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Well, the Prime Minister said this was the Queen's flag and then he told us he was going to prove it. All he proved was that it was a royal flag, which everybody knew.

Mr. Pearson: I was always under the impression that the Queen was royalty. When the monarch is a Queen then the royal flag is, no doubt, the Queen's flag; and if the right hon. gentleman would prefer to have it the Queen's flag I am sure Garter King of Arms would not object.

If I may summarize, we feel it is desirable to recognize along with our national flag—and there can only be one national flag—a flag which symbolizes our association with the other nations of the commonwealth, and for this purpose the most appropriate symbol is the royal flag because the Queen is the head of the commonwealth; as Queen she is head of the commonwealth.

The hon. gentleman, who began by saying we should not have two flags at all, has moved an amendment which says we should replace the royal flag by the Canadian red ensign which is still, until it is changed by proclamation, the Canadian distinctive national flag by order in council. The hon. gentleman now wishes to put forward as a commonwealth flag a flag which he admits is still the Canadian national flag and which, after it has been replaced by another flag, will not be a commonwealth flag because it has been the Canadian flag and contains the Canadian coat of arms on it.

I ask the house to decide whether it is fitting that alongside this national flag we should have a flag representing our commonwealth association and, if that is the case, whether the royal flag of the commonwealth is not the best flag for this purpose.

Mr. Nowlan: I have just one question for the right hon. gentleman. He referred to the Queen's flag. I should like to ask him this. When Her Majesty visits Canada again, assuming she comes into this building, what flag would fly from the peace tower; the union jack or the royal standard?

Mr. Pearson: Over the tower, if the Queen herself were in the building, would be flying her royal standard.

Some hon. Members: The Queen's flag.

Mr. Pearson: On an occasion of that kind I would hope that over other government buildings where the Queen was not present both the red maple leaf flag and the commonwealth flag would be flying side by side.

Mr. Graffiey: Now you have three flags.

Mr. Barnett: Would the Prime Minister permit me to ask him a question before he ends his remarks? I ask him this not for the purpose of debating anything he may have said, for the moment at least, but for information. If I heard the right hon. gentleman correctly he indicated that the union jack is in fact the flag of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. I should like to know whether Her Majesty's government here in Canada has consulted with Her Majesty's government in the United Kingdom with respect to this proposal that we should use a flag which is regarded as the flag of the United Kingdom for the purpose set out in the resolution.

Mr. Pearson: They have been made aware of the resolution before this house but it would be quite improper, of course, to consult them about this matter. The Canadian parliament will decide this question. The fact is that the flag which they have adopted as the flag of the United Kingdom is the royal flag, and they adopted it after consulting with the Queen. We have exactly the same right to consult the Queen, if parliament so desires, as to whether a royal banner can be adopted for commonwealth purposes. The British government does not come into this.

Mr. Nasserden: I have a question for the Prime Minister. He appears to be concerned about Canada's association with the com-

monwealth, and he believes some emblem should be adopted to show our commonwealth association. My question is this. Has there been any question from any quarter concern-in Canada's association with the commonwealth which raises this subject as a question which needs to be dealt with?

Mr. Pearson: I am not sure I understood the question. I gather it was whether any other nation in the commonwealth has raised this question.

Mr. Nasserden: No. If we are so concerned all of a sudden about asserting our association with the commonwealth, is it because someone has questioned our association with the commonwealth?

Mr. Churchill: Is it in doubt?

Mr. Pearson: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. I do not know what the hon. member is driving at.

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): I rise at this time to say we concur in the amendment, and that as far as I am aware it will receive the unanimous approval of the New Democratic party for whom I speak at this time.

I should like to begin by complimenting the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton for bringing this matter to the attention of this house and giving us an opportunity to register our views with regard to the proposal. We were unable to do this in the committee. It is unfortunate that the Prime Minister began by taking an inflexible position in connection with this proposal. I may say that the argument he advanced was considered by members of the committee, and we did not feel it could stand up to any logical examination.

It is important to register the position taken by the committee. What is being suggested in its report is not a commonwealth flag as such; we do not have the authority to create a commonwealth flag. But we do have the authority to designate an emblem to symbolize our association with the commonwealth until such time as the commonwealth itself may designate a flag.

It is regrettable that the Prime Minister should have seen fit to cast aspersions on the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton because of any position he may have taken in the committee or here in the house. There was agreement among all members of the committee that in order to achieve the greatest possible degree of success each member was free to voice his opinions, to change his views, to modify them, to try to come to an honest compromise with the other members concerned. The hon. member for Victoria-Carleton does not deserve the insulting treatment he got this afternoon.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Scott: I should like to say for the record that I have before me an amendment which I had intended to move. It is almost identical with the one now before the house. We have had an opportunity to examine some of the aspects of the union flag. It seems to me it is clearly a misuse of the union jack to attempt to designate it in the manner proposed by the government. It is beyond argument that the union jack is the flag of Great Britain, and we simply do not have the right to downgrade that flag, the flag of another country, by appropriating it for what we think is a peculiarly Canadian purpose.

It is perfectly reasonable for us to adopt the Canadian red ensign for these purposes because in many ways the Canadian red ensign is a sort of Canadianized union jack. We obtained it from the British merchant navy, we placed our coat of arms upon it, and it has developed a special place in the flag family of Canada. Therefore it is perfectly proper for us to adopt the Canadian red ensign for these purposes, whereas it is completely improper and I think is in fact an insult to the union jack to downgrade it by appropriating it for what is purely a Canadian purpose. I hope there will be enough members in this house to carry the amendment and defeat the proposition put forward in the flag committee's report.

One other observation that could be made is that the flag committee itself did not have a very long period of time in which to discuss the principle of a flag for our commonwealth association; most of our time was spent in trying to designate a distinctive Canadian flag. I wish members would stop talking of two flags. The committee was unanimously of the view that we were striving to create a distinctive Canadian national flag.

Mr. Pugh: Hear, hear.

Mr. Scott: But none of us at any time—at least this certainly applies to myself—ever felt this precluded us from dealing with the principle of a flag, not a national flag but a flag to symbolize our association in the commonwealth and our allegiance to the crown. This was clearly before the committee. We were asked to report upon the flag question, and that included both the resolutions that were before this chamber for consideration.

I think all of us in the committee were very, very impressed by the arguments put forward by those in the committee who would have wished to see the red ensign as Canada's distinctive national flag. We listened to those arguments with respect. We could not agree that they were sufficient to constitute the red ensign as a distinctive flag for Canada, but we did realize the deep loyalties and long traditions that have grown up around the red ensign. It is a Canadian flag and it is a flag which I think it is perfectly proper, perfectly appropriate and perfectly desirable to now give a special place by designating it as a flag to symbolize our association in the commonwealth.

All the arguments put forward by the Prime Minister this afternoon simply do not stand up, and he cannot get around the very real barrier posed by the fact that the union jack is not a Canadian flag and we have no right to appropriate it for our own purposes. That is one reason I regret that the government have started out with their usual inflexible position on this matter, and I hope that as the debate progresses they will become convinced, as many of us are convinced, that they are wrong and that it would be far more appropriate and proper to designate the Canadian red ensign for this special purpose. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, we will support the amendment when it comes to a vote.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. Pugh: No, sir.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Okanagan Boundary.

Mr. D. V. Pugh (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, might I say right off the bat that I agree with the last speaker's statements with reference to a second flag for Canada. However, I do not agree that in the committee we all felt there should be two flags; in fact my distinct impression is that early on in the flag committee talks I and the last speaker brought out the fact that we were going to choose a flag for Canada which was finally put through as a distinctive national flag. But there was no doubt in my mind, along with others, that we were working for only one flag for Canada despite the fact that two resolutions had been put before us. We discussed the two resolutions and we said "No, we do not want two flags". I am not alone, and was not alone in the committee, in that view.

However, I would just like to say one or two things following on what the Prime Minister has said. I believe he was a little off the beat. I must say that I hate following him in a speech because many of the points he puts forward I find rather difficult at times to follow from the point of view of sense. I have stated that the committee believed we should have one flag and one flag only, and I believe this change in government thinking is just one more attempt to wipe the Canadian red ensign right off the face of the map. Their last minute substitution of the royal union flag just does not bear any merit at all.

The Prime Minister had a great deal to say about the royal union flag and the reason for our using it, which he said is historical. The royal union flag and its predecessors in England and those countries comprising Great Britain were always the Queen's flags, the Prime Minister said, and the royal union flag was the flag for the whole of the country.

If my recollection is correct, out of the mouths of the witnesses the Liberals called in the flag committee there is no question at all but that the royal union flag and its predecessors were not the flags of the country. The royal union flag was a distinct naval flag for use at sea only; it was not supposed to be used even on land bases. However, after a great many naval victories it became a very popular flag and through usage, tradition and the fact that the British people liked to fly it over their own home base, it became popular. It became popular first of all not by edict, any parliamentary reference or anything like that, but because it was flown over the homes and was finally popularized to the extent that the government made it the flag of the country. This is my recollection.

I would like to draw an analogy between that and the Canadian red ensign. After drawing the analogy I would only point out that the Canadian red ensign, our present Canadian flag, is the flag we should have if we are to have two flags. That is why I seconded this amendment. The Canadian flag that we now have—the red ensign is still our flag—has flown in this country since its beginning in 1867. It was the first flag to fly on any flagstaff over our government buildings, and it stayed there until a Liberal government in 1904, for some reason or another, hauled it down.

But that did not kill the red ensign. It came back and—we all know its history from a legislative point of view—has been Canada's flag since that time, and is still until an act of this parliament changes it. During

all that time usage and tradition were the only things that made it Canada's flag. Usage and tradition have made it Canada's flag in the same way that usage and tradition made the royal union flag the flag of Great Britain. Let us not have any mumbo-jumbo over the Queen's flag.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is more appropriate for this purpose. We have a Canadian flag now. I must say at the beginning that it is a flag which I did not want to see changed in any way, shape or form, and I fought for it in committee until such time as we had a vote on it and our red ensign was turned down. At that stage I sought other means, along with other Conservative members, to produce some form of the red ensign and, failing that, find a flag which would embody those traditional symbols of the founding races of Canada, namely the French and the English.

I should like now to touch upon the history of the use of the Canadian red ensign in Canada. Many people feel that this flag was created overnight. The usage of this flag has been responsible for its acceptance. It was not adopted as a result of some parliamentary whim of a Liberal government some time after 1904, when it was taken down. It was again adopted as the Canadian flag after serious consideration; and what it meant to the people of those days it means to the people of Canada today.

If we want a change then I will agree to such a change, but to make my position absolutely clear in this regard I must say that the committee from the beginning intended to select one flag for Canada and one flag only. The resolution passed by the committee included the word "only" in association with a national flag. Obviously we were thinking of two flags, one to be the national flag and a second to show our allegiance to the Queen and our membership in the commonwealth. Many arguments were presented to the committee in this regard, but as far as I am concerned the word "only" means, only one flag for Canada.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) has suggested that we should show our allegiance to the Queen and our membership in the commonwealth by the adoption of a second flag. Surely we do not need a second flag to show our allegiance to the Queen. Other commonwealth countries have not adopted flags to show their allegiance to the Queen or their memberships in the commonwealth. Throughout our history we have demonstrated time and time again our allegiance to the Queen. If we adopt, as our final choice, the one red maple leaf flag as our national flag, that should be accepted as our flag for all purposes.

The only other argument in support of the adoption of a second flag is that it will show our relationship to the commonwealth. Canada has shown leadership in commonwealth studies, and has done a great deal to further commonwealth relations. We have never been backward in doing so. Therefore do we need a second flag to exemplify our commonwealth relationship Do we need a flag other than the red ensign to show our allegiance to the Queen?

The Prime Minister stated that the vast majority of Canadians desire a second flag, and indicated that the evidence supported his statement. I have never seen any evidence, certainly none was presented to the committee, that supported that argument. Has any member ever talked with an individual on the streets of the cities of Canada and heard that individual state that we need another flag to show our allegiance to the Queen and our relationship to the commonwealth?

For the reasons I have stated I was, from the beginning of the committee meetings, opposed to the adoption of a second flag. In this regard I should like to support the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott) who said that the Prime Minister was despicable in his remarks about the speech made by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming).

Mr. Scott: I did not use the word "despicable", I said he was insulting.

Mr. Pugh: Using the words of the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister was insulting not only to that member, and other Conservative members of the committee, but to his own Liberal members whose votes in the committee were to be kept secret.

Mr. Pickersgill: Would the hon. member permit a question of a purely factual nature which I ask, because I feel what the Prime Minister said has been misunderstood? As I understand it, there was only one vote cast against the seventh report of the committee. Anyone who can do elementary arithmetic would come to the conclusion that—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Is the hon. minister asking a question?

Mr. Pickersgill: I am asking the hon. member whether he thinks that in view of the fact that only one vote was cast against the report, it is reasonable to infer that the vote was not cast by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton?

Mr. Pugh: I should like to thank the hon. minister for his lesson in arithmetic.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could clarify the situation.

Mr. Pugh: I am now making a speech. You can clarify whatever situations you wish to clarify when you are making your own speech.

May I point out that the hon. minister may be accomplished as far as elementary arithmetic is concerned, but perhaps not so accomplished as far as elementary common sense is concerned.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but for the sake of clarification I should like to state that there was only one vote against the report, and it was cast by myself.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The facts presented by the hon. member do not constitute a question of privilege. The hon. member is aware that he is entitled to take part in this debate, at which time he can clarify any statement he feels should be corrected.

Mr. Pugh: As I suggested, Mr. Speaker, the minister may be good at elementary arithmetic but he is not so good, as far as common sense is concerned. If he will add up the votes he will find that there were 14 votes. There were seven votes cast for the motion, two against, with five abstentions. The chairman did not vote. That makes a total of 15 votes, and that is what I meant by elementary arithmetic. Perhaps I should not insult the minister's intelligence by saying that he is not good so far as common sense is concerned, but excuse him on the basis that he has not read the report thoroughly.

Mr. Pickersgill: Will the hon. member permit another question? Is it not true that the final vote on the seventh report of the committee, as read by the Prime Minister, indicated that there was only one vote against, with a number of abstentions? The hon. member for Mégantic (Mr. Langlois) has indicated that he cast the vote against the report.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Pugh: Whatever the circumstances, the votes taken in the committee were to remain secret, and it was certainly not proper for the Prime Minister to indicate what took place.

The Prime Minister rather scathingly attacked the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton, who said that two flags were not necessary. I suggest he attacked him in this way because of his proposed amendment, which does in fact suggest a different flag. In actual fact the reasoning behind that amendment lies in the knowledge that the votes on the flag issue now being taken in the house are not consistent with the votes taken on the same issues at the meetings of the special committee. Adoption of the red ensign was defeated by the committee, and that is a matter of record. Following that defeat we did not turn our tails and scurry home but attempted to find a solution to our problem by the adoption of a modification of the red ensign. When that attempt was thwarted, we tried to select a flag which would incorporate emblems symbolic of the contributions of the two founding races of this country. I have used that same analogy today.

It is perfectly obvious that the government is being supported by members of other parties in this house in its desire to approve two flags. Now that they have taken a stand we are asking them to consider, instead of the royal union flag, Canada's flag of the past, her ensign. It is rather interesting to note what happened in the committee as set out in the report. In the third paragraph there is the following:

> It was moved "that the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to provide that the Canadian red ensign may continue to be flown as a symbol of Canada's membership in the commonwealth of nations and of her allegiance to the crown". An amendment was moved to substitute the words "royal union flag, generally known as the union jack" for the words "Canadian red ensign".

Then the votes are set out. One can read this easily and quickly, but any member who was on that committee knows that there was a wealth of time and words behind the final adoption of the recommendation in the seventh report of the flag committee. Members of the house should consult their own members who were on that committee to find out just what their attitude was.

We had the distinct impression that word had come down from Joey Smallwood that if a recommendation for the royal union flag was not made he would be offended and would continue to fly it anyway. That is what we thought. We expressed that view and we were laughed at. I would say to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) that he should sit down and consult with the Liberals who were members of that committee because as I said a great deal of time was

spent and many words were uttered in that regard.

Mr. Churchill: Were both motions moved by Liberals?

Mr. Pugh: There was a lot of emotion on the part of the Liberals, and I will leave it at that. I do not want to go on at length at this time. I think I have made clear the basis of the recommendation of the committee that there should be only one distinctive national flag. I believe I have made my feelings very clear on the matter, as did the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming) who moved the amendment. As I have said, we could not understand why there was a change right at the end.

I respect the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott) because he was a distinct asset to that committee, but I know he will recall the argument that preceded the recommendation for one national flag. I have put forward my argument why we should not have two flags and at the same time why we have now moved an amendment for a second flag. I say that if Canada has a flag today which is hers through tradition and general usage it is the Canadian red ensign. In seconding the amendment I wish to emphasize the fact that if we are to have a second flag for the two distinct purposes that have been set out, to express allegiance to the crown and our commonwealth affiliation, then there is one flag in Canada today that does so to a T, our present Canadian red ensign.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the amendment to the motion for concurrence in the seventh report of the special committee I should like to begin by suggesting that in spite of some of the arguments that have been made it is completely clear in my mind that there is a distinction between the flag adopted by the vote early this morning and what we are considering now. I think the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming) outlined this very well when he said that the committee had decided, as contained in their report, that only one national flag would be adopted. Paragraph 5 of the sixth report of the special committee, subparagraph (b), sets out the position clearly in these words:

> Your committee considered the following motions: ... (b) The adoption of only one national flag —motion carried 14 to zero.

So there is no confusion whatever, Mr. Speaker. It is clear that the committee's decision was for only one national flag and that that flag should be the single red maple leaf on a white background with two red bars. I want to say, as is recorded in *Hansard* and in *Votes and Proceedings*, that I did not support the recommendation made by the committee to the house, but the consensus of the house has now been taken and so far as I am concerned I intend to accept and respect the decision made by the House of Commons respecting Canada's national flag.

There is one other thing I think we should be clear about and that is that this house and, indeed, parliament as a whole, does not have the right to create a commonwealth flag. The hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott) pointed this out. I believe we have the right to designate a symbol of our allegiance to the commonwealth and to the crown. The Prime Minister argued that if we are going to do this it would be proper for us to select the royal union flag as that symbol. So far as I am concerned, that may be an argument but it is not conclusive from the point of view of ruling out all other symbols that could in fact serve for this purpose.

It is my personal opinion that the flag that is designated as being suitable for the purpose of displaying our allegiance to the commonwealth and to the crown could in fact be some other symbol than the royal union flag. I believe that the Canadian red ensign, which contains the royal union flag as part of its composition, with a distinctive Canadian content would in fact be a more appropriate symbol. As I have just stated, the Canadian red ensign has the royal union flag on it but there is also the Canadian coat of arms in the fly, and in my opinion this is a preferable symbol for the purposes suggested in the seventh report.

The hon. member for Victoria-Carleton moved the amendment now before us and it is coincidental that the hon. member for Danforth indicated he was prepared to move essentially the same amendment. For your information, Mr. Speaker, I have written out before me a similar amendment. It was, therefore, just simply a matter of time and who was recognized first.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go on at length about this matter, except to say that the sixth and seventh reports of the committee are matters of free votes within our party. There may be other members of our party who wish to express their own individual views respecting this matter. So far as I am concerned, I am ready to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming). I hope that we can

have unanimous consent in this house to accept the amendment. The reason I say that is contained in the last sentence of the amendment moved by the hon. member in which it is stated that the committee, for such purpose, be revived.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that under the rules of this house it is not proper for this house to amend a committee report. If we do not accept a committee report and we have some suggestions for changing it, then under the rules that amendment must contain instructions to the committee when the report is referred back. Of course, for such purposes, the committee must be revived. If there were unanimous consent in this house, however, I believe we could save a great deal of time by asking for that unanimous consent and amending the seventh report of the committee by substituting the Canadian red ensign for the royal union flag. Then, we could get on with dealing with this matter and perhaps complete it during this sitting. I appeal to the members of the house on all sides to accept this amendment unanimously so that it would not be necessary to revive the committee and we could get on with other government business.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, after sitting for six weeks on the special flag committee, which was also instructed to study a proposal similar to the amendment proposed today, I had then decided not to support the motion along those lines, for the adoption of a flag identifying us as a member of the commonwealth or as an associate member of the British commonwealth countries, if that flag were to be the union jack.

I rose earlier to say that I was the only one to vote against it at that time. I must point out again today that in this matter, I am speaking for myself. Everyone is free to speak as he sees fit. I am convinced that to refer the matter again to the committee would be to no avail and would delay everything.

The amendment which has just been introduced tends to substitute the red ensign for the union jack. I think that it is a trap. We have just voted last night in favour of a distinctive national flag. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, we have sweated hours and even days to arrive at last night's result. As a member of the committee, I can even say that the selection of such a flag brought tears in the eyes of many. Those members of the committee who are in the house this afternoon could confirm my statement. They worked industriously and with all their hearts.

I am wondering today why we must choose a flag to show our allegiance to and our association with the British commonwealth of nations. Did we not adopt last night a distinctive national flag which, in due course, will become official? That flag could very well represent us at all times and in all circumstances.

I fail to understand also why the Canadian government is obliged to choose a flag to show our allegiance to the commonwealth. If the commonwealth wants a flag to identify its member nations, it should choose one.

It is true that we are free to do so, but it is very difficult to find any sense in all that.

We now have a flag—a flag that we got with great difficulties. Everybody here and outside the house knows that. I think that the single maple leaf flag will be quite appropriate to represent our country within the commonwealth. Because of what this flag means, of the eagerness displayed to get it, of our pride in flying it, because also of the sincerity of the Canadian people as evidenced by that symbol we chose last night, I think that this emblem would be quite appropriate to represent our country within any organization. In closing, I say that it is not necessary to have a second flag, one is enough to represent Canada. Let us hoist that flag, telling ourselves that it serves all purposes and that we are entitled to fly it in any circumstances, as it was adopted by parliament. It is true that we are also a member of the British commonwealth of nations.

But it is not so much the interpretation that could be attributed to it when it will be hoisted across the nation. It will not be hoisted only to show that we are a member of the commonwealth, but as a national flag, and some will defend it as such. It will then be absolutely false.

One must not forget, Mr. Speaker, that this flag hides legitimate feelings which deserve to be defended with the greatest ardour, the greatest unity, as it is a national flag. On the other hand, today we are presented with a flag which has so many ties for some groups across the country that it is intended to impose it as a second flag, a second class flag, to impose it simply to show our allegiance to the commonwealth.

The best sign of allegiance—and we can never say it enough—is a national flag, the

one we adopted yesterday; and when I heard, with my own ears, the anthem sung yesterday, I saw what emotions the adoption of this flag had given rise to.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot reveal how the vote was taken, but the matter was studied and discussed in the committee. I must abstain from revealing how the other members of the committee voted after these negotiations, but I adopted a position in committee, I maintain it today and I shall defend it tomorrow.

I did not approve the choice of this flag in the committee, and I will not support it today; my colleagues can follow the dictates of their conscience, but I for one oppose the second motion. This does not mean that I can be expected to support the other, for when the second comes, I will adopt exactly the same attitude. For, in my opinion, one national flag is sufficient to represent us anywhere, anytime.

[*Text*]

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, my first words must be those of congratulation to the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming) for presenting in a highly competent and capable manner an argument that should find great merit in the eyes of the government, since he was proposing that the government adopt as our commonwealth symbol a flag over which we have some right and jurisdiction.

If nothing else was learned from the speech of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and the interjections during it there is one definite lesson, that we in this country have no right to ask the people of the United Kingdom to provide us with their flag for use as a commonwealth symbol. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton, we have every right and justification to propose the Canadian red ensign as that symbol.

In my speech yesterday I listed the reasons that I felt the flag design which was adopted by vote early this morning would not be satisfactory as a national flag. Already we see some of the justification for the argument I made then, an argument which was made by many other hon. members on a number of occasions. The flag design adopted last night is not capable of conveying an association with any other country which belongs to the commonwealth because it does not contain within it those symbols which are inherent in the red ensign, a flag capable of being both a national and international flag in indicating our association with our commonwealth friends and the contribution Canada has made over the years to the building of the commonwealth of nations.

Despite the conviction displayed by the Prime Minister in his speech in supporting the recommendation of the flag committee, the design recommended by the committee is not at all as satisfactory as the Canadian ensign would be in representing our commonwealth association. He presented in a most illogical argument a degree of gobbledygook unsurpassed during the last flag debate and, in my opinion, not surpassable in the present debate.

Last Friday the Prime Minister made a high sounding speech indicating his views on why we should adopt a new flag. I did not agree with the arguments he made then, nor do I now, but I admit he made a significant contribution to the debate. But his speeches earlier this morning and this afternoon have added nothing to any feeling of respect for him and the office he holds, principally because of the attitude he adopted and the method which he used in endeavouring to get his points across.

One of the most interesting portions of his speech this afternoon was that in which he admitted for the first time that the Canadian red ensign was our national flag. Until he said that I had always held the impression, according to statements made by the Prime Minister, that we did not have a national flag and that what he was endeavouring to do was produce one. Now, all of a sudden, after the vote has been taken and a new flag chosen, we discover through the mouth of the Prime Minister that the Canadian red ensign was, according to his mind, all the time a national flag.

The Prime Minister attacked the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton in a most despicable way. He laughed at the hon. member and told him how illogical he was. If the hon. member was illogical in any way it is because of the illogical procedure of the government in endeavouring to produce a second flag for the Canadian nation. What the hon. member was trying to do, as we in the official opposition have tried to do on so many occasions during the life of this parliament, was put forward arguments which he hoped would make sense not only to the Canadian people but to other members of the commonwealth. Since I have been in this house the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming) has displayed a devotion and dedication to the betterment of the Canadian way of life which is a credit not only to his

constituency and to his province but to this nation. He is not the type of man who should find the Prime Minister deriving great joy and benefit from deriding the remarks he has made in putting forward a cogent argument with regard to an illogical recommendation on the part of the government.

Why should the Canadian red ensign not be the flag which represents our association with the commonwealth? What better flag could be flown from the flagpoles of this nation to portray our association with that great body? I cannot think of anything of which Canadians would be more proud than the knowledge that this house had at last found a place in this country for a flag which has meant so much to so many for so many years. As I said yesterday, I appreciate that this new flag may in days to come acquire something of the meaning which attaches to the Canadian red ensign today. But it does not have that meaning now. If we are to do anything for this new flag in the hope that it will become an acceptable symbol of this nation, we should produce alongside it, since the government desires two flags, one which is steeped in the history and traditions of this land, one which means so much to those who have lost loved ones in two world wars, one which means so much to the builders of this nation. I point out again that this is a flag which incorporates in it the union jack; it has in it the stuff of which the commonwealth is made, especially the British tradition which is so important and which has played so large a part in the development of this nation of ours. Surely the fact that the New Democratic party and the Social Credit party find a degree of merit in this amendment which they could not find when it came to the selection of a unique national flag should be an indication to the government that it would be wiser and saner to accept this proposal by my hon. friend from Victoria-Carleton and have it adopted, without the degree of debate and rancour associated with the vote which was taken early this morning.

I am not interested in debating at great length the value of a second flag to this nation. I am not interested in debating whether we should have one, two, three or four flags flying from the flagpoles of this country. But I am interested in seeing some common sense used, if we are to accept the second flag, in the selection of that flag. We as Canadians can find many more reasons in favour of the adoption of the Canadian red ensign than can be found in favour of the adoption of the union jack. It is true there was a time when the union jack was used as widely in this nation as was the Canadian red ensign. There was probably a time when Canadians did not know whether the union jack or the Canadian red ensign should be the official flag of this nation. But that time has long passed.

If anything was achieved by the debate which has just ended it was that great bodies of Canadians in all parts of this nation were convinced that the Canadian red ensign has been the flag of this country ever since 1867. A great many of them for many years hence will continue to fly it and to respect it. They will still consider it to be the flag of Canada. What more logical step could this parliament take than to adopt it, thus recognizing the feelings which are held, and deeply held, by so many people in this country today? For many Canadians it will not be easy to move from the Canadian red ensign to a red maple leaf flag. If we were to adopt the Canadian red ensign as our commonwealth symbol it would at least give these people an opportunity during the period of transition to fly the flag they want to fly, knowing that it still had some meaning in this country.

Nothing which the Prime Minister said today convinces me there is any justification for accepting the union jack rather than the Canadian red ensign. I believe there are many other members in this chamber who remained unconvinced by what the right hon. gentleman had to say. I believe that in his own party there is less acceptance of the union jack than there is of the red ensign. After all is said and done, after votes have been recorded and after a new flag design has been adopted by this house, I remain convinced that there are many members of the Liberal party who feel great devotion for the Canadian red ensign. They do not want to see it hauled down from the flagpoles of this nation. They feel deeply about this. Now, at this moment, they have an opportunity to do something about it by urging the Prime Minister and his colleagues to accept the amendment which is before the house, thus ending this flag question so that we may go forward to deal constructively with the material and economic affairs of this nation which the people who sent us here wish us to deal with as prudently as possible.

Mr. Joseph Macaluso (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to enter into the debate on this amendment at this time, but rather to speak on the main motion. However, after listening to some of the

speeches of this afternoon I feel I should enter into the debate. I am perhaps one of the last of the members of the flag committee to speak during this flag debate. First of all I would also like to thank the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) for appointing me to the committee. It was not a task that I asked for but it was a task I was happy to carry out, not only for the Prime Minister but in my view for Canadians across this country.

I found on that committee, together with the other members of all parties, close friendships and close associations of mind although we differed in certain respects. I found that apart from our differences in certain respects we could always be friendly and sociable. I am happy therefore that this committee gave me an opportunity to know some members of this house somewhat better. I disagree with some of the remarks that have been made with regard to the Prime Minister's speech. I think the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Coates) used the words, in connection with that speech, "insulting" and "despicable". He also suggested that some things had been said with derision. I am sure the Prime Minister did not intend to be insulting or derisive. I knew the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton before being appointed to the flag committee, and during the meetings of the committee and before that time I always had a great deal of respect for him, although we were of different minds on this subject. I thought he would be the last to suggest that the remarks of the Prime Minister should be taken in this vein and used against him.

Certain remarks have been made in this house with respect to the decision of the committee regarding one national flag as contained in the sixth report of the committee. It is true that the report stated that a vote was taken on one national flag for Canada but, as the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott) pointed out, during the committee meetings it was made very clear and all members of the committee knew very well—and I was also one who raised this question—that although there was to be a vote on one national flag for Canada it was to be without prejudice to the committee dealing with a flag symbolizing our connection with the commonwealth of nations and our loyalty to the Queen. I challenge any member of that committee to deny that as a fact.

My views on a national flag were well known in the committee and are known in my constituency. I wanted to speak in the debate on the sixth report of the committee, but circumstances prevented my so doing. However, I have no hesitation in making my views known with respect to the seventh report of the committee. I respect the views of the hon. member for Danforth and the hon. member for Mégantic (Mr. Langlois). The hon. member for Danforth at all times—he stated this in the house and I am sure he will not think I am taking too much of a liberty in stating it again—supported the Canadian red ensign as being the flag symbolic of our commonwealth association. That view was always held by the hon. member for Danforth. Although I assume that when the vote was taken he may have voted for the union jack, I believe he did so reluctantly because he was always for the Canadian red ensign being the flag designated for our commonwealth association.

The hon. member for Mégantic was also opposed to any kind of flag symbolizing our commonwealth association. I respect completely this hon. member's view. However, Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to draw attention to the remarks made in committee by the mover of this amendment, the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton, and the seconder, the hon member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Pugh). I am sorry they are not present at the moment. I would point out that the remarks made in the committee, when the proposal was put forward that there be a flag symbolizing our commonwealth connections and our loyalty to the Queen, should be discussed by hon. members opposite, as a loyal opposition which sincerely believes that the Canadian red ensign should be the flag designated to symbolize our commonwealth association, with the mover and seconder of the amendment, because the views they propounded in the committee were exactly opposite to those they are now propounding.

I can understand the views of those who believe the Canadian red ensign should be the flag designated for this purpose. I also, being honest with myself, held that view and I held it, I might add, somewhat strongly. But then I kept looking into the matter further, when it was brought to my attention that perhaps it should not be designated as the flag for commonwealth purposes. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the views expressed by the Prime Minister today helped me to see why it should not be so designated. In fact a question was asked by, I believe, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill), "Were they Liberals who moved both motions?" The answer was yes; the hon. member for Leeds admitted that he

was the one who moved the amendment designating the union jack as the commonwealth flag, and another Liberal member moved the original motion that it should be the Canadian red ensign.

Mr. Churchill: That was the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman), was it?

Mr. Macaluso: I cannot recall who it was, but I think it was the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra. I believe if that hon. member was here he would admit that. I see that the hon. member for Danforth agrees with my recollection. I listened to the arguments put forward this afternoon by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton for whom, as I have said, I have always had respect, even before I became a member of the flag committee, although we differed at times. The mover and the seconder of this amendment are the same members who argued in committee that the Canadian red ensign should not be relegated to a secondary position. The hon. member for Okanagan Boundary argued strongly and sincerely that he would not see the Canadian red ensign in a secondary position at any time, even if the one national flag for Canada was adopted. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I found the statements made today by the seconder of this amendment incongruous and contradictory. I am not arguing with his reasons for changing his mind, but surely he should indicate those reasons to this house. He argued very strongly in favour of his position, as have many other members of the Conservative party.

Mr. Churchill: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Macaluso: Yes.

Mr. Churchill: While he is dealing with people who have changed their minds, will he tell us why the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) changed his mind?

Mr. Macaluso: I do not know why that hon. member changed his mind. If that member was present perhaps he would give you an answer. Although I have had discussions with him, he has not expressed his reasons, and I do not think it is my function to explain such a change of opinion.

Mr. Churchill: Why did the Prime Minister change his mind?

Mr. Macaluso: I have no knowledge of that either. Perhaps the hon. member should have directed his question to the Prime Minister when he was here today.

The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Coates) stated that the Prime Minister had said today that the Canadian red ensign was the national flag of Canada, and of course we have heard a great deal on that subject. The Prime Minister has stated on many occasions, and I support him, that the Canadian red ensign was originally intended to be used as the national flag of Canada until parliament ruled otherwise. That argument has been repeated here on many occasions.

I am of neither French nor English stock, although I was born in this country. My grandparents were immigrants to Canada, and I am thankful that they came here rather than somewhere else. My wife is of English and Scottish descent, so I do not know what my children could be called. In any event we have too many hyphenated names around here as far as I am concerned. Perhaps my children should be referred to as English-Scottish-Italian-Canadians. However I have always considered them to be strictly, only and always Canadians, and I feel very strongly about this.

Many individuals have suggested that in my point of view I am overlooking British history. Many individuals living in my riding, who are of English speaking and U.E.L. stock, do not take exception to the flag adopted this morning. I can give the names of some of these people, who would not be opposed to my doing so, but I will not do so at this time.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh.

Mr. Macaluso: The hon. member laughs, but I suggest that he knows many individuals of the same type who live in his riding.

As I suggested, many people have spoken to me harshly because they feel I have forgotten British tradition, and British jurisprudence in law. I would be lacking in respect for, and ignoring those principles I learned at university if I were to forget either British tradition or the tradition and culture of my own family, and I say with a great deal of reluctance that those who would do so are neither true to themselves, their consciences or anyone else.

I am in favour of a flag which denotes our commonwealth relations and our loyalties, if you will, to the Queen. I am not in agreement with those hon. members, such as the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming), who suggests that because there is something missing in the one national flag

which we have proposed we feel the need for a second flag. Anyone who feels that the symbols on a flag represent feelings that can be lost when those symbols are replaced does not hold true feelings for that which the flag represents. I suggest such individuals have never held dear to their hearts those things represented by a flag, if they can believe that such things can be lost by a change in the flag.

The members of the Conservative party who sat on the special flag committee saw fit to absent themselves during two votes. On the first occasion the vote concerned the adoption of the Canadian red ensign as representative of our commonwealth relationship. The second occasion was on an amendment that the flag to indicate that relationship should be the union jack. If their feelings were so strong in this regard why have they adopted a different attitude at this time? Why, having taken the attitude they took in the committee, do they now in this house propose an obviously illogical amendment?

The royal union flag, commonly known as the union jack, still flies in many areas of this country, particularly in Ontario. One has only to look at high schools, elementary schools and public buildings to observe the union jack. Why should the union jack not continue to be flown in this country? I am sure that it will not cease to be flown because of the adoption of this amendment. I am sure the Canadian red ensign will not cease to be flown as the result of the adoption of the flag which we voted on early this morning.

I do not suggest for a moment that we should attempt to stop the citizens of this country from flying either of those flags. However, there is nothing at all wrong with flying the union jack in this country as an indication of our allegiance to the crown and our membership in the commonwealth, particularly when it is flown by the government of Canada and those citizens of Canada who will continue to fly it, in any event, on appropriate occasions. I do not profess to know all of the occasions on which the union jack should be flown. I have always felt that the Canadian red ensign is a beautiful flag, and I still feel that way. I do disagree with those who suggest that the Canadian red ensign imparts a specific Canadian message, but that does not mean I disrespect the feelings of hon. members who think otherwise.

We learned from experts who appeared before the committee that the red ensign came to us from the British admiralty, and that as a result of usage it was adopted by order in council as the Canadian national flag in 1945, at which time it was stated that it should continue to be the Canadian national flag until a future parliament decided otherwise, and adopted a distinctive flag. I cannot accede to the argument that we can fly the Canadian national flag proposed now by the government while at the same time fly the Canadian red ensign with the Canadian coat of arms.

I went along with the suggestion to substitute the union jack for the Canadian red ensign because I felt very strongly and sincerely that the Canadian red ensign should not be placed in a secondary position, as a flag representative of our commonwealth relations. I think the amendment to the motion now before us deals with this suggestion in even stronger terms than I have used.

An hon. Member: It is easy.

Mr. Macaluso: It may be easy but—

Mr. Churchill: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Macaluso: I will be through in a moment and I will be glad to answer anything then. The hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Pugh) stated in his speech that he saw no evidence in the flag committee that there should be other than one national flag. I have already given my view on that and it is substantiated by the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott). I put out the challenge that this is not so, that there was always the qualification that it would be with no prejudice to the committee discussing the matter at a later date.

As the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) stated today, I felt during the debate on the amendment that to be consistent with their views and with the views of the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary they would have moved an amendment to delete altogether the recommendation made in the seventh report of the committee. I do not wish to put forward to members opposite that they should not have changed their minds. Of course they should. We all have the liberty and the freedom to do so, but I felt I should try to clarify some of the things that were said during the debate on this amendment.

If the amendment should carry, my own personal feeling is that I am quite prepared to continue respecting the Canadian red ensign not only as the flag designated to represent our commonwealth association and our loyalty to the crown but as a flag which I admit and have always stated has some history in the development of this country. It

has some history. I disagree that it should be our national flag but I am not one who has ever said that it has no history whatsoever.

I will conclude my remarks now and wait to speak on the motion itself, if we get to it. Before sitting down I will accept the question that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) may have had.

Mr. Churchill: I will reserve my question and answer the hon. member in a speech I hope to make later today.

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Macaluso) was labouring at some length the question of the logicality or otherwise of the position taken by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming) when he introduced the amendment. He appeared to be rather puzzled by it. I should like to say at once that I find nothing illogical about the fact that this amendment was introduced by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton. I can understand the preoccupation of the hon. member for Hamilton West, having been a member of the committee, with the ins and outs of all the votes that took place, but it seems to me that those in the official opposition who have spoken so far on the proposition now before us have made it quite clear that in the first instance they would have preferred a single flag without any other arrangement, that that single flag should have continued to be the red ensign and that they reserved their position on the second proposition in the committee and abstained for that quite logical reason. However, when the decision made by the house last night is given full effect it will result in the removing of the red ensign from the Canadian scene in any official sense, and it is logical that the official opposition should now seek to propose the amendment that is before us.

I say at once, Mr. Speaker, that I do not share their line of reasoning in this respect. I made a public statement in my own constituency when the original resolutions in the name of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) appeared on the order paper. I said that while I did not necessarily agree with all the particulars contained in those resolutions I personally liked the idea of Canada having a national flag of a distinctive maple leaf design and I also liked the idea of having a flag which would be a symbol of our relationship with the commonwealth and our allegiance to the Queen. That has been my position ever since.

I have not participated in the debate since it began except briefly for a few minutes the other day, but I have a few things I should like to say with reference to the amendment now before us, which I may say I support quite strongly. I listened rather carefully to the statement made by the Prime Minister earlier this afternoon and I must say I was a little surprised that, after having been so reticent about participating in the earlier discussions, he should suddenly launch himself to the forefront at such an early stage of the debate on this motion.

When the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Coates) spoke earlier he urged that some of the members of the Liberal party, who he feels have an attachment to the red ensign, should do some urging of their leaders to reconsider their position and to consider supporting the amendment. In my view the hon. member for Cumberland is suggesting a rather circuitous route. So far as I am concerned I appeal directly to those members of the Liberal party, in the light of the declaration that there will be a free vote, to show their attachment to the retention of the red ensign for the particular purposes suggested in the report of the committee, namely as a symbol of our association with the commonwealth and of our allegiance to the crown.

My assessment of the Prime Minister's arguments was that they were embedded purely in the ancient principles of heraldry. He had some authorities and I am not going to quarrel with the correctness of the views of the authorities he cited. But I am going to suggest that with regard to the question of the kind of flag symbols we are going to have there are considerations which are of more vital and vibrant importance than strict adherence to all the principles of ancient heraldry. As a matter of fact, I think we have already ploughed a little new ground in this connection by the action the house has already taken in connection with the other motion. I am not suggesting that such considerations should be entirely ignored and in my view they are not entirely ignored in the amendment moved by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton which my colleague, the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott), indicated he would have been prepared to move had it not already been proposed. I feel that the original suggestion brought forward by the flag committee ignores the very thing which was symbolized in the earlier report of the committee, namely that history is not a static or a dead thing. This report of the committee ignores the fact that the British empire and the British commonwealth is something which is living, evolving and mov-

ing on into the future which I, for one, hope will be as splendid as it has been in many respects in the past.

At the conclusion of his remarks I asked the Prime Minister whether or not the Canadian government had consulted with or made any attempt to ascertain the views of the government of the United Kingdom in respect of the proposal that we might adopt the royal union flag as the symbol of our allegiance to the commonwealth. I did so specifically because of my feeling that, while at one time we were in effect under the umbrella of the United Kingdom, we were an extension of it, since 1931 that has not been the case. We are, in fact, an independent nation even though we owe allegiance to the Queen who is one in person with the Queen of the United Kingdom. It would have been simply a matter of courtesy, in my view, apart from anything else, before such a proposal as this were placed before the Canadian parliament, at least to have had some sort of assurance that the government and people of the United Kingdom were willing and happy that we should do so. At least we should know if they are unhappy about it.

The Prime Minister's arguments concerning the origination and derivation of the royal union jack may be quite sound and logical from a historical point of view. I am not going to enter that argument or attempt to set myself up as any authority in this connection. I do suggest that, for all practical purposes, the union jack is the flag of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland. We should recognize that fact. I do not know whether or not any other members have heard reports similar to those I have heard from people returning to Canada from the United Kingdom in recent weeks and months. I have had it reported to me that at least some people in the United Kingdom, when they read their newspapers, were rather disturbed by the fact that at this late date we Canadians apparently were trying to steal their flag. I have no way of knowing how widespread that sentiment may be in the United Kingdom. Apparently it has come as quite a surprise to at least some people in the United Kingdom to discover that Canada, who they thought had asserted her independence quite some time ago, still considered that, somehow or other, she was under their umbrella or tied to the apron strings of the mother country. I gather they were inclined to be just a bit resentful over the fact that we had taken action which led to the establishment—I think we all agree it was in large part under the leadership that came from Canada—of the commonwealth of nations, as free, independent nations associated with one another, and yet apparently still desired to keep the United Kingdom flag rather than be willing to fly our own.

In support of the amendment, I may say that I feel there would be no quarrel on the part of anyone in the United Kingdom if we were to select what has been our flag since 1945 officially, with its union jack in the corner and our coat of arms, as a symbol of our association with the commonwealth. We may continue to use it freely in that sense. We have other associations in addition to those we have within the commonwealth. For an example, we are a member of NATO. Let me take a hypothetical situation. Let us suppose we wanted a flag which would be, in some measure, a symbol of our association in NATO. Would we think of proposing a resolution in this house that would make the stars and stripes the symbol of our association in NATO without asking our cousins in the United States whether or not they were agreeable to this idea? Perhaps the parallel is not exact. I would agree that perhaps the royal union flag has heraldic implications that the stars and stripes has not. Nevertheless, if you consider the logic of things in this day and age, I suggest that really there is not much practical difference between suddenly deciding we are going to adopt officially in this parliament, for our own purposes, the flag of the United Kingdom, and suddenly deciding we were going to adopt for certain purposes and usages, the flag of the United States of America.

I really have not much more to say, Mr. Speaker, except that I do feel when we look back on all that has taken place in this house and throughout the country since the question of a Canadian flag came to the fore, the difficulties that have been encountered, and if we take into account all the factors that are involved in terms of healing some of the wounds that were referred to last night, then it would be the part of wisdom for this parliament to retain in a permanent and honoured place the red ensign that many Canadians have come to know and to love. Apart from any other considerations, apart from the fact that I find the symbolism of the Canadian red ensign very appropriate for our association in the commonwealth, I believe these considerations should not be lost from sight by members of this house in reaching a decision on the committee report which is now before us.

I appeal to hon. members opposite in particular to consider these things before they come to a decision. All of us in this house claim we have the right to vote freely and have been given the right to do so by our party leadership. We should consider all these elements before we decide to reject out of hand the amendment which is now before the house. My only real association with the red ensign in conjunction with the commonwealth was during the period I was in attendance at the commonwealth parliamentary conference in Kuala Lumpur some time ago. I must say that there are situations when we, as the senior member of the commonwealth, find that the position of our flag in the array of commonwealth flags is right next to that of the United Kingdom. This is a symbol which I feel most Canadians would accept equally well. It is in keeping with the traditions that have been built around this particular emblem which first had official recognition in this country. It is a symbol which I would hope would be more acceptable in the eyes of many people of French speaking ancestry than one which is purely and simply a symbol of the United Kingdom, a country which I honour and respect and to which I have a strong sense of emotional attachment that sometimes puzzles me because I have never been there. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I think here is an area in which we can move toward a unity of feeling and understanding, things which may be lost if we insist on implementing the report of the committee.

For these reasons I would appeal to other hon. members of the house to join with those of us who have already indicated our support for the amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, I had no intention of speaking on a distinctive national flag for Canada. But I certainly intend to discuss the recommendation contained in the seventh report of the committee concerning the desire of the government to have a flag representing the agreement between Canada and the commonwealth.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Macaluso), who so ably dealt with the procedure adopted by the committee, showed how difficult it is for members who did not sit on the committee to understand the ramification of the votes. How much more difficult it must be for the Canadian people in general to follow the procedural implications of all the votes that were taken.

As I set out on my few brief remarks this afternoon may I say to you, sir, that everything I have to say in a historical context, and every other context, relates to the amendment before the house and the desire of the government to have a flag representing Canada's co-equal position in the commonwealth.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I always thought that it was not quite proper for a member to speak in too great details about the history of his own electoral riding in the House of Commons. But allow me to recall some historical facts concerning Brome-Missisquoi, the electoral riding I now represent in this house.

Some 75 years ago the population of Brome-Missisquoi was approximately 75 per cent English speaking and 25 per cent French speaking. Today, in 1964, the percentage is exactly the opposite: 75 per cent French speaking and 25 per cent English speaking.

Mr. Speaker, you can undoubtedly notice by my accent that English is my mother tongue, but today I have the honour of representing a dominantly French Canadian population in the House of Commons.

[*Text*]

Mr. Choquette: Today your riding is 75 per cent Liberal and 25 per cent Conservative.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grafftey: It is not true, and I am glad the hon. member for Lotbinière made such a remark, because I am going to answer him in a few minutes. I am quite pleased—

[*Text*]

—I think hon. members will soon realize why I am happy that the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) made such an interjection because he thinks—

[*Translation*]

—because the government proposed a distinctive flag, that the Liberals will necessarily obtain votes in the next election in the province of Quebec. That is not necessarily so.

[*Text*]

Mr. Choquette: We will get the Liberal vote, that's for sure.

Mr. Grafftey: We in Brome-Missisquoi understand the true historical fact that two great races founded the glory and the strength of Canada. Today this approach also includes many citizens who, since the time of confederation, have come to Canada to join

the two historic founding races in building a stronger and greater nation.

I know, as I begin my observations, that I am going to repeat myself but I am sure you, sir, will see that these keynote remarks, these introductory remarks I make, are definitely to be related to the amendment before the house and the government's desire to have a commonwealth flag. I cannot do it without referring to the historic background of my riding and to the present situation in it.

Although we are dealing with something that has national significance I think there are times when we can speak in some detail of our ridings, more especially when one speaks of Brome-Missisquoi where we truly understand, where the two great founding races live side by side in harmony and understanding, where we understand—and it is not an intellectual proposition—the positive attributes of unity in diversity are something deeply believed in and felt. That is why I found it very difficult to take the floor of the house and speak one way or the other during the debate on a distinctive national flag; but it will soon become apparent to the hon. member for Lotbinière why I am on my feet now.

[*Translation*]

I have a good answer to the question put to me by my hon. friend a few minutes ago.

[*Text*]

I feel, sir, that in relation to the problems of national unity and confederation, when we talk about the necessity for mutual understanding and bonne entente, and better understanding, we are not nearly positive enough in underlining the positive and glorious aspects of unity in diversity.

I think that in most organizations it is unfortunate that a 90 per cent area is the problem area and a 10 per cent area is the area of rich opportunity. This has been true in questions relating to national unity. Unfortunately we spend an inordinate amount of time on the 90 per cent problem area and typically ignore the 10 per cent area of pure opportunity. I hope before this debate is over, whether we are on amendments or subamendments, whether we are speaking of a commonwealth flag or a distinctive flag, I hope from now on in this house and outside it we will talk about the 10 per cent area of rich opportunity in relation to the problems of confederation and national unity.

Ten years ago I was speaking with one of my good friends in Montreal and I made remarks rather like those I am making in the house right now, and he said, "Oh, Heward, how boring. Can't we take it for granted we are united and strong and go ahead and deal with the bread and butter economic issues that are really facing this nation?" "Well," I said, "I suppose you are right, we can." But I think today as we deal with this subject, whether it is a distinctive flag or a commonwealth flag, that we cannot take such a thing for granted. Especially in the House of Commons we must show real leadership and discuss positively subjects which lie in the area of national unity, federal-provincial relationship and confederation. Now that we have a distinctive Canadian flag I hope we shall get on to discuss the real, bread and butter economic issues.

The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) suggested in the course of his intervention, and I am glad he made it, that because the government had proposed what the Prime Minister described as a non-political flag, and because of what has happened in the house in the last 24 hours, the Liberals would be elected automatically in the province of Quebec. I would simply point out that in 1962 there were some who felt that because of the introduction of simultaneous translation services in this chamber, bilingual cheques and that sort of thing, the position of the Conservative party in Quebec might be helped. Well, I think the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Choquette)—

[*Translation*]

—Mr. Caouette and the Créditistes have certainly given proof to the contrary in 1962.

[*Text*]

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that I am straying from the subject of the amendment to some extent. But speaking directly to the amendment and to the question of a flag representing our association with the commonwealth, we must concede, now, that there is no fleur-de-lis in the distinctive flag or the proposed commonwealth flag. I say this without any rancour whatsoever. I am not saying it is what I want and I am not saying it is what the people in my province want. Certainly, whether the choice, now, is to be the union jack or the red ensign there will be no fleur-de-lis in the proposed commonwealth flag.

An hon. Member: It is in the red ensign.

Mr. Grafftey: It is in the red ensign but not, I think, in the sense we were considering during the original debate. I know that much of the Prime Minister's argument was technically correct—not all of it, by any means. But who in the world would suggest that it is

possible to explain technicalities from the Atlantic to the Pacific on an issue so emotionally charged as this? I am convinced of one thing. I am convinced that while we on this side of the house had a free vote, no matter what was written or said across this land, the same could not be said for members on the other side of this chamber.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member kindly resume his seat. I am sure he will permit the Chair to bring to his attention the rule that he cannot reflect on a vote of the house.

Mr. Grafftey: I was not speaking on a past vote. I was speaking of a vote on the particular amendment which is before us.

I know there will be laughter from the other side at what I am about to say. But had the party to which I belong formed the government—I cannot say when we would have brought a flag, or flags, before the house for approval, or even if we would have proceeded by bringing a flag or flags before the house at all—I am convinced of one thing: We would have brought in one distinctive flag for one united Canada. There would have been no doubt about it. I realize I am speaking very frankly and forthrightly. My party, collectively and as individuals, has often made mistakes in the province of Quebec. But we have never made the mistake of dividing and ruling, as members opposite have done. That is why I left the Liberal party. I left the Liberal party because of resolutions such as we have before the house today.

The Prime Minister can try to tell us this is not a two flag resolution. He can go into technicalities. He can squirm. But he knows as well as I do that members in his Quebec caucus have stated this will be interpreted in Quebec as a two flag resolution. A party which is sympathetic to an associate state, a party which has never said the same thing inside the province of Quebec as it has said outside that province, now pleads with us to keep this question of a commonwealth flag above politics. I am not scared of the Prime Minister. He is an honourable man who wishes to do everything possible to unite this country. What I am scared of are his lieutenants such as the hon. member for Lotbinière, who think they can wave a flag and forget the economic issues and attempt to poison the minds of the people in the province of Quebec against the party to which I belong, telling them: Here is your flag; we are going to be elected automatically. No matter what the Prime Minister says, this is a two flag resolution.

Mr. Pigeon: We can go for two weeks on this subject.

Mr. Grafftey: Like his right hon. predecessor, a great Canadian, Louis St. Laurent, a man I respect as I respect the present Prime Minister, a man who did much to unite and help this country, the present Prime Minister does not know what the old guard of the Liberal party is like in the province of Quebec. We have noted the utter surprise of the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan). He could not understand why his party is doing what it is doing. At the same time we notice this other attitude expressed by the members from the province of Quebec. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you why the government is following its present course. It is because the party opposite has never said the same thing in the province of Quebec as it has said outside that province. While the Prime Minister would like to keep this whole matter out of the political arena, through gross ineptitude people who wanted to vote for a distinctive Canadian flag were forced to do it by reason of closure and today we are forced to move into an area—

An hon. Member: Would you answer a question?

Mr. Grafftey: I will answer later. On this side of the house we have always said we want a united Canada under one distinctive flag. But no matter what members opposite say, this proposal now before us will be looked upon in the province of Quebec as a two flag issue. Their colleagues from Quebec will soon tell us how it will be regarded in many sections of this country. No amount of technical explanation, no amount of weaselling in and out will explain that away.

Make sure of one thing. Members opposite have come up to me and said, jeeringly: "Heward, you cannot vote against report No. 6; think what would happen in Missisquoi county, which is mainly French speaking." Again, members have approached me and said in the same tone: "Heward, you cannot vote against report No. 7. Look what will happen in Brome county". Yet the Prime Minister says this is not a two flag resolution. Who is fooling whom? Who has done more than members opposite to divide this country?

Mr. Choquette: Try to make sense. You have just said the opposite thing. Make up your mind.

Mr. Grafftey: I want to make one thing very clear. Yesterday I made my position unequivocally clear both in English speaking and in French speaking Canada. Members of my party did not in all cases agree with me, but we were allowed to vote in such a way as to express our views. Since I was a college student I have always stood for one united Canada under a distinctive flag without a fleur-de-lis or union jack in it. I was allowed to vote that way. Were you allowed a free vote over there? Are you going to be allowed a free vote on this seventh report of the committee?

Some hon. Members: Sure.

Mr. Grafftey: Not on your life. Through gross ineptitude you have plunged, like the Liberal party has always plunged, a delicate question of national unity, federal-provincial relations and confederation right into the heart of partisan politics. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of Canada's co-equal position with other members of the commonwealth in the commonwealth of nations. I am proud, as every member of this house is proud, to recognize the presence of the crown in Canada. Enough said. But when I voted yesterday for a distinctive Canadian flag, I voted in the name of all the citizens of Brome-Missisquoi, English speaking and French speaking; and we did not need this cynical approach that is being brought forward today, namely a two flag resolution.

Mr. Matheson: Let us hear about the amendment.

Mr. Grafftey: You will hear about the amendment. I say to hon. members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that no member is more responsible than the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) for the unhappy situation we are in right now.

Mr. Matheson: That is a generality.

Mr. Grafftey: It is a very important generality that the people of Canada are soon going to understand.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker. would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Grafftey: I will answer the hon. members' question when I have finished, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Matheson: A moment ago the hon. member said that the Prime Minister had been correct in some of the technical comments respecting a flag, although not in all. Perhaps, since he is generalizing, he will be able to bear down and tell us where in any of his comments the Prime Minister was in error.

Mr. Bigg: That is not a proper question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I would ask the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Bigg) not to interrupt the hon. member for Leeds who has posed a question with the permission of the hon. member who has the floor.

Mr. Grafftey: I will answer questions at the end of my remarks, sir, which will be very soon. I would say that no matter what many people want to do in this vote regarding the union jack, whether they do not vote at all or vote for the amendment in favour of the red ensign, let it be quite clear that as far as I am concerned, no matter what we are doing now—and I know we cannot talk about past votes in the house—when I voted yesterday I voted in the name of every Canadian in my constituency, English and French speaking, for one distinctive flag, for one united Canada. If we are in the delicate position we have now reached in this debate it is because of a government and party that is flirting with the idea of an associate state and has unwittingly—that is the best we can say, unwittingly—sown the two state theory. Therefore it is only logical that Canadians are now becoming confused when they bring a two flag resolution before the House of Commons and present it to the Canadian people.

I say quite forthrightly and frankly that in my heart of hearts, no matter how I am going to vote—there is a paradox here and perhaps hon. members will think I am contradicting myself, but I am not—on this report, I will do everything in my power to explain inside and outside the province of Quebec that what we were handling was a one flag resolution, whereas because of the actions and the stupidity of this government it seemed to many Canadians that we were dealing with a two flag resolution proposed by a government that has never said the same thing in different parts of Canada to all Canadians. No matter how stupid at times we might have seemed, especially to members opposite, we have always said the same thing in every corner of Canada; we have always stood for one united Canada, for one distinctive flag no matter what it looked like.

Mr. Choquette: You want to unite Canada, but your party is divided.

Mr. Grafftey: Take the whips off your party and you will see how your people vote on this issue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I would ask the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) not to interrupt the hon. member who has the floor.

Mr. Grafftey: I know some hon. members will say—and this may include some of the remarks I have made—that a great many sad things have been said during the debate on the flag, whether it has been on this resolution or the other; but the facts of political life in Canada are these. I was asked this on the radio the other day, namely about our being a national party when we had such a small representation in the province of Quebec. West of the lakehead the government has less members than we have in the province of Quebec. It is very difficult, in the classical sense of the word, to call the two old, traditional parties national parties. Let us both realize that fact on the floor of the House of Commons, act responsibly and recognize that we have not a strong mandate, on either side of the house, from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. Pepin: Do you want to secede and join the United States?

Mr. Grafftey: I do not, and I do not think the hon. member does, either.

Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Grafftey: Yes.

Mr. Walker: I wonder whether the hon. member would take the assurance of the government whip, as another hon. member of the house, that the whips are not on in this vote and that it is a totally free vote.

An hon. Member: If so, it is the only one.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, let us make progress bit by bit. In this present debate it has been said time and time again that no matter how technically—

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, before six o'clock—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Is the hon. member rising on a question of privilege or a point of order?

Mr. Choquette: I think we should hear from the hon. member whether or not he is in favour of the amendment. He has not said a word about it, so he is out of order.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, no matter how—

Mr. Choquette: Are you in favour—yes or no?

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will display good manners and keep his seat, I will get to the point.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member will have an opportunity to do this at eight o'clock.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned at six o'clock I was talking about my riding of Brome-Missisquoi, and I pointed out that most of the citizens of Brome were English speaking while most of my electors in Missisquoi were French speaking.

I also wish to point out that when I voted for a Canadian flag last night, I voted for a distinctive flag for a united Canada. And when I voted for a distinctive Canadian flag, I voted on behalf of my English speaking and French speaking fellow citizens in the riding of Brome-Missisquoi.

Concerning the seventh report of the flag committee, I must tell the members of the government that as the member for Brome-Missisquoi and speaking for all the voters of that riding, we do not need a flag for Brome and another for Missisquoi.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to say that I intend to do everything possible during this debate, with a sense of responsibility, to make sure that every Canadian will recognize that, as far as those who support this party are concerned, this is a one flag resolution. Because of the actions of the present government there is a definite feeling among the people of this country that this is a two flag debate. That is the situation, whether we like it or not, in spite of the appeals for unity that have been made by members of this party to the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson).

A number of Liberal members from the province of Quebec, as well as from other parts of Canada, have told me that the situation with which we are now faced is not indicative of a Quebec phenomenon but

rather of a Canadian phenomenon. I believe that a great number of people in this nation feel that the government, as the result of this motion for concurrence, is proposing two flags for Canada. As far as my constituency is concerned, the government is proposing one flag for Brome yet another for Missisquoi.

Hon. members perhaps will remind me that yesterday I voted in favour of a distinctive Canadian flag and I did so because I believe in one flag for one united Canada. Hon. members opposite do not like to hear this side of the debate, because it is in this area that they are going to find themselves in difficulty. No matter how many errors the party which I support has made inside and outside of this House of Commons during the flag debate, and no matter how many technicalities the right hon. Prime Minister discusses, we believe in one flag for one united Canada.

Just before we adjourned at six o'clock I explained that, because this is an emotionally-charged issue, we in this party have exercised a free vote, and we will continue to exercise a free vote in respect of each phase of this flag issue.

In reference to the amendment now before the house, I plead with members opposite to make sure that their whip is off when they vote. It is not good enough for them to say that the whip is off, yet stand as a group and vote as a group, because the people of this country cannot be fooled about this issue. Action of that kind on the part of Liberal members of parliament does not represent a free vote.

We in the Conservative party believe that no matter what distinctive flag is selected, it should be the only distinctive flag for Canada.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh.

Mr. Grafftey: Hon. members opposite try to smear the Conservative members representing Quebec constituencies on every emotional issue which comes before this house, but because of television, radio and fast communication, the people of Quebec have become informed and can no longer be fooled by this type of action. This belief enunciated by Liberal members has been exposed, and what has taken place during this debate has been brought to the forefront and the attention of the people of Quebec.

All the members in this chamber have heard the catcalls from across this house during the debate on this motion, and the preceding motion for concurrence. We are all aware that the Liberal members think that we are afraid to vote against these motions for concurrence because we know what will happen. The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) during this debate yelled across the floor, while I was participating in this debate, that I was afraid to vote against the motion for concurrence in the report of the committee. We know what she meant by that verbal ejaculation.

We know what the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) meant when he spoke on the flag issue, suggesting that French Canada would become completely Liberal. As an ex-Liberal from Quebec I can appreciate why the Liberal government is treating the flag issue in such a way. Because of my appreciation of that fact I left the Liberal party. The Liberal approach to the flag issue has been founded on the concept of one flag for French speaking Canada and one flag for English speaking Canada or, as related to my constituency, one flag for Brome and one flag for Missisquoi. This approach will no longer be effective because the Liberal party can no longer fool the people about this issue.

I am not speaking with the authority of my party but I know in my heart of hearts as I stand here that while we Conservatives may have a rough time in the province of Quebec we voted yesterday, no matter how we vote on this motion, in terms of thinking of one distinctive flag for one united Canada. We do this as Conservatives realizing that the melting pot theory is not applicable to the Canadian mosaic, and again members opposite, by paradox, may think I am plunging the whole issue into partisan politics. Sir, as a member from the province of Quebec I am not willing to stand here and listen to the pontifications of the leadership of the Liberal party in the House of Commons and then go back to the province of Quebec and face the villainous type of partisanship we are going to see on this kind of issue.

It is all very well for the Prime Minister to say in the House of Commons: "Let us keep this matter out of partisan politics". I suggest that he write a letter to some of his Quebec members telling them to do the same thing in the province of Quebec when this issue is over. The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) has made the classic mistake of so many members of parliament on both sides of the house in relation to our province, a province that both of us have the honour to represent in the House of Commons. One would have thought he would have learned his lesson, but so many professional men in the province of Quebec feel that because they may be on the right side of emotional issues they can forget economic issues. The hon.

member for Lotbinière said: We have got our distinctive flag now, and as the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi has mentioned the fact that 75 per cent of the people of his riding are French speaking they must be 75 per cent Liberal today. That is false because today the people of my province recognize that the major issues are of an economic nature. I know it is bad for us to be on the wrong side of sentimental issues, but today 85 per cent of our farmers are living with net annual incomes of under $2,000 and 20 per cent of our urban families are subsisting in poverty and want.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Perhaps I should remind the hon. member that what we are dealing with at the moment is an amendment to the effect that the seventh report of the special committee be not now adopted but that it be referred back to the committee with instructions to strike out of the recommendation the words "royal union flag, generally known as the union jack" and substitute therefor the words "Canadian red ensign". It may be that the hon. member's remarks are related to this subject but that is not apparent to the Chair. I would ask him to make an effort to relate his remarks to that particular subject.

Mr. Grafftey: I was out of order, Mr. Speaker, and I bow to your judgment. I only say it is pretty hard for a young member of parliament who has seen so much poverty to hear a member opposite say that he thinks he is going to get an automatic vote because he has produced a symbol in the form of a flag.

To get back to the proposition that we have a two flag issue, Mr. Speaker, I say it is not a two flag issue. It is a one flag issue, but because the government has unwittingly plunged both resolutions into the partisan arena, because they have engendered by their actions a certain sympathy with the associate state idea, because they have never said the same thing in Quebec as they have outside of the province, unless we are very careful as to how we handle this resolution many Canadians in and outside of the province of Quebec will be thinking that we are dealing with a two flag resolution. Many of the members opposite have told their leader that in and out of their caucus, and it is going to be interesting to see how they vote.

Having said that, I plead that we make progress bit by bit and tonight adopt this amendment. Let us adopt the amendment for the red ensign because no matter how the Prime Minister enters into technicalities, we all know that the union jack is the official flag of the United Kingdom. I would think that hon. members opposite in a spirit of give and take would like to show us there is a free vote over there by voting for this amendment, which makes good sense to me and I am sure to all members of the House of Commons. There must be give and take in this sort of thing. Because of the actions of the Liberals in and out of the house there is great danger no matter what we do here. No matter what we do it is possible that this resolution will be described as a two flag resolution, a flag for Brome and a flag for Missisquoi. Let us avoid this and let us do things step by step that will better the situation. If you are sincere you will show us the whips are off and you will show us that you are ready to vote for this amendment providing for the adoption of the red ensign to indicate our relationship with the commonwealth.

Members opposite know there is going to be much unnecessary confusion related to the fact that the union jack, while greatly respected in many parts of this country, is largely recognized as the flag of Great Britain, our great ally. Let us not have this unnecessary confusion. If you are not plunging the whole matter into partisan politics, why do you sit there and sneer and yell? Where is the give and take? If this matter has not been plunged into partisan politics why is there this inflexible line of this or nothing else? When you see many responsible members in the other parties supporting this amendment, surely you can see its good sense. Surely if the leadership of that party is listening to its backbenchers from Quebec and outside of the province of Quebec they will adopt this amendment immediately. I plead with the party opposite to do so right away. Otherwise there is great risk that because of their actions this will be interpreted as a two flag resolution.

Let us recognize the fact, as I said before six o'clock, that neither of the two traditional parties, the Liberals or the Conservatives, can truly call themselves national parties any more. I recognize that with our corporal's guard from Quebec we are no longer a national party in the great sense of the word, but with your corporal's guard from west of the lakehead neither are you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member although perhaps he just wanted to finish his sentence.

Mr. Grafftey: I would say that with their corporal's guard from west of the great lakes neither are the Liberals a national party. So let us treat this whole subject in a spirit of give and take. Let us end some of the sadder aspects of this debate, the things that have been said and done in and outside of the House of Commons. Let us show a spirit of give and take and be ready to vote for this amendment so that finally we can get down to dealing with economic issues such as the question of poverty which really mean something to most of the Canadian people.

Mr. B. S. Mackasey (Verdun): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the house my contribution to the debate will be a very short one. My participation this evening is motivated solely by the remarks of the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey). I may say that my interruption was a very spontaneous one. I have listened with a great deal of interest both before the supper hour and since eight o'clock to the remarks of the hon. member who represents that very historic constituency. Earlier in his remarks I sensed a certain degree of sincerity with which that hon. member has always spoken when discussing national unity, the flag and his wonderful constituency of Brome-Missisquoi.

I have listened with perhaps more than usual attention to the remarks of the hon. member because in many ways the constituency of Brome-Missisquoi and the constituency of Verdun are very similar. I think the hon. member would be the first to agree that we both represent wonderful constituencies in a wonderful province. Like the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi I represent French speaking Canadians and English speaking Canadians in great numbers. Like the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi, as he said earlier today, my decision on how to vote on the flag was a very agonizing one as I struggled to reconcile the different factors and to come up with a vote which I thought was in the best interests of my province and all Canada. Despite the sincerity which I sensed in the remarks of the hon. member, I resented deeply any implication on his part that my vote then, and my vote in the future on this seventh report, will be motivated by anything other than my own desire to do what is best for my constituency and for my country.

Mr. Winkler: Do you say that for the rest of your colleagues as well?

Mr. Mackasey: I can assure the hon. member—

An hon. Member: What about yours?

Mr. Winkler: Do not worry about mine; I will look after my own apples.

Mr. Mackasey: I can assure the hon. gentleman that I do not need the whip of this party or any other party to tell me how I am going to vote. I have one person to satisfy when it comes to voting, and that is myself. I believe, and I have always followed this belief, that if I do what I think is right, I am doing what is politically right. I repeat my resentment for every member of parliament, that the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey) should suggest that any member on this side of the house, be he from British Columbia, Newfoundland or Quebec, English speaking or French speaking, is motivated by any other reason than a sincere desire to do his best for his constituency.

I have listened to practically all the speeches. There is no one on that side of the house who can accuse me of once heckling a speaker, of once interrupting a speaker, because I have followed this flag debate on the premise that the issue was such a great one nobody would want to participate in the debate unless he were motivated by sincerity and was a man dedicated to the House of Commons. I say therefore to the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi that this speech could have been a great speech because it had all the ingredients that were necessary for a great speech if he could have learned to refrain from the partisan tone that he introduced.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; I am wondering if at this point the hon. member is not straying from the question at issue. I believe what he should be considering is not what the hon. member has said or what motivated him in his speech. I suggest that what he should be doing is submitting his own views on the question at hand.

Mr. Mackasey: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member, whom I respect, is obviously proud of the fact, and with just reason, that he voted according to his conscience yesterday. I do not know of any member on this side of the house or in his own party that would find fault with his decision. In the final analysis, he made it in good faith and good conscience. I would ask all members of this house, when the amendment comes before us, to grant that same privilege so that nobody can be accused of vot-

ing in other than a sincere manner, or that the whip has told us to do this or that. I have as much right to vote for a new flag or for the union jack as the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan). What makes the hon. member for York-Humber a hero because he votes against his party any more than the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi is a hero when he votes against his?

I respect the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi and I respect the hon. member for York-Humber, because I feel both of these people were motivated by the same reason. On at least four occasions the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi has emphasized the fact he voted for the new flag. Then, he goes on to say he cannot possibly vote for the union jack; that is his privilege.

Mr. Grafftey: I did not say that.

Mr. Mackasey: I believe the hon. member said for the two flag resolution; it is a question of semantics, I think. I say this in all sincerity that my vote for a new, distinctive flag and my vote for the union jack as a symbol of membership in the commonwealth are votes made out of sincere conviction. As a matter of fact, I believe that this action will finally restore this flag to a place of distinction in this country. What has been the role of the union jack since the red ensign has taken prominence? What, specifically, has it stood for other than some symbol of that particular country that was the mother country of so many of us? At least, by this action of parliament, if the motion passes, the union jack will once again have a proud place in our country, in our future events.

The hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi made an issue of the fact that we will get confused with a new flag and a union jack. As a great Canadian, as the good Canadian I happen to know he is and also as a good Quebecker, I wonder what the hon. member might do this Saturday or next Saturday when he stands at the ceremony for opening a new road under the fleur-de-lis flag of Quebec? Does he turn his back on it or does he not recognize it for what it is, a symbol in the province of Quebec to be used on occasions where it cannot be confused with the red maple leaf or the union jack? The same thing happens to members of other provinces. The province of Quebec is not the only province with a provincial flag of its own. Other provinces have provincial flags. Certainly, they have a place in this country. There is no need for any confusion.

We will have occasions in Ontario, Newfoundland, Quebec and the other provinces, upon which the maple leaf, the union jack and the provincial flag are all displayed in a position of prominence. What amounts of intelligence is necessary to distinguish between them, to understand why they are there? So, Mr. Speaker, much as I appreciate the remarks made by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi and his sincere sentiments toward the province I respect and love, I resent the fact he said that our party has spoken with two voices in that province. This, again, was an unfair remark when it comes to national unity. On four occasions in his remarks to the house the hon. member paraphrased the remarks of Brutus when he praised the Prime Minister, then accused him of having two voices, one for Quebec and one for the rest of the country.

I know the hon. member thinks very highly of the French. However, I ask him if he would get up in his riding this Saturday and read some of the things that have been said in the heat of battle in this house during the flag debate? Would he read the statements of one member that the symbol of French Canada is the red maple leaf, a statement which was based on a letter written in the 1800's? Of course he would not. He would be ashamed to do it and so would I. I am sure there are many good Canadians on your side of the house who stand and make an impassioned plea for a point in which they believe. I can forgive any speech in this House of Commons if it is made sincerely and it reflects a man's true feelings, and I include the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) as long as they are made with sincerity. This is his prerogative. If I vote sincerely for the resolution which will make the union jack a symbol of our membership in the commonwealth, I do not want the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi or any other to be imputing motives for my vote. I will have no problem in going back to my constituency, which resembles the constituency of the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi, and explaining to those people that there is but one flag, the new red maple leaf, and one symbol of our membership in the commonwealth of nations.

In conclusion I would like to say on behalf of the French speaking members, not only on this side but on that side, that many of us thought the speech made yesterday by the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue (Mr. Martineau) was a classic in tolerance and I sense it made a lot of us a little bit ashamed,

perhaps because it was in complete contrast to much of the bitterness and hate that has permeated this house for too long.

I know the French speaking Canadians of my own party are free to vote as they wish, and because of their cultural and other traditions, because of the fact they are the first to admit they do not have the strong ties with the British isles that we do, if they are willing to vote for the union jack let nobody here interpret it as an effort of the whip, as an effort of party discipline, but rather as a symbol of these French speaking Canadians willing to subjugate their natural desire for what they think is in the best interests of Canada.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member a question. I appreciate his comments and the sincerity with which he delivered his address, but I would like to ask him if he has read the speeches that were made in this house against the prime minister of Canada when the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) was prime minister, speeches by members who now sit on the treasury benches? Did he ever listen to the C.B.C. commentators in the province of Quebec in those days when they were engaged in a very definite program? I do not say this in any way validates anything that has happened here this session, but I think he should bear those things in mind.

Mr. Mackasey: This is a very objective question from the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Winkler) for whom most members have a great deal of affection. It is also an honest question, but I think it radiates what is wrong with this house, the constant references to the abuses in the past, the constant references to what happened in 1954, 1956 and 1958, and what one member said about another member's prime minister. This is precisely the type of sickness that has permeated this place.

This is the type of thing which makes it practically impossible to sit down and discuss anything objectively. I have no more sympathy with members on this side who would attack the character of anybody on that side than I have with members on the opposite side who have constantly to interpet as racism everything French speaking members do on this side.

Mr. Winkler: I appreciate that and I agree with the hon. member, but I ask him where then does he place the blame?

Mr. Mackasey: I am afraid the hon. member will have to repeat his question.

Mr. Winkler: I cannot repeat the words exactly. I appreciate the sincerity of the remarks made by the hon. member in answering me, but I ask him where then does he place the blame?

Mr. Mackasey: I think, Mr. Speaker, I must not have clarified myself adequately. I am not interested in placing the blame. I am interested in, from today on, getting rid of the insults, fancied insults and constant references to what members said about other members six, 18 and 20 years ago.

It amazes me how people can reach back into their memories and remember some insult thrown at the Leader of the Opposition or, as in this case, at the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) on something that happened 14 or 15 years ago.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. The comments of the hon. member are very interesting. The question was also very interesting but I am sure both hon. members would agree they are a bit beyond the scope of the amendment before the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. L. J. Pigeon (Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm): Mr. Speaker, I was glad to support the red maple leaf flag, even though I would have preferred a green maple leaf. But, as regards the amendment now before the house and also the question of flying the union jack in certain circumstances to show our allegiance to the crown and our commonwealth association, well, I find it unacceptable.

I can say right now that I shall not support the union jack motion, because it is not the flag of the commonwealth but that of the United Kingdom and its colonies. To recognize in our statutes the union jack as one of our own flags, even if only in certain circumstances, constitutes an encroachment, it seems to me, upon our Canadian sovereignty, inasmuch as the union jack is the flag of the United Kingdom and its colonies. Canada has been an adult and sovereign country since the Statute of Westminster. I find it unacceptable that we should support the motion respecting the union jack.

As for the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming), I shall refrain from voting, and for the following reason: a vote against this amendment means a vote in favour of the union jack, whereas a vote in favour of the

amendment does not mean a vote against the union jack, but in favour of maintaining the red ensign. Therefore, I would rather abstain from voting.

Mr. Speaker, as I have already mentioned, the government is claiming our association with the commonwealth in order to have us accept the union jack. Why does the government not propose also the tricolour, the French flag, since France played a leading part in Canada when our country was first discovered.

The reasons invoked by the government in support of the union jack could also apply in favour of the tricolour because, for an important part of our people, it carries the same meaning as the union jack does for another section of the Canadian people.

I do not believe that it is sensible for a sovereign country like Canada to ask the representatives of its people to vote in favour of the union jack and to even have in its statutes two flags, one bearing a maple leaf, and the other one which could be flown under certain circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, the newspapers of the province of Quebec, together with those of the rest of the country, have criticized this formula of two flags proposed by the government. Unfortunately the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska (Mr. Pepin) is absent tonight, although he was here this afternoon. Here is what I read in the newspaper *La Tribune*:

> M.P. Jean-Luc Pepin does not like the idea of having two flags.
>
> The federal M.P. for Drummond-Arthabaska, Mr Jean-Luc Pepin, stated yesterday about the legislation dealing with a distinctive Canadian flag that; as the matter now stands, he did not like much the section providing that the union jack can still be flown to represent Canada's allegiance to the British crown. "I do not like it", he said.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Pigeon: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, in order to be fair to the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska, would the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm read the other paragraphs of the article in question, because I think the heading possibly does not suggest exactly what the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska stated? In all fairness to the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska, would the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm read into the record the other four paragraphs in that article?

[Mr. Pigeon.]

Mr. Pigeon: With pleasure, Mr. Speaker, if the house has no objection. They read as follows:

> The parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Trade and Commerce stated however that he was leaving it up to the Prime Minister of the country who would clarify the matter sometime this week.
>
> The opposition is taking advantage of this.
>
> The opposition is taking advantage of the existing confusion, in the opinion of Mr. Pepin, to strongly oppose the proposal.
>
> Now, according to Mr. Pepin, it is entirely false to suggest that two official national flags and anthems are being proposed.
>
> The hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska said that he found it more acceptable to recognize two anthems. But there again, he said, only one will be national: "O Canada". He said that the "God Save the Queen" would be a royal anthem, and it would be nice if we were to sing it to Her Majesty when she pays us a visit.

Mr. Speaker, since I do not want to take up too much of the time of the house, I shall not go on reading this article. But all the same, the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska said he did not like the two flag proposal.

I feel that if the house, in compliance with the Prime Minister's wish, adopts the union jack, even on certain conditions this will promote the separatist movement in the province of Quebec.

By adopting two flags, even though one of them is to be adopted on certain conditions, the government recognizes two Canadas and two nations.

Mr. Béchard: It is not two flags, but only one.

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Speaker, I have here an article by Mr. Yves Michaud, dated May 20, 1964.

Mr. Michaud, who is a highly respected Liberal, finds it abnormal that the government—

Mr. Choquette: He is not a Liberal in Ottawa, but in Quebec.

Mr. Pigeon: It is true, Mr. Speaker, that since the break between the federal and provincial organizations, that Mr. Michaud may be a Liberal in Quebec but not in Ottawa. Then if he is no longer a Liberal in Ottawa, I pay him my respects.

Mr. Chrétien: Certainly, he is not a Conservative.

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Speaker, the following remarks appeared in *La Presse* of Saturday, May 30, 1964;

> The Société Saint-Jean-Baptiste of Montreal gave a cold shoulder to this proposal for two flags. Those two flags mean two nations, two different

racial groups, and they will further the gap between the English and French speaking Canadians.

This Canadian flag is decidedly presented too late.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the government is making a monumental error in asking the house to vote in favour of the union jack which cannot be Canada's flag, even under certain conditions, which is not the commonwealth flag but solely the flag of the United Kingdom and its colonies.

Mr. Speaker, if Her Majesty the Queen comes to Canada in the future, we can then be polite and fly on parliament hill Her Majesty's flag.

On the other hand, if the President of the United States makes an official visit to Canada, there is no need to adopt a bill and to include certain conditions in our statutes, in order to fly the American flag. We do not need that. If the President of the United States comes to Canada we shall have the courtesy to fly the American flag. The same thing could apply to all sovereigns and prime ministers of other countries.

Once again, I think this is a mistake from the standpoint of national unity.

The government will widen the gap between French speaking and English speaking Canadians. It seems to me that, the unrest being what it is at present, the government should withdraw its measure for the adoption of the union jack, so that this flag will not be approved by the house.

I would very much like to have the opinion of the French speaking members from Quebec to know what they think. Let them tell us how they will vote when the question is put.

Personally, as I said, I will vote against adopting the union jack, not because I have no respect for this flag, but because, to my mind it is a foreign flag.

As far as the amendment moved by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton is concerned, while respecting the position of the hon. member, I shall abstain from voting for the reasons I mentioned earlier.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. member?

Mr. Pigeon: Certainly.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm aware that the government members from Quebec will have the courage to vote on the amendment as well as on the main motion, instead of abstaining?

Is the hon. member aware that we intend to do that?

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member to repeat his question, because I did not hear him.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I asked the hon. member whether he was aware that the government members from the province of Quebec intended to vote both on the amendment and on the main motion and that consequently, they were brave enough not to abstain from voting, as the member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm intends to do? Is he aware of that?

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the hon. member for Lotbinière that if he votes for the union jack, he does so for the sake of unity within his party, not because of any real feeling for the union jack.

Moreover, I want to tell him that we shall certainly not vote this week, since the debate will go on for some time, until probably after the Christmas holidays, if we have any.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a supplementary question?

Is he aware of the fact that we shall not be cowardly enough to abstain from voting?

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. That remark by the hon. member for Lotbinière was entirely uncalled for.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Speaker, I feel that the word the hon. member for Lotbinière just uttered is against the rules and, consequently I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that word.

Mr. Grégoire: Withdraw.

Mr. Béchard: That is quite right.

Mr. Paul: Mr. Speaker, following the question raised by the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm, I am of the opinion that the hon. member for Lotbinière used unparliamentary language. He has no right to impute motives to anybody in this house. In fact, we did not impute any to him when he refused to vote on the education bill. I believe that the hon. member for Lotbinière should have the decency and courage to withdraw his words and not impute motives to anybody in this house.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. May I suggest to the hon. members who now take part in this exchange of views that perhaps the

difficulty started, in my opinion, when the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm, in a certain way, imputed motives to hon. members on the other side of the house, with respect to the way in which they might vote during this debate.

I take the liberty of suggesting to the hon. members that it would perhaps be proper to forget the remarks which have been made and, once more, I want to mention that in my opinion, the words of the hon. member for Lotbinière are uncalled for.

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

I just want to say that I have always been polite toward all hon. members, including the hon. member for Lotbinière. Moreover, if that is the kind of co-operation that they want to show during this debate, I want to tell the government that this debate could go on for at least a month.

Mr. Choquette: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. According to Beauchesne, threats are positively prohibited.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member rose on a question of privilege.

Mr. Choquette: I admit, in all fairness to the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm, that I used a somewhat virulent expression. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, what I meant was that when the time comes to vote on the amendment before us and on the resolution concerning the union jack as a symbol of our allegiance to the crown and our participation in the commonwealth, instead of abstaining, we shall have enough courage to express our views.

On the same question of privilege—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. There is no question of privilege in the statement made by the hon. member for Lotbinière.

In my opinion, if an hon. member is entitled to rise on a question of privilege, it is the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm, and I know that my hon. friend will accept the explanations of his colleague for Lotbinière.

Mr. Pigeon: Just a word. His explanations are rather clumsy, but let it go.

[*Text*]

Mr. Terry Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of us must envy the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) who says he has no difficulty and will have the courage to vote on this question. I am sure we are all aware of that old expression, "Fools rush in where wise men fear to tread". Those of us who have some conception of the depth of feeling and compassion in the nation and how important these questions are to so many people who are, rather like myself, perhaps just a little puzzled as to why this nation needs two flags, are just a little hesitant about how we should vote on this question. The question in my mind is not clear. Because the hon. member may think that is because there is such a limitation on my thinking power I will reserve my right to the opinion that he who cannot even see the difficulties is not likely to give us much valuable advice on how to handle them.

I did think the remarks of the hon. member for Verdun (Mr. Mackasey) were worthy of some comment and note, and they do highlight what I think is the most important aspect of this matter that we can discuss; that is, the mental attitude of the members, our state of mind when we consider this question. Certainly much has been said by the hon. member for Verdun about the sincerity of members taking part in this debate and he made much of that point. We all know that there can be very sincere mistakes, but there can be a lack of understanding or a willingness to take a stand on so few facts that it is difficult to comprehend that it can reasonably be called honest. I think many of us have varying standards by which we feel that we must acquaint ourselves with the problems involved in a question before we can really call ourselves sincere when we venture an opinion.

In my view, while I do not want to make this just an exercise in semantics, sincerity means more than a mere belief, because of ignorance, in a certain thing and standing in this house and saying it. Certainly sincerity calls for the responsibility of knowledge, for acquainting oneself with the facts as well as trying to give honestly the opinion one has formed. I may be just a little bitter or perhaps a little suspicious, or perhaps I have learned a lot from watching the Liberal party over the years; but when the hon. member for Verdun says he does not think anyone in this house would want to get up and talk about the flag unless he was absolutely sincere I think he perhaps pinpointed for us the reason why so few Liberals took part in the flag debate. I suggest this does not exactly go along with his comment that while he may have been speaking for himself, it was not because the whip was on. I suggest that

if he is asking us to consider as worth while his opinion that all members of the Liberal party are like himself in that regard, then he is indeed naïve. I have seen nothing to indicate, in the actions of the government supporters, that there was anything approaching what I would call sincerity with regard to this problem.

Certainly anyone in this house who listened to the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) when he said what this flag was supposed to stand for, the unity it was supposed to bring to the nation, why the flag had to be distinctive, and then looked at the same time at the order paper and the resolution which is before us to bring in a second flag, can only come to the conclusion—this is what it indicates to my mind, at least—that this is an admission on the part of the Prime Minister that the flag adopted by this house last night is very hollow when it comes to symbolism.

I suggest to the Liberal members of this house that they will have the same task as the rest of us, if we are to have a new flag that must be honoured and accepted. I ask seriously the question: When there is before us this present resolution, which cannot signify anything but a complete failure of the flag that was adopted last night to be symbolic, how are we going to sell last night's flag? I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I am very perturbed at the question now facing us with regard to a second flag, particularly since we now have an amendment that the red ensign be substituted for the union jack if we are to have a second flag. I am aware of the depth of feeling and attachment to the red ensign of so many Canadians. I am sure every member in this house knows that there is a good percentage of the population of this country who as long as they live will neither forgive nor forget the tearing down of that banner to which they have become so attached. If I thought for a little while that perhaps the transition period while older people get older, young ones grow up and the attachment to the red ensign fades and those people gradually die out, so that a decade or two or a generation or two from now all that feeling may have faded away and the new flag will be accepted as symbolic of everything that the two flags are now supposed to stand for, I suppose I should feel a little better about it. But I cannot see how we hope to generate that feeling toward the new flag, if it is really to become the flag of this country, when we find it necessary to have a second flag flying when we want to really express something.

How can we build up this flag and say that the flag adopted in this house last night is a Canadian flag, if we are going to start at the outset by saying that it does not stand for anything and we must have another flag to fly when we want to express ourselves as Canadians? It becomes even more incomprehensible to me, Mr. Speaker, when I note that they want to have the union jack, not the red ensign, as Canada's second flag. These are the people who have put so much emphasis on the word distinctive and have said they want to fly a distinctive flag on special occasions. They have now put forward the union jack in place of the red ensign, which has signified Canada for 100 years, which is the only flag that is really distinctive of Canada today.

Meeting the arguments of my hon. friends opposite, who say they find on the red ensign the symbolism of the union jack repulsive and have rejected it because they have taken it as a symbol of colonialism and it has some unhappy memories connected with it, surely they are not going to suggest that the union jack does not have those same objections. As well as that, the union jack does have the disadvantage that it could not by any stretch of the imagination be called distinctive. I am really seriously interested in seeing some member on the government side get up and straighten out my thinking on this question or explain their own, because certainly on the record so far there is no logical explanation for this proposal.

This brings me back to where I started in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, namely to the question of sincerity. The hon. member for Verdun may be very sincere in his remarks on this question. Again I say that if he is sincere about himself, I can accept that; but when he asks us to accept his opinion of the rest of his party I find it just a bit difficult to swallow.

Most of us on this side of the house are convinced that there is only one reason why the union jack is being presented to this house by this report of the committee. That reason is that Joey has said: Give us the union jack or else. That statement does not seem to surprise or upset many of the members on the other side of this house. Perhaps that is because they sit in their places obeying the party whip slavishly on all scores.

On many occasions it has been embarrassing to me that the members in this house have shown such little unanimity. Perhaps I envy the members of the Liberal party because of the effect their party whip has on

them. He seems to be able to drive them like a flock of sheep in any direction he wishes them to go. On the other hand, perhaps it is better to be a member of this party where the men are men and not trained seals.

In seriously considering the flag issue we must also think of the state of mind of the members of the Liberal party. I have attempted to understand their feelings. I have listened to the remarks made by hon. members opposite in an attempt to figure out what is taking place. Many times in this chamber the kind of remark made by the hon. member for Verdun (Mr. Mackasey) has been repeated. He has invited us to forget all about our feelings on the matter of this flag, has suggested that we begin again without recrimination and leave politics out of the question. Every time the Grit party is successful in achieving something by its dirty tricks, the members of that party immediately begin talking to us in that manner. Last night they voted in favour of the sixth resolution of the committee, and by their remarks and attitudes have indicated to us that the Liberal whip managed to get to them, lining up their vote. Yet today—and he did not even wait until today—their leader played the cheapest trick I have ever seen played in this house. Even last night he said, vote with us now. That is a most contemptible performance on the part of a prime minister, and I suggest to the members on that side of the house that if they wish to consider the flag issue on a level above politics, let them first stop those dirty, Grit, political tricks. Put an end to their purely political lines of approach, and do away with all their pious platitudes. Let them depart from the level of hyprocisy we have observed on that side of the house month after month.

The flag issue is a serious one, and I suggest that members on the other side of the house should have some regard for the welfare of this country. Once they have accomplished their purposes in adopting the flag proposed by the sixth resolution of the committee as the national flag of Canada, by dirty political methods, let them now for God's sake refrain from political trickery in respect of the union jack. Is it necessary that they continue to divide this country, and to continue with their Grit tactics which are based on the concept of divide and rule?

While I realize that the government must satisfy Joey's desire on the flag question, I would ask members on that side of the house how far they intend to go with their Grit political methods. How much consideration do those members have for that political party in preference to the general welfare of this nation? My suggestion at this time is that if any member on that side of the house wishes the flag, voted upon early this morning, to become revered as a national symbol, standing for the unity of this country, he must stop now in his attempt to adopt a second flag. Two flags can only mean two sections of this country, and that is one sure way of continuing the division of this nation. Surely a thinking person in this country, even a member of the Liberal party, will realize that the manner by which the flag issue has been introduced to parliament can do nothing but add to any division which exists in this nation.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the members on that side of the house wish to have something of significance on a flag which is represented by the red ensign, as a result of more than 100 years of usage in this country they should give the people of this country a fighting chance to adopt such a flag. I implore them not to push the union jack on the people of Canada as an added reminder that even in the Liberal party the members do not believe that their flag is symbolic of this nation. They must be aware of the fact that the flag they have chosen is representative of pressure from Quebec and from Joey Smallwood, and that the maple leaf in the middle stands for what is left of the country. They must be aware that the flag indicates their belief that this nation is treated by the Liberals as a club. There is symbolism in that flag they have chosen, and it is this: The bars on each end separated by the big red maple leaf represent the two parts of the country divided by the Liberal party.

I am not sure whether I should vote for our amendment, but I know that I feel that, if we must have a second flag, it should be the red ensign rather than the union jack. I am unable to comprehend how any hon. member of this house can come to any other conclusion. As I have said, over the months I have come to understand some of the attitudes expressed in opposition to the red ensign, but it has been my feeling in that understanding that the opposition was directed more toward the union jack than the red ensign. If we are going to have a second flag, the flag suggested by the government is in fact that part of the red ensign which is most objectionable, and that part which many people have felt should be replaced. I think that objection was the basis of the move by the government to introducing the new one red maple leaf or Canadian distinctive flag to parliament. That being so I cannot understand government members who

support the union jack rather than the red ensign. If those members who object to our commonwealth ties and our allegiance to the Queen are honest in their feelings that we should have a second flag for Canada, surely they must realize that it is the union jack which has been associated with colonialism. Of the two flags, the one which symbolizes colonialism, I suggest, is the union jack.

Mr. Speaker, I should be very pleased if some hon. members opposite, particularly those representing French Canadian constituencies, would enlighten me as to some of my difficulties. I should like some hon. members of the Créditiste party, who are so determined to rid the country of the union jack, to explain their approach to this flag question. If we must have a second flag, I have no hesitation in voting for the Canadian red ensign in preference to the union jack, and I shall certainly vote in favour of the amendment. However, I am afraid that the amendment might carry, in which event I would have voted for a second flag for Canada which I think is silly.

I should like to understand one thing about the way the flag committee worked. I realize how the Liberal members tried to mislead the committee by proposing a vote on the question as to whether the committee preferred the three maple leaf design to the one maple leaf design. Following that vote the Liberal members of that party were quick to suggest that the vote had been unanimous in favour of the one maple leaf design, but that is not a true picture. I suggest that a vote on the motion and amendment before us now is similar to that vote. Most of us have some difficulty in this regard. I think an honest member on the government side, who has seriously thought about the flag issue in relation to the events of the past several days, would vote for the red ensign in preference to the union jack as the second flag for Canada. I had sort of hoped that both resolutions would be withdrawn completely. I really think that if there is hope of the flag we adopted yesterday becoming what it must, for the good of this nation we must defeat this resolution completely, and I hope we do.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take any part in the debate and I am not really going to take any part at all. However, I saw a television news broadcast at a quarter to seven on CJOH and, having seen it, I took the trouble to telephone the station to tell them that they had made a terrible error. I told them I thought they had time to correct it but they did not bother correcting it. I think it should be corrected in fairness to my parliamentary secretary and to the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Béchard). The story as I heard it, and I listened very carefully, was that my parliamentary secretary, the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Cantin), had undertaken to second and indeed had seconded this motion and then had withdrawn and in his place had been substituted Mr. Albert Béchard from Newfoundland.

Sir, that was either a piece of the grossest kind of carelessness on the part of Mr. Stursberg or it was a piece of deliberate malice. I do not know which, but having heard a good many of Mr. Stursberg's sneering and careless comments over the years I say that hon. members can take their choice. In my opinion these news broadcasts are the worst in this country and the most biased on the air. When the hon. member for Bonaventure, the chairman of our Quebec caucus, was willing and anxious and eager and accepted yesterday the seconding of this motion it seems to me it is singularly and terribly unfair to have that misrepresented on television.

Mr. Aiken: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order. I was about to rise at this moment. I think the minister had a point of privilege to raise which I thought might have been raised by the hon. member for Bonaventure. However, I think that the minister has said sufficient to explain the point of privilege which might have been raised more particularly by the hon. member for Bonaventure.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I was not raising a question of privilege. I believe that I, like other hon. members, have the right to speak in the debate and I was speaking in the debate. I was referring to the fact that one element of that debate has been grossly misrepresented in a television news broadcast.

I say, sir, that we on this side of the house are proud of the unity of our party. We are proud of the fact that whether our members are English speaking or French speaking they have stood together and have voted together for national unity in marked contrast to the display we have seen on the other side of the house in the official opposition. I am proud of the hon. member for Bonaventure and I am also proud that when he was

delayed for a few minutes in getting into the house my parliamentary secretary was willing as a French speaking Canadian to get up and second the motion to make the union jack the symbol of our allegiance to the crown and our membership in the commonwealth.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I think we have been led to believe that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) is not an admirer of Mr. Stursberg. I would say that in this as in other things I do not share his point of view. It is not for us here to discuss Mr. Stursberg, but he does happen to be a man who has a very high reputation not only in Canada but abroad as a highly qualified student, scholar and commentator.

It is interesting that in this country of ours, which people sometimes say is dull and lacklustre, we have spent so much time on a flag. I suppose no country in the world has ever discussed a flag for as long as we have been discussing the question and now to add to the infinite variety we are beginning a discussion on two flags. Who says that Canada is not an interesting and different country?

Yesterday it was a new flag; today it is an old one. I think that the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming) has through his amendment sought to improve a situation which was made far from glorious by the action of the committee, as indeed by the action of the government earlier in its two flag resolution. There has been some reference made to the flag which was discussed previously, a matter on which I made one speech, and I expect this speech to be my last on this one. I am not now, Mr. Speaker, nor have I ever been one of those who are so adamant against the adoption of a distinctive Canadian flag without the symbolic representation of any other country. Had we on this troubled occasion had a distinctive flag introduced in an appropriate way which would not have torn and disturbed our country and which was a flag of interest and of beauty, I would have had no hesitation in supporting it. Therefore when I endorse the amendment of the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton I am not waging any rearguard action on behalf of the Canadian red ensign.

I think the hon. member has given a big assist toward resolving the situation in which we found ourselves by reason of the introduction of that first embarrassing, unhistoric and almost ludicrous exercises in dual flagdom. There are many reasons why it is difficult to support the committee's seventh report as it now stands. In one case there is some uncertainty as to the use of the royal union flag, the union jack. We are not clear when it would be used. On a visit of the sovereign the royal Canadian standard would be flown. On a visit of the prime minister of another commonwealth state it would be highly questionable whether the union jack would be flown because that individual would not be a head of state but a head of government. Indeed, if any flag were flown would it not be the flag of that particular commonwealth country?

As some of my colleagues have mentioned earlier today, it seems that this second flag diminishes the role and the symbolic value of the national flag. One might ask: Are there any occasions on which Canada is not a member of the commonwealth? Are there any occasions when Canadians do not bear allegiance to the crown? Therefore you have the problem of flying a flag on given occasions to demonstrate certain facets and facts of our national life which are in existence at all times. This is one of the problems that troubles me.

To go further with regard to the matter of the symbolic representation of flags, a flag should reflect, reveal and symbolize Canada in all its facets, international and otherwise, The flag of Canada should demonstrate that we are a member of the commonwealth, of NATO and of the United Nations. A meaningful flag should demonstrate all the aspects of Canada and all the things for which it stands in the great international world. It stands for great things in that world, and we can and should be proud of it.

We have before us the matter of a second flag, and we must take some action upon it. We must vote. However, the suggestion that such a flag be the union jack is a most regrettable and improper suggestion. It is a presumption upon the United Kingdom, a great and friendly country. It is a symbolic denial of Canadian history and the growth that has been made in this country from colony to nation. I do not ever suggest that one political party has a monopoly on virtue or has uniquely contributed to the development of this country. However, the thing that makes me proudest of the party to which I belong is that all down through the years it has been a great commonwealth party, and within that commonwealth has been the great champion of freedom and independence for this country. I ask why the flag of the United Kingdom should be chosen for commonwealth representation? Why

should it not be the flag of Australia, or any other commonwealth state?

Through the efforts of the great Sir Robert Borden, and his efforts will be admitted by everyone, we put into action the dream of a commonwealth of autonomous communities, in no way subordinate one to another. The United Kingdom has been a great and friendly power, an ally, a country which has brought freedom to many parts of the world. It does not, however, hold any position of prominence in the commonwealth of nations. I think it is a disservice to history to suggest that this country, the United Kingdom, has a role in the commonwealth greater, juridically, constitutionally or otherwise, than other commonwealth states including our own. This is a backward step. I do not suppose it was a deliberate step toward colonialism. It reminds me so much of Mackenzie King's suggestion that the British government should intervene in 1926, just shortly before he went all over the country on the phony constitutional issue.

Where in the seventh report of this committee do we remember the work of Borden, do we remember the great commonwealth conferences in which Canada took the lead, do we remember Meighen, do we remember the Statute of Westminster, do we recall that throughout the years this country led the way within the commonwealth and, as the senior dominion, was the champion of freedom within the commonwealth in so many ways. This commonwealth is one of the greatest political institutions of modern time. If we are to have this second flag, Mr. Speaker, let it be one which has something unique in its representation of Canada's role in the commonwealth, a role of which we can be very proud. Someone said earlier today that we used only the union jack in this country until 1945. This was not the case. The ensign was used in this country long before 1945. My colleague from Calgary North (Mr. Harkness), during his participation in the earlier debate, showed a poster used by Sir John A. Macdonald in 1891. The slogan then was, "The old flag, the old policy and the old leader." The flag was not the union jack, it was the red ensign in 1891. The ensign signifies not subservience, not colonialism, but it signifies independence and it signifies monarchy. It signifies, too, that the monarchy is a Canadian institution. Monarchy is not confined to the United Kingdom. When the Queen is in this realm, she is the Queen of Canada.

We have developed a unique and wonderful country here in the new world, retaining the values of the old and I hope the virtues of the old, too. If we must have our second flag, let us try to retain something which symbolizes Canada in the commonwealth.

Perhaps a more practical point, Mr. Speaker, we can predict that regardless of what the other place does in respect of the red maple leaf flag, millions of Canadians will continue to fly the Canadian red ensign for many years. Why not let the practice of these Canadians be given some official status? Do not let us in these difficult times, times which have torn a nation and wrecked parliament, exacerbate the difficulties by asking Canadians to turn in their red ensigns and buy red maple leaf flags and buy the flag of the United Kingdom at the same time. The flag of the United Kingdom is not the flag of Canada. I think it is presumptuous of us to be passing legislation relative to the flag of another great country.

If we put ourselves in a situation where, on occasions, we officially raise to the top of the flagstaff all over Canada for Canadian purposes a union jack, we have just retraced history to those days when we were a colony of Great Britain. Great Britain was a great mother country but this land, Canada, was not without its difficulties in relation to London. The stories of some of our statesmen indicate, I think, that they had to press vigorously for the kind of independence to which we were entitled. It is a meaningless and regrettable thing, after all these years, after the ensign had been sanctioned by custom and then certified by law, after the passage of years and generations, that we should move back to the flag which flew over us in colonial days. If this is to be something meaningful, this second flag, our other face to the outside world or perhaps only to the commonwealth, I hope that the government, which has in so many things been able to change its decisions and alter its directions, will accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming). As a Canadian who loves the commonwealth and admires Britain, but who is a Canadian nationalist first before being a lover of Britain, I would not want to have to vote against this report incorporating, for Canadian purposes, the flag of another country. I do not think this is an exercise any of us would wish to engage in, and the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming), in the wisdom and good judgment which he always brings to public matters, has provided an

opportunity for unanimity on this matter at least.

Heaven knows, we have had enough trouble over the first flag. Let us be sensible about the second. Let us underscore our history a bit. Let us not do that which those in future generations will consider a bit ridiculous and wonder how the champions of independence within the commonwealth should, in 1964 or 1965, suddenly decide to go back to a flag of their colonial past, to take from one of the members of the commonwealth its flag and make it, for peculiar and limited occasions, our flag.

This thing is going to be difficult to rationalize. I do not know who suggested it. I have not the slightest idea who has the power in the Liberal party. I do not particularly care, but I have an idea that it might be from a part of the country that has not had the long tradition of dominion development that Canada as a whole has had.

I do not want to speak with partisanship but I say this is a great mistake. It is a backward step. It is one which will embarrass many of us today and the whole country tomorrow. I would commend to the house and the government the sensible, soundly historically based amendment of my colleague from Victoria-Carleton.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, we are now considering the motion for concurrence in the seventh report of the special committee on the Canadian flag.

The sixth report of that committee dealt with a distinctive national flag which was adopted last night. Tonight, we are asked to adopt a second Canadian flag. We are told that it is not a second flag, but it is stated, as reported in *Votes and Proceedings* of October 29 last, that it will be flown as a symbol of Canada's membership in the commonwealth of nations.

As stated on page 834 of *Votes and Proceedings*, that flag may continue to be flown as a symbol of Canada's membership in the commonwealth of nations and its allegiance to the crown.

Mr. Speaker, I looked up the word "adhésion" in the dictionary. I have the Larousse dictionary which is well known for its definitions of terms, and here is how the word "adhésion" is defined:

"Contrat d'adhésion": A contract where all the terms are set out in advance by one of the contracting parties without the other parties having any say in the matter.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

Therefore, membership in the commonwealth, as stated in the report of the committee, would mean entering into a contract with another country where the contract would stipulate in advance all the terms on which we, who are becoming a member, would have nothing to say.

That is the wording used by the committee in its seventh report. And as I pointed out, that is recorded on page 834 of *Votes and Proceedings* of October 29 last.

Mr. Speaker, I protest against the concurrence in this report precisely because of the terms used concerning our membership. In fact, if we did approve, it would mean that we accept all the terms laid down in advance by one of the parties without the other having an opportunity to discuss them.

To this, Mr. Speaker, we do not agree, we do not accept to join the commonwealth without having an opportunity to discuss the terms of our membership. Which contracting party will lay down their terms in advance and which party will not have an opportunity to discuss them and will simply have to accept them?

Those terms are prescribed to us while we cannot discuss them. And note that this is specified in the definition found in the Larousse dictionary which is universally recognized as the French language dictionary.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot accept the wording of the seventh report and, once again, I ask which contracting party will lay down its terms in advance and which contracting party will have to accept them without discussion? There are two contracting parties: Canada is one and we would mark our membership in the commonwealth of British nations by adopting the union jack which is England's flag. At first sight, we must conclude that it is England that would lay down her terms in advance while we would not have an opportunity to discuss them.

This is textually recorded in the seventh report of the special flag committee and it is the definition of the word "adhésion" which can be found, as I just mentioned, in the Larousse dictionary, which is universally recognized for the definition of words.

Mr. Speaker, it may be that—

[*Text*]

Mr. Woolliams: Would the hon. member answer a question? I have listened to him with interest up to this point but does he suggest there should be any connection be-

tween Canada and the commonwealth and, if he does, what should be the symbol of that connection?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I think it is possible for free and independent nations such as Canada to join the commonwealth. I do not have the slightest intention to suggest anything else, but not an "adhésion." Participation, very well. When we participate, we are equal members, with equal voice and equal decision. But what is suggested at the present time? As can be seen on page 834 of *Votes and Proceedings*, and more particularly in the third from last paragraph of the report of the committee, it is suggested to fly—

[*Text*]

Mr. Woolliams: Will you answer the question? If you don't want to answer it then say so.

Mr. Grégoire: I have answered the question.

Mr. Woolliams: You don't understand my question.

Mr. Grégoire: Then ask it again.

Mr. Woolliams: My question is twofold. Should we be a part of the commonwealth—

Mr. Caouette: Yes.

Mr. Woolliams: —and if we should be a part of the commonwealth what flag or symbol should represent Canada as a member of the commonwealth?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Very well, Mr. Speaker. In answer to the first part of the question, I will say that we are a part of the commonwealth.

[*Text*]

A part of the commonwealth? We advocate that we be a partner in the commonwealth. Does that answer the first part of your question?

Mr. Woolliams: Yes.

Mr. Grégoire: As for the second part of the question, I would suggest—

[*Translation*]

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is neither the responsibility of Canada, nor of the Liberal government nor the Prime Minister, to decide what the commonwealth flag will be, but of all the prime ministers of the commonwealth to choose a flag which will really identify the commonwealth of free nations.

It is not a responsibility of Canada to decide what the commonwealth flag will be. That decision is neither the sole responsibility of Canada, nor of the Prime Minister, nor of the Liberal members or of the Canadian parliament, it is the responsibility of all the parliaments or all the prime ministers of the commonwealth countries, which will be able to agree to choose a flag which will really be significant of the commonwealth, like in the United Nations where many nations agreed to choose a flag of the nations which was accepted by all the nations of this world as the only symbol of the United Nations.

But what we do not accept at the outset in the committee report, is that we are asked to adhere to the commonwealth, to enter with it into "contact d'adhésion" in which we would have nothing to say and where another nation will lay down its conditions to us without allowing us to discuss them in advance.

Mr. Choquette: Would you object to reading the whole definition of the words "adhère" or "adhésion" as given by the dictionary?

Mr. Grégoire: Very well.

"Adhésion: nom féminin."

Here it says the word is feminine in French. Two synonyms are given.

"Union." "Jonction".

Mr. Choquette: As, "jonction".

Mr. Grégoire: Yes, "jonction", precisely. I do not believe that the commonwealth is a union. It is an association of free and equal partners. It is not a union.

Mr. Choquette: That is it.

Mr. Grégoire: No, it is not a union; it is an association of free and equal partners, and in that capacity we may belong to it.

It is not a "jonction", because we do not amalgamate but we develop individually in order to develop together. There is a difference between that and the word "union".

Mr. Choquette: It is a definition through association.

Mr. Grégoire: In the real meaning of the word:

"Contrat d'adhésion"—a contract where all the terms are set out in advance by one of the contracting parties without the other parties having any say in the matter.

Examples are given: gas, telephone, transportation, etc.

Canadian Flag

Mr. Choquette: Provided you pay your telephone bills.

Mr. Grégoire: Yes, provided you pay your bills with the telephone company—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. May I suggest to the hon. member to let the hon. member for Lapointe, who has the floor, proceed without interruption.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Once again, I ask the hon. member to let the hon. member for Lapointe proceed without interruption. At the same time, I would invite the hon. member who has the floor to come back to the matter under consideration.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order—

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, the point of order raised by the hon. member for Lotbinière is not well-founded.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My point of order, which is well-founded, is this. In my opinion, the hon. member for Lapointe has no right to give an incorrect definition of the word "adhésion".

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, the point of order raised by the hon. member for Lotbinière is not well taken.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. There is obviously no point of order there.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Lotbinière wishes to speak, he should do so when his turn comes.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I rise once again on a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Would the hon. member for Lotbinière sit down. The hon. member raised a point of order, but there is no point of order. At this time, I recognize the hon. member for Lapointe.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Choquette: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, are they preventing us from talking? What about freedom of speech?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Lotbinière rises on a question of privilege.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, in this house, and that justifies my question of privilege, there are people who cannot be as familiar with the French language as those who speak that language as their mother tongue—

Mr. Grégoire: This is not a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Choquette: I rose on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Grégoire: There is no question of privilege and I would ask the hon. member for Lotbinière—

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. May I suggest we allow the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) to speak to his question of privilege? The Chair is doubtful that there is any real question of privilege but the hon. member is entitled to make his point.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: My question of privilege is as follows: If the hon. member for Lapointe is allowed to define the word "adhésion" as he is doing—

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, there is no question of privilege.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, may I state my question of privilege completely? I had barely started before I was interrupted.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. May I have the co-operation of all hon. members.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Lapointe will admit that the hon. member—

[*Text*]

Mr. Grégoire: Let him state his question of privilege.

Mr. Choquette: Just keep quiet and I will make it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I was interrupted before I could state part of my question of privilege.

My question of privilege is this. It is obvious that some hon. members are not acquainted with French as well as we are—

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, this is not a question of privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lapointe does not give the right definition of the word "adhésion"—

Mr. Grégoire: There is no question of privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is no question of privilege. The member for Lapointe has the floor.

Mr. Choquette: Would the hon. member for—

[*Text*]

Mr. Winkler: On a further question of privilege, we on this side of the house are interested in making a determination with regard to the amendment this evening. If these two hon. members continue to argue as petulantly as they are now doing we will get nowhere.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is no question of privilege.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, we are also anxious to dispose of the matter as promptly as possible provided there will be no obstruction from the other side.

Mr. Choquette: It hurts the hon. member for Lapointe.

An hon. Member: It bothers him.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I had just reached the point of explaining the idea of "adhésion" to the commonwealth and why we object to the wording of the seventh report of the special committee on a Canadian flag.

"Adhésion" refers to a ruling nation and to another which is being dominated.

Mr. Choquette: That is not true.

Mr. Grégoire: We do not accept this, Mr. Speaker, a ruling nation and a nation which is dominated. We believe in an equal partnership of all free commonwealth countries.

Would this adhesion be symbolized by the loans granted without interest to the United Kingdom by the Bank of Canada? Would that be Canada's adhesion to the commonwealth? A nation imposing its terms upon another? And we, in Canada, are supposed to accept all this?

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are ready to be recognized as partners, as a participating nation, but not as one which has a "contrat d'adhésion" with the commonwealth of free nations.

Now, I shall ask this question. Which other commonwealth countries accepted the union jack to signify their partnership? I am not using the term "adhésion" but "partnership", because the word "adhésion" is a monumental error in the seventh report of the special committee on the flag which we should hasten to rectify by unanimous consent of the house.

But what other commonwealth countries have adopted the union jack as their flag, by a vote of their own parliaments, to symbolize their partnership in the British commonwealth of free nations? There are none, so why should Canada do so? Are we in such a hurry to give ourselves this flag in anticipation, now that we have decided to have one, whereas, since confederation, we Canadians have been refused a distinctive national flag?

Mr. Speaker, what are the other countries which, under the same circumstances, and through parliament, had members who are responsible to the people vote in favour of a flag as a symbol of their membership in the commonwealth? There are none.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the union jack is not the flag of the commonwealth and has never been. It has always been the flag of England, the flag of the British empire, but it is not the flag of the commonwealth. On the other hand, the Prime Minister admitted himself that it is not the Queen's flag, but the flag of royalty. Every attempt was made to make us Canadians distinguish between the Queen of England and the Queen of Canada, in order that we should accept the latter.

Today they want us to assimilate British royalty with Canadian royalty, in order to have us adopt the union jack. They have always tried to make two different things out of Queen Elizabeth II: on the one hand, she was the Queen of England, and on the other hand, the Queen of Canada. I even recall that, to make us understand, they tried to compare her to the Holy Trinity: only one God, but three persons, three distinct persons. We were told, I do not know for how long, that she was the Queen of England, but not the Queen of Canada; that it could be the same person, but not the Queen of Canada; that those were definitely two different things.

And now, today, they would have us accept once and for all what they have always maintained in Ottawa: this royalty united into one person, the Queen of England and the Queen of Canada, the same royalty. They then go on to say that, since the union jack represents the flag of royalty, we must have the union jack in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, when we took the oath of allegiance, it was to the Queen of Canada and not to the Queen of England that we pledged our loyalty, so that should a conflict arise between the various countries of the commonwealth, should we have to fight one against

the others, should we have to choose, should there be a conflict of interests, our allegiance would force us to fight for the Queen of Canada and not for the Queen of Australia or New Zealand. Here, in Ottawa, in an effort to make us accept the crown, we were always told that the crown in Canada and the crown in England were two different things. Today, a package deal is offered us. Well, we no longer accept it.

Mr. Caouette: No package deal.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the union jack is England's flag and not the commonwealth's.

Mr. Caouette: That is right.

Mr. Grégoire: If England is the commonwealth of free nations then we refuse, Mr. Speaker, to be part of it in the future. On the contrary, if it is a group, an assocication of free nations, very well then, but if England is the commonwealth, we are out. And what they are trying to force upon us today is not the commonwealth flag but the flag of England.

Mr. Speaker, when time came to choose a flag at the United Nations the United States flag was not chosen. The United States did not try to impose their flag on the United Nations under the pretence that they are located in the United States, on American soil. A part of United States territory was made into a free territory.

The United States did not, at the same time, impose their flag upon the United Nations; the latter chose a truly distinctive flag. Today we are asked to approve the British flag to symbolize Canada's "appurtenance" to the commonwealth.

Several Liberal members, and especially those from the province of Quebec, will admit that I am perfectly right.

This afternoon we heard the Prime Minister of Canada quoting Bona Arsenault to add weight to his thesis; I must say that, at that point, he could not rise to the occasion if he had to resort to Bona "la pitoune" Arsenault, of Quebec. His argument must have been very weak indeed if he had to quote him. If he can quote that passage, why then does he not accept his statement according to which the C.B.C., in Montreal, is infiltrated with communists? Oh. No. There are protests among the members of the Liberal party, because Bona Arsenault is a man who changes his mind as often as he changes his shirt, and he must change his shirt quite often because he changes his mind often too. Is the Prime Minister so short of quotations that he feels he has to quote Mr. Bona Arsenault? I would say, therefore, that his argument is very weak indeed and even sophisticated.

I never heard such a series of sophisms as I heard this afternoon to try and make us adopt this flag. We have been told: It is the flag of royalty; the Queen is the head of the commonwealth, therefore, we choose the union jack.

On the other hand, it is also true that the royalty is not recognized in all the commonwealth countries. Royalty is not recognized in Ghana or in India. Yet, the Queen is recognized as head of the commonwealth.

Then, Mr. Speaker, it is not the royal flag that is needed but the flag of the Queen of Canada and, in my opinion, the best flag for the Queen of Canada would be the national distinctive flag we have chosen yesterday, as it will be the one that will really symbolize royalty in Canada.

An hon. Member: Would the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I have but ten minutes left.

Time has come for Canada to assert herself in the world. A year ago I found out at the United Nations that the Prime Minister was not treated like a chief of state but rather like a servant in the United Nations because, as we were told, only the chiefs of states are entitled to a special seat. But the Prime Minister was not entitled to the "blue seat treatment", since the chief of state of Canada is the Queen of England. Then, let us give the Prime Minister of Canada an opportunity to become the real head of state of Canada and to be considered as such at the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, for all these reasons, because we believe we are perhaps the most Canadian of the Canadians, we object to the union jack becoming the symbol of the commonwealth, as well as to the red ensign. When the commonwealth chooses a flag accepted by all the countries in the commonwealth, then we shall accept it, not by a vote in this house, but by custom, and that will be all. Until then, we accept only one national distinctive flag, namely the one we chose yesterday, the maple leaf flag, and we shall accept no other, let alone the flags of other countries.

An hon. Member: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, may I point out that, as I see the clock from here, it is ten o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

[*Text*]

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have the concurrence of the house to deal with government notices of motions on today's order paper, so they can be transferred to the orders of the day.

Mr. Churchill: This is reverting to motions, Mr. Speaker. We had hoped that there would be a vote tonight so we could get on with the business of the house.

Mr. McIlraith: I am quite agreeable, Mr. Speaker, if the house is willing to sit on and there is any prospect of reaching a vote tonight.

Mr. Churchill: Two members of the government party were asking for the floor 15 or 20 minutes ago.

Mr. McIlraith: That was 15 or 20 minutes ago. Perhaps we could have the vote tonight, Mr. Speaker, if the house would agree to sit a little longer.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, we do not give our consent to proceed with a vote tonight, as we feel that if we have been unable to vote tonight, it is because of the systematic obstruction from the other side of the house. Because of this obstruction, we will not agree to vote later tonight.

[*Text*]

Mr. Churchill: We will agree to revert to motions for this purpose.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear what my hon. friend for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) said just now; but I was going to make the plea that we might agree to transferring notices of motions tonight. I wonder if we could also have an understanding that, whether or not we get to oral questions tomorrow, we take the two or three minutes that would be necessary for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State (Mr. Stewart) to deal with written questions on the order paper, because they are piling up.

Mr. McIlraith: I would be very glad to agree to that, Mr. Speaker. Could it be made an order of the house so there will be no difficulty, if we answer the written questions tomorrow, about departing from the motion before the house.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The house has heard the suggestion of the President of the Privy Council. Is it agreeable?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McIlraith: May we transfer the notices of motion, the one standing in the name of the Minister of Justice and the other standing in the name of the Minister of Finance, to orders of the day?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

TRANSFER TO PROVINCES OF FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR SHARED PROGRAMS

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (for Mr. Gordon) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution, which has been recommended to the house by His Excellency:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure of an interim nature respecting certain conditional-grant and shared-cost programs that have become established federal-provincial programs to enable such of the provinces as may wish to do so to assume financial responsibility for such programs within the ambit of national objectives; and, in respect of those provinces that assume such responsibility for specific programs, to provide a tax abatement under the Income Tax Act, a tax equalization payment and, where necessary, an adjustment payment, or to provide a cash payment in lieu of a tax abatement for particular programs or as cash compensation in other cases, and to authorize such agreements as may be necessary to ensure that the continuation in the interim period of any such program by provinces with such federal assistance will accord with national objectives; and to provide for other related or incidental matters.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Did I understand the Chair to say the motion was moved by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon)?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion was moved by Mr. Sharp for Mr. Gordon.

Motion agreed to.

JUDGES ACT

PROVISION FOR SALARIES OF ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR MANITOBA AND QUEBEC

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution, which has been recommended to the house by His Excellency:

That it is expedient to amend Bill C-112, an act to amend the Judges Act, now before the house, to authorize the provision of salaries for two additional judges of the court of Queen's bench

for Manitoba and to increase from three to five the number of additional judges of the superior court of Quebec for whom salaries may be authorized to be provided.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the house seems to be in very good humour, perhaps hon. members would consider granting leave to introduce the bill standing in the name of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau).

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

COMBINES INVESTIGATION ACT AND CRIMINAL CODE

EXTENSION OF MORATORIUM RESPECTING B.C. FISHING INDUSTRY

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-141, an act to amend an act to amend the Combines Investigation Act and the Criminal Code.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Favreau: As this house well knows, the purpose of this bill is to extend the moratorium which prevents or suspends the application of the Combines Investigation Act as far as the relations between fishermen of British Columbia and those who process fish are concerned.

[*Text*]

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being after ten o'clock, this house stands adjourned until two thirty o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

It being five minutes after ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, December 16, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. CAOUETTE—TRIBUTE BY HISTORICAL SOCIETY TO BALDWIN AND LAFONTAINE

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

May I be permitted to call attention to the ceremony that took place this afternoon on parliament hill when a good many people, under the patronage of the Société historique de Boucherville, paid tribute to two great Canadians, the Hon. Robert Baldwin and Sir Louis-Hyppolyte Lafontaine.

Sir Louis-Hyppolyte Lafontaine died 100 years ago, and it was 50 years ago this year that a joint monument was erected on parliament hill to those two great politicians.

Mr. Speaker, we could not let this occasion pass without recalling that Sir Louis-Hyppolyte Lafontaine and the Hon. Robert Baldwin were those who made the strongest stand to obtain for us what is called today a responsible government.

One could recall also that the first step taken by Lafontaine on entering parliament was to make a speech in French to ask for equal status for the French language in parliament. If, today, we can make speeches in our mother tongue in this house, we owe it to Lafontaine and Baldwin.

That is what I wanted to call attention to in rising on a question of privilege.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

WORLD PATENT SYSTEM

Question No. 1,989—**Mr. Mather:**

Is consideration being given to seeking a world patent system recognized by all states?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): The laws on patent are based on existing international conventions and the matter is receiving periodical consideration.

C.N.R. RENTAL FOR PALAIS STATION, QUEBEC CITY

Question No. 2,096—**Mr. Marcoux:**

1. Is the rental paid by Canadian National Railways to Canadian Pacific Railway for the use of the Palais station in Quebec city still based on the agreements signed in 1932 and 1933?

2. Does the present rental charge include the same services as were included in 1933?

3. What were the amounts paid by Canadian National Railways, in the Palais station premises in Quebec city, to Canadian Pacific Railway for the years 1933 and 1942 and for each year since 1957?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows:

1. Payments made to the Canadian Pacific Railway for use of Palais station and associated facilities are still based on the principles of the original agreement of 1915 and the supplemental agreements of 1930 and 1933.

2. Yes.

3. Canadian National shares in the operating cost on the basis of general and coach yard wheelage ratios, and also contributes 50 per cent of the interest on invested capital. Due to the fact that the joint expenses are grouped with those of other related facilities, it would be difficult to segregate, with any degree of accuracy, the user road's share of expenses applicable to Palais station premises.

[*Text*]

C.N.R. MAINTENANCE CHARGES, QUEBEC CITY

Question No. 2,098—**Mr. Marcoux:**

For each year between 1939 and 1955 (a) what was the total number of hours charged to the Canadian National Railways for maintenance and operation of the C.N. railway cars at the Palais station in Quebec city (b) what was the total cost of the hours charged for repairing such railway cars (c) what was the cost of parts billed to the C.N.R. by the C.P.R.?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advise as follows:

As the records of the company have been destroyed this information is no longer available.

[*Text*]

FRENCH TEACHERS FOR CIVIL SERVANTS

Question No. 2,115—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many individuals have been employed by the civil service commission as French teachers for civil servants?

2. What is the salary range for those employed in these positions and what is the total annual expenditure?

3. Has a special branch been set up to carry out this program and what is the estimated cost to the federal treasury for the establishment of this branch and its annual operation?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. The civil service commission has employed 21 persons, 11 in full time continuing positions and 10 on a casual basis, to teach French in the civil service commission language training centre.

2. The salary ranges for those employed in these positions are from $5,400 to $10,500 per annum. The estimated total expenditure on salaries for these employees in the period April 1, 1964 to March 31, 1965 is $61,155.

3. The civil service commission has established a language training centre, a division of the executive secretary's branch of the commission. The estimated total cost of the centre to the federal treasury, including faculty heads, administrative and clerical services, office rental, and also English teachers who teach English to French students, for the period April 1, 1964 to March 31, 1965, is $230,196.

C.N.R. TRAIN CREW OPERATIONS, MOUNTAIN REGION

Question No. 2,116—**Mr. Lambert:**

1. Has the management of the Canadian National Railways made any recent changes, or does it intend to make changes in the near future, in the operations of train crews in its mountain region and, if so, what are these changes and how do they affect the personnel of its train crews?

2. Is there presently any labour contract agreement between management and its operating personnel covering changes, conditions of employment between contracts and, if so, what are they and do any such provisions cover any runs between two subdivisions?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1 and 2. The management of the Canadian National Railways point out that an inquiry has been instituted by the Minister of Labour under the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act into the industrial situation arising from the running of certain trains through the terminals at Nakina and Wainwright, and as the matter is under investigation the management are of the opinion that it would be inadvisable to give information outside of the inquiry.

[Mr. Cantin.]

PENITENTIARY EMPLOYEES PROVIDED WITH WEAPONS

Question No. 2,156—**Mr. Howard:**

Has any penitentiary employee been provided with a blackjack or other similar truncheon, club, or weapon and, if so, in which penitentiaries were such weapons so provided, in which areas in each such penitentiary, and has any such employee ever had occasion to use such a weapon and, if so, what are the details thereof?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): 1. Custodial officers of the Canadian penitentiary service were issued with regulation billies at the following penitentiaries: Dorchester penitentiary; St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary; Manitoba penitentiary; Saskatchewan penitentiary; British Columbia penitentiary.

2. Such weapons were provided for employment in areas as follows: (a) Dorchester penitentiary, to the officers assigned to the dissociation and segregation areas (b) St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, to the officers assigned to the dissociation and segregation areas (c) Manitoba penitentiary, to the officer assigned to the dissociation area (d) Saskatchewan penitentiary, to the officers patrolling ranges after the closing of the prison (e) British Columbia penitentiary, to all custodial officers employed at the penitentiary.

3. Custodial officers had the occasion to use such a weapon under the circumstances described hereunder:

(a) Dorchester penitentiary, there has only been one such incident during the course of the last year. Two inmates were exercising in the dissociation area, when they began to fight with one another. The officer supervising the exercise attempted to intervene and break up the fight whereupon one inmate turned on the officer and attempted to attack him. The officer drew his billy and struck the inmate one blow. The inmate desisted immediately. The injury was not serious, the inmate did not require hospitalization and received immediate first aid to a slight cut on the back of the head.

(b) St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, on one evening in 1963, in cell block No. 1, one inmate set fire in his mattress and cell equipment. The three officers on duty went to remove him from his cell as the inmate appeared to be unconscious. The officers carried the inmate to a table, and while two officers were looking for the stretcher in the same building, the inmate suddenly stood up and attacked the third officer, reaching for his neck or his face. One of the two first officers came back rapidly and used his billy on the inmate's head.

The blow was sufficient to stop the attack, however, the inmate was not unconscious. He was escorted to the hospital for check-up. He was not seriously hurt.

On another occasion in 1962, two inmates returning from the exercise period attacked the three guards escorting them and five other inmates to the isolation cells. One guard was hit on the head, suffering a serious cut which kept him away from work for a period of two months. Another guard suffered a broken right hand.

The guards were not able to reach their billy and one of them had to use a shovel to free the guard who had been hit on the head. These two inmates had attacked the officers by using one bench and one brush handle and were inciting the five other inmates to participate, in order to take hold of that building. These inmates were sent to the criminal court and were sentenced to one year consecutive.

4. In all other cases of attacks by inmates against custodial personnel, such attacks numbering to 23 since 1962, the guards have used their bare hands to overcome inmates using knives, crowbars, soft drink bottles or broken pieces of furniture. Nineteen officers have suffered injuries, varying from slight contusions to 100 per cent permanent disability confirmed by the provincial labour department work accidents compensation board.

VISITS TO PENITENTIARIES BY JUDGES OR MAGISTRATES

Question No. 2,158—**Mr. Howard:**

1. Since January 1, 1963, have any judges or magistrates visited any penitentiaries and, if so, what are the names and addresses of the said judges or magistrates, the penitentiaries which they visited and the dates of the said visits?

2. Did any of the judges or magistrates, make any comments or recommendations following such visits and, if so, what comments or recommendations and what action has been taken thereon?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): 1 and 2. Since January 1, 1963, the following judges or magistrates have visited Canadian penitentiaries as listed hereunder and commented as indicated:

Kingston penitentiary:

February 15, 1963, Magistrate H. T. G. Andrews, address unknown.

June 6, 1964, a group of 42 magistrates of the province of Ontario who were attending a provincial convention in the city of Kingston, names and addresses unknown.

April 17, 1964, Hon. Mr. Justice Brooke and six other honourable justices from the supreme court of Ontario, names and addresses unknown.

October 20, 1964, Hon. Judge Lyon of York county, address unknown. Hon. Judge H. Waisberg of York county, address unknown.

The comments that were made by these judges and magistrates were complimentary and no particular recommendations were made by any of them.

Agassiz correctional camp:

June 22, 1963, Mrs. Edward Brockman, a member of the council of magistrates, England; Mrs. Brockman commented as follows:

I found it all most interesting, so much man's work to be done out there, that the effect cannot be anything but good—also the kindness of all who showed us around made me understand what a bond there is, all the world over, between the people who work among convicts.

Saskatchewan penitentiary:

January 21, 1963, Judge T. Hughes of Saskatoon. General comments of favourable nature. No specific recommendations.

January 22, 1963, Justice M. S. MacPherson of Regina. Made favourable comments and has since communicated with the institution on many occasions, with reference to training programs available.

June 10, 1963, 15 judges of the magistrate's court of Saskatchewan: Judge L. F. Bence, Regina; Judge E. L. Elliott, Regina; Judge W. G. Cameron, Regina; Judge T. Taylor, Saskatoon; Judge R. H. King, Saskatoon; Judge J. J. Flynn, Moose Jaw; Judge E. Z. Anderson, Prince Albert; Judge A. C. McMurdo, Prince Albert; Judge D. J. Mitchell, Weyburn; Judge R. D. Newsome, Estevan; Judge J. M. Policha, North Battleford; Judge J. H. Sunstrum, Rosetown; Magistrate R. D. McAra, Melfort; Magistrate K. B. Crawford, Meadow Lake; Magistrate G. K. Fielding, Wynyard.

Comments were of a favourable nature and no specific recommendations were made.

July 22, 1963, Chief Judge Nelles V. Buchanan, northern Alberta. Judge Buchanan commented as follows:

I merely wanted to say to you that I greatly appreciated your kind co-operation in seeing to it that I had the opportunity of inspecting in detail the penitentiary and the penal farm. I should have seen your institution long ago and having seen it I feel that I am in a better position to handle the problem of sentencing of prisoners who happen to appear, for sentence, before me.

Dorchester penitentiary:

October 11, 1963, Hon. Judge J. Albert Pichette, Edmonton, New Brunswick.

Questions

May 14, 1964, Magistrate J. P. Mackin, Saint John, New Brunswick. No comments or recommendations made.

Date	Title
6 June 63	Asst. police magistrate
6 June 63	Magistrate
6 June 63	Magistrate
6 June 63	Magistrate
27 June 63	Judge
17 Apr. 64	Justice
17 Apr. 64	Judge
17 Apr. 64	Judge
17 Apr. 64	Judge
17 Apr. 64	Judge
17 Apr. 64	Judge
17 Apr. 64	Judge
20 Oct. 64	C. C. judge

Comments of a general nature were made. No specific recommendations. Hon. Mr. J. Brooke wrote as follows following his visit:

We were impressed with the difference between this institution and Kingston penitentiary and with the training that is available to inmates. Your comments with respect to the length of time that it takes to complete the training course adequately at Collin's bay is a matter which we will bear in mind in considering the question of sentence.

Joyceville institution:

June 6, 1963, three magistrates attending a seminar at Queen's University visited the institution under the direction of Magistrate A. Falzetta, secretary of the Ontario magistrates' association, Sudbury, Ontario.

June 26, 1963, Hon. Judge W. Sheppard, Toronto.

April 17, 1964, Hon. Justices W. D. Parker, S. Schatz, J. Brooke, E. Moorehouse, L. Landreville, E. Haines and N. Fraser of the supreme court of Ontario, addresses unknown.

October 20, 1964, Hon. Judge Lyon of York county, address unknown.

Prison for women:

October 20, 1964, Hon. Judge Lyon of York county, address unknown.

In all cases comments were favourable and no recommendations were made.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Collin's bay penitentiary:

Visits by judges and magistrates since 1 January 1963:

Name	Address
P. E. D. Baker	Kingston
J. E. Robinson	Hamilton
G. H. Jermyn	Gananoque
F. Ebbs	Oshawa
W. A. E. Sheppard	Toronto
Hon. Mr. Justice Brooke	Osgoode Hall Toronto
N. C. Fraser	Toronto
E. L. Haines	Toronto
L. A. Landreville	Toronto
J. Moorehouse	Toronto
W. D. Parker	Toronto
S. N. Schatz	Toronto
H. Waisberg (A director of the J.H.S.)	Toronto

LAU NGAR MYE—CHARGES UNDER IMMIGRATION ACT

Question No. 2,161—**Mr. Lambert:**

1. Was a charge of making false statements under the provisions of the Immigration Act or any related charge made recently against Lau Ngar Mye of the Toronto area?

2. If so, has a trial been held and with what result?

3. If such prosecution has taken place, what were the circumstances which removed Lau Ngar Mye from the protection of the amnesty granted in 1961 to Chinese nationals who had entered Canada illegally?

4. If Lau Ngar Mye has been convicted and suffers a penalty thereby, is there to be any further penalty or disability, such as deportation, which he may incur?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): 1. Yes.

2. Yes, he was convicted and sentenced to a fine of $1,000 or four months imprisonment. The fine was paid.

3. He did not qualify for the amnesty because it applied only to illegalities related to illegal entry and did not apply to subsequent illegalities not related thereto.

4. No.

TELEVISION STATION CJOH, OTTAWA—DRAMATIC PRODUCTIONS

Question No. 2,178—**Mr. Orlikow:**

Did the present owners of the private t.v. channel in Ottawa, or their associates, undertake with

the B.B.G. to produce a number of hour long dramatic programs in Ottawa and, if so, how many have been produced?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Ted Cott of N.T.A. Telefilm (Canada) Ltd. appeared at the public hearing with the CJOH application. He stated "we are prepared to produce one or more of the 'Play of the Week' programs up here in association with Mr. Bushnell". The board has no information as to whether these programs were produced.

TELEVISION STATION CJOH, OTTAWA—
AWARD TO CANADIAN PLAYWRIGHT

Question No. 2,179—**Mr. Orlikow:**

Did the present owners of CJOH, or their associates, undertake to provide an award to a Canadian playwright for the best play and, if so (a) has such an award ever been made (b) what is the value of such award?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Ted Cott of N.T.A. Telefilm (Canada) Ltd. appeared at the public hearing with the CJOH application. He stated:

We are preparing to produce one or more of the "Play of the Week" programs up here in association with Mr. Bushnell and, in fact, when and if this licence is granted, we are prepared to announce the establishment of an award to a Canadian playwright for the best play which can be produced on this program.

In the logging process stations are not required to file with the board information of this kind. The board, therefore has no information as to whether the station has made such an award, or its value.

TELEVISION STATION CJOH, OTTAWA—
PRODUCTIONS FOR U.S. SHOWING

Question No. 2,180—**Mr. Orlikow:**

Did associates of the present owners of CJOH undertake with the B.B.G. to produce such programs as "Open end" in Ottawa for showing in New York and other American cities and, if so, have any such programs been produced in Ottawa and shown in the United States?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Ted Cott of N.T.A. Telefilm (Canada) Ltd. appeared at the public hearing with the CJOH application. He stated:

We look forward in our discussion with Mr. Bushnell and his associates to be able to do various of our "Open End" programs here so that they would be presented in New York city, and, since they are taped, they are also presented to other of the major cities in the United States.

In the logging process stations are not required to advise the board of productions they have undertaken or of material that has been shown in the United States. The board, therefore, has no information on this matter.

TELEVISION STATION CJOH, OTTAWA—
SERIES FOR CHILDREN

Question No. 2,181—**Mr. Orlikow:**

Did associates or the present owners of CJOH undertake with the B.B.G. to have a series for children made in co-operation with a company in France, partly in English and partly in French, using Canadian talent and, if so, has any such series been produced and shown on Canadian t.v.?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. N. A. Taylor, president of N. A. Taylor Associates, a group of companies concerned with the production and distribution of films, appeared at the public hearing with the CJOH application. He stated:

We have also invested in the co-production of a pilot film for a television series for children. We have done this in co-operation with a company in France. We hope to make part of the series in France and part of the series in Canada...

In the logging process stations are not required to advise the board of productions that they have undertaken. The board has no information as to whether such programs were produced and shown on Canadian television.

TELEVISION STATION CJOH, OTTAWA—
PRODUCTION OF FILMS BASED
ON CANADIAN NOVELS

Question No. 2,182—**Mr. Orlikow:**

Did associates, or the present owners, of CJOH in Ottawa, undertake with the B.B.G. to produce motion pictures based on Canadian novels and to show them internationally and, if so, have any such films been produced?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. N. A. Taylor, president of N. A. Taylor Associates, a group of companies concerned with the production and distribution of films, appeared at the public hearing with the CJOH application. He indicated that one of his film companies had produced one such film and was considering the production of others. The board has no information as to whether these films were produced.

TELEVISION STATION CJOH, OTTAWA—
DEVELOPMENT OF CANADIAN TALENT

Question No. 2,184—**Mr. Orlikow:**

Did the owners of CJOH in Ottawa undertake with the B.B.G. to give priority to the encouragement and development of Canadian talent and, if so, how many Canadian artists have appeared on programs originating at CJOH and what are their names?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): In his application to the board Mr. Bushnell stated: "The discovery, encouragement and development of talent will be given

a high priority". Stations are not required in the logging process to file information of this kind with the board. It would be the board's intention at the public hearing of the application for the renewal of the licence of the station which expires on March 31, 1966, to examine the licensee on the station's operation in the light of undertakings given with respect to the employment of the staff and artists.

TELEVISION STATION CJOH, OTTAWA—EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,185—**Mr. Orlikow:**

Did the present owners of CJOH in Ottawa undertake with the B.B.G. to exchange shows, created in Ottawa, with the United States and England, and, if so, have any such shows been organized?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Yes. In the logging process stations are not required to file with the board information of this kind. The board, therefore, has no information as to whether any such shows have been organized.

TELEVISION STATION CJOH, OTTAWA—FRENCH PROGRAMMING

Question No. 2,188—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Did the successful applicants for channel 13 in Ottawa promise the B.B.G. that they would provide a minimum of ten hours of French language broadcasting, each week, produced in Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec?

2. How much French programming has CJOH televised since it began operations?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. Yes.

2. The board does not keep a continuous detailed record of the material broadcast by the station since it began operating and is not, therefore, able to provide the information requested.

TELEVISION STATION CJOH, OTTAWA—USE OF OTTAWA PERFORMERS

Question No. 2,189—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Did CJOH promise the B.B.G. that they would schedule variety and live dance programs produced in Ottawa and using Ottawa artists, musicians, etc.?

2. Have any such programs been produced, and, if so (a) how many, and (b) at what cost?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. Yes.

2. (a) The board does not keep a continuous detailed record of the material broadcast by the station since it began operating and is not, therefore, able to provide the information requested. (b) The board does not make public the financial information it receives from private station operations.

[Mr. Lamontagne.]

TELEVISION STATION CJOH, OTTAWA—PROPOSED USE OF TALENT AND STAFF

Question No. 2,190—**Mr. Orlikow:**

Did the successful applicant for a private t.v. channel in Ottawa ask the B.B.G. to compare the superior quality of their plans for the use of talent and staff as compared to those of the other applicants?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): The board's record indicates that the applicant made the following statement at the public hearing while presenting the application for CJOH-TV: "We feel that the board must consider the lower sights that the other four applicants have set and ensured by their talent and staff allowances."

VISIT BY MINISTER TO ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY

Question No. 2,211—**Mr. Martineau:**

1. Did the Minister of Justice visit St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary on October 26, 1964 and, if so (a) who accompanied him on this visit, and (b) what was the purpose of this visit (c) what was the outcome of this visit (d) will the minister prepare a report concerning the conditions observed at the institution in the course of this visit (e) will the minister table such a report before the House of Commons?

2. Did the minister verify, in particular, if any of the charges made by an ex-inmate of this institution, in the course of a C.B.C. program called "This Hour Has Seven Days" on Sunday, October 25, 1964, were founded and, if so, what measures does the minister intend to take to correct this situation?

3. Did he, in particular, verify details of the charges made in regard to one Gaston Nicholas, an inmate in this penitentiary and did he establish if this person has been denied the privilege of keeping his daughter's picture in his cell?

4. Did the minister and his party partake of a meal within the prison walls and, if so (a) was this fare the regular fare served to the inmates, and (b) was a special menu arranged for the prisoners on that day because of the minister's visit?

5. Has any disciplinary action been taken or is any such action being considered against the warden of this institution or any of its officials?

6. Are the guards on duty at this institution being examined as to their mental and physical aptitudes to fill these positions?

7. What qualifications are required to fill these positions?

8. Are any guards being removed as being unfit to fill their position?

9. What measures is the minister planning to remedy the conditions existing at this institution and what committees will be appointed to deal with same?

10. What powers will these committees have, and how will their membership be composed?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): 1. The Minister of Justice visited the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary on Monday, October 26,

1964. (a) The minister was accompanied by the Minister of Public Works and approximately 60 representatives of the press, radio and television. (b) The purpose of the visit was for the minister to see for himself the existing conditions at the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary. (c) This visit satisfied the minister that the present facilities at the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary should be abandoned as soon as possible and, in consequence, both he and the Minister of Public Works were impressed with the need to press the completion of construction of new facilities with all speed. (d) No. (e) No.

2. The minister investigated these accusations and found nothing that would substantiate them.

3. Yes. The penitentiary authorities denied permitting this inmate to keep one unusually large photograph of his daughter. However, a photograph of regulation size is now in this inmate's possession.

4. The minister and his party did not partake of a meal within the prison walls. During the visit of the kitchen and servery, the regular fare served to the inmates was inspected and tasted by the minister and any other person who wished to do so. No special menu was arranged for the prisoners.

5. No.

6. Yes.

7. The qualifications required to fill these positions are: (a) Age limit, 23 to 40 years. (b) Physical fitness; height, minimum 5′ 8″; weight, satisfactory for height, build and age; eyes, not less than 20/60 without glasses; must satisfy institutional doctor in all medical aspects as to physical fitness. (c) Education, minimum of grade 10 (grade 9, Quebec) or equivalent and achieve suitable standards in any psychological personality tests that may be given. (d) Ability, proven satisfactory police or military experience is a decided asset for any applicant. (e) Character and appearance, the applicant should be neat in appearance. During the selection board interview, the applicant is assessed as to: (i) suitability for carrying out duties according to regulations; (ii) ability to express himself orally; (iii) self control; (iv) self confidence; (v) potential leadership; (vi) ability to co-operate with others. (f) Training; to pass a three month induction training course and a further three month probationary period of employment.

8. No.

9. Measures have been taken by the Minister of Public Works to hasten the construction program of penitentiary institutions in the province of Quebec. It is also intended to establish two committees; one parliamentary committee to deal with the physical and material need of penal institutions, the other a committee of experts to deal with the overall field of correction in Canada.

10. The composition and powers of these committees are now being considered and the minister intends to advise the house as soon as a decision will have been taken on this subject.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Question No. 2,230—**Mr. Woolliams:**

1. How many people are employed in the C.B.C.?
2. What is the total capital investment of this crown corporation?
3. For the past complete fiscal year, what was the total revenue the C.B.C. earned or produced?
4. How much money was paid to the C.B.C. out of the public treasury in 1963?
5. What was the total cost of producing films by the C.B.C. in 1963, which said films or any part thereof were not, and will not be shown on the television network?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

1. 8,089 as at September 30, 1964.

2. The total cost to the corporation of capital assets in use at March 31, 1964, as shown by the latest published balance sheet of the corporation, was $68,442,958. The net book value of these assets after provision for depreciation, was $36,612,401.

3. Total gross revenue earned or produced by C.B.C. in the fiscal year 1963-64, $33,010,-055.

4. Parliamentary grant in respect of the net operating amount required to discharge the responsibilities of the national broadcasting service 1963-64, $78,376,828. Parliamentary grant for the capital requirements of the national broadcasting service 1963-64, $7,332,-985.

5. The combined film and video tape write-off for two television networks in the 1963-64 fiscal year totalled $104,751. This included the costs of programs cancelled because of emergency programming, such as the death of President Kennedy, and material unsuitable for use.

CONSIDERATION OF AIRPORT CONSTRUCTION, KIMBERLEY, B.C.

Question No. 2,232—**Mr. Howard:**

1. Since January 1, 1964, has the government received any representations for building an airport at, or near, the St. Eugene Indian reserve near Kimberley, B.C., and, if so, from whom were the

representations received, what was the nature of each and what action is contemplated with respect thereto?

2. In the course of considering any such representations, or in considering the question without any such representations, were any members of parliament consulted and, if so, which ones and what was the response in each case?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. No, but the department has itself been in touch with various local municipalities regarding the airport problems of both the east and west Kootenays and its present investigations of alternate possibilities.

2. In reply to requests received from the member for Kootenay East regarding the future prospects for the Cranbrook airport, information on these current departmental investigations was supplied to him.

LAND PURCHASE, CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I.

Question No. 2,259—**Mr. MacLean (Queens):**

Has the government, during the last year and a half, purchased land in the city of Charlottetown and, if so (a) what is the area of the land purchased (b) from whom was the land purchased (c) what was the total price paid (d) what is the intended use to be made of the land purchased?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Yes, (a) 0.34 acre; (b) A. Pickard & Co.; (c) $7,428.37, (d) marine agency depot.

TELEVISION STATION CJAY, WINNIPEG—VARIETY PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,272—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Did the successful applicants for the private t.v. channel in Winnipeg, Manitoba, undertake with the B.B.G. to provide an opportunity for professional and up-and-coming amateurs, to develop their talents on that channel?

2. Have any actors, musicians, singers and variety artists been hired for programs produced by the private t.v. channel in Winnipeg, Manitoba and, if so, since the station began to operate, how many and when?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. Yes.

2. Stations are not required in the logging process to file with the board information concerning the hiring of specific talent. It would be the board's intention at the public hearing of the application for the renewal of the licence of the station which expires on March 31, 1966, to examine the licensee on the station's operation in the light of undertakings given with respect to the employment of artists.

EFFECTS OF AIR POLLUTION ON AGRICULTURE

Question No. 2,294—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

[Mr. Howard.]

1. Is the government conducting or supporting research into the present or possible future effects of air pollution on agriculture and, if so, at which institutions and under whose direction is such research being carried out?

2. What have been the findings of each research project carried out within the last year?

3. For each of the last five years, what has been the cost to the government of such research?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. The Department of Agriculture is not conducting or supporting research into the present or possible future effects of air pollution on agriculture.

2. N/A.

3. N/A.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

Question No. 2,295—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. Is the Department of Transport conducting or supporting research into methods of air pollution control and, if so, at which institutions and under whose direction is such research being carried out?

2. What have been the findings of each research project carried out within the last year?

3. For each of the last five years, what has been the cost to the government of such research?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

JOLIETTE, QUE., FEDERAL BUILDING—AIR CONDITIONING

Question No. 2,297—**Mr. Pigeon:**

1. Does the government intend to instal an air conditioning system in the federal building in the town of Joliette (post office, unemployment insurance office, etc.) and, if so, when?

2. If no air conditioning is to be installed, for what reason?

[*Translation*]

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. No.

2. The federal building at Joliette was built in 1888, with additions constructed in 1914 and 1952, and is typical of many buildings across the country where risk of deterioration from moisture saturation of the fabric of the building, and the materials of construction, will most likely prevent the installation of an air conditioning system. Investigation into different phases of this general problem is underway, both at the national research council and at the Department of Public Works.

[*Text*]

STUDENT LOANS GRANTED

Question No. 2,300—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. As of September 30, 1964, how many students in each province and territory have been granted Canada student loans?
2. In each province and territory, what was the total of loans as of September 30, 1964?

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): 1 and 2:

Preliminary figures on loans made under the Canada Student Loans Act as of September 30, 1964, are as follows:

Province	No.	Amount
B.C.	1,456	$1,065,814.00
Alta.	285	99,050.50
Sask.	741	432,905.00
Man.	270	100,705.00
Ont.	3,781	1,851,888.00
Que.	29	14,201.00
N.B.	698	263,289.00
N.S.	631	223,011.50
P.E.I.	78	27,167.00
Nfld.	130	44,225.00
Yuk.	2	1,000.00
Total	8,101	$4,123,256.00

COMPANIES ESTABLISHED IN DESIGNATED AREAS

Question No. 2,308—**Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John):**

1. What are the names of companies which have set up operations in designated areas?
2. In what location has each been established?
3. What is the amount registered on the certificate for each of these companies and what is the type of production of each?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): 1. It would not be in the public interest for the government to disclose the names of companies which have set up operations in designated areas and which have indicated, on a confidential basis, their intention of taking advantage of the tax incentives available to new enterprises in designated areas. When certificates under section 71A of the Income Tax Act have been issued, the government will give consideration to publishing the names of those firms which have received such certificates.

2 and 3. Companies which have set up operations in designated areas and which have indicated their intention of taking advantage of the tax incentives are arranged alphabetically according to standard industrial classification.

In Alberta-British Columbia in the designated area of Blairmore: electrical apparatus.

In New Brunswick in the designated areas of Campbellton, Minto, St. Stephen, Woodstock and Sussex: food, textiles, transportation equipment, wood products.

In Nova Scotia in the designated areas of Amherst, Inverness and New Glasgow: clothing, petroleum products, wood products.

In Ontario in the designated areas of Brantford, Chatham, Cornwall, Timmins, Wallaceburg and Windsor: chemicals, composite, electrical apparatus, food, leather, machinery, metal fabrication, miscellaneous, non-metallic minerals, paper products, primary metal manufacturing, printing, publishing, textiles, transportation equipment, wood products.

In Quebec in the designated areas of Causapscal, Louiseville, Matane, Mont Laurier, Rouyn, St. Jean, Shawinigan and Val d'Or: chemicals, electrical apparatus, knitted goods, metal fabrication, miscellaneous, non-metallic minerals, paper products, textiles, transportation equipment, wood products.

No certificates under section 71A of the Income Tax Act have been issued to date.

SUICIDES IN FEDERAL PENITENTIARIES

Question No. 2,310—**Mr. Peters:**

1. How many suicides have taken place in federal penitentiaries during the last five years and, if any, give name, location of prison, date and particular?
2. Was an inquest ordered into each suicide and, if not, for what reason?
3. During the same period of time how many attempted suicides were serious and how many were superficial attempts not calculated to produce death?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): 1 and 2. During the last five years, suicides have taken place in federal penitentiaries as follows and an inquest ordered into each suicide, except where indicated:

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY

Date	Name	Particulars
Apr. 7, 1959	3862—Lyons, J. W.	By hanging. (Under psychiatric treatment)
Aug. 2, 1959	3876—Hamelin, R.	By hanging. (Under psychiatric treatment)
Sept. 11, 1959	4201—Poirier, A.	By hanging. (Under psychiatric treatment)
Jan. 31, 1960	4777—Renaud, J.	By hanging.
Oct. 14, 1961	6655—Rouleau, E.	By hanging.
Aug. 14, 1961	8830—Bedard, Y.	Jumped from fourth tier in dome. (Under psychiatric treatment)
Apr. 12, 1964	7042—Taffet, P.	Death by hanging. (Under psychiatric treatment)

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY

Date	Name	Particulars
Oct. 23, 1960	7324—Lapratt. NOTE: The coroner declared suffocation by strangulation and did not order an inquest.	By hanging.
July 3, 1961	7886—Lebeau. NOTE: The coroner declared death by strangulation and did not order an inquest.	By hanging.
Sept. 21, 1961	3755—Baylis. NOTE: The coroner declared death by strangulation and did not order an inquest.	By hanging.
Sept. 29, 1962	8144—Wright.	By hanging.
Apr. 26, 1964	581—Clark.	By hanging.

SASKATCHEWAN PENITENTIARY

Date	Name	Particulars
Jan. 25, 1961	8383—McCorquodale, R. H. NOTE: The coroner declared death by asphyxiation and did not order an inquest.	By hanging.
Apr. 3, 1963	8847—Brass, S. W. NOTE: The coroner did not order an inquest.	By hanging.

BRITISH COLUMBIA PENITENTIARY

Date	Name	Particulars
June 24, 1959	9879—McRae.	By hanging.
July 30, 1960	9880—McCarty.	By hanging.

3. During the same period of time serious suicide attempts and superficial attempts not calculated to produce death were made in the following numbers:

Institution	Serious attemps	Superficial attempts not calculated to produce death
Dorchester penitentiary	3	21
St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary	3	No statistics were kept of such attempts.

Institution	Serious attempts	Superficial attempts not calculated to produce death
Kingston penitentiary	11	63
Prison for women	2	9
Collin's bay penitentiary	1	—
Joyceville institution	—	1
Manitoba penitentiary	1	21
Saskatchewan penitentiary	2	4
British Columbia penitentiary	1	9
Total	24	128

CONTRACT OF C.N.R. PRESIDENT

Question No. 2,311—**Mr. Pigeon:**

When was the contract of Mr. Donald Gordon, president of the Canadian National Railways, last renewed and, for how many years?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Pursuant to the provisions of the Canadian National-Canadian Pacific Act 1936 (later amended by Canadian National Railways Act 1955), Mr. Donald Gordon was appointed president of the Canadian National Railway Company by its board of directors, such appointment being approved by the governor in council, effective January 1, 1950. The appointment is not for any specified term, but in accordance with the statutes the chief executive officer holds office "during the pleasure of the directors". Coincident with the appointment as president, and in accordance with the statutes, the governor in council appointed Mr. Gordon a director and chairman of the board. Mr. Gordon's current appointment as a director and chairman of the board of directors, pursuant to sections 6 and 8 of the Canadian National Railways Act, was approved by order in council P.C. 1963-1473, dated October 4, 1963.

[*Text*]

CROSSING OF PETITCODIAC RIVER, NEW BRUNSWICK

Question No. 2,314—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What formula was used to determine the $800,000 grant for construction of a crossing of the Petitcodiac river near Moncton under the M.M.R. Act?

2. What is the estimated cost of the crossing in question and what type of crossing is to be constructed?

3. Has an agreement been signed by the parties involved in the construction of the crossing and, if so, on what date was the agreement signed and who were the signators to the agreement?

4. What will be the site of the construction of the crossing and is the property on which the crossing is to be constructed presently under the ownership of either the federal government or the government of New Brunswick?

5. In what instances has the federal government awarded grants for river crossings within any province of Canada before a determination of cost, type of crossing or location for project been secured?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): 1. The federal contribution is based on the amount of arable marshland which will be permanently protected from tidal flooding, and the value of such protection in providing a secure basis for full development of the area. The project was analysed according to the same formula as that used for the construction of the Annapolis river dam in Nova Scotia.

2. $3,000,000 for a combination rock filled dam and causeway equipped with aboiteau.

3. No.

4. The northern end of the crossing will tie in with the Dickson boulevard in Moncton. The province is assuming full responsibility for acquiring all rights of way.

5. None.

FEDERAL BUILDING, AMHERST, N.S.

Question No. 2,318—**Mr. Coates:**

1. On what date will tenders be called for the construction of a new federal building at Amherst, N.S.?

2. What departments of government will have quarters in the new federal building?

3. What will be the estimated cost of this building?

Questions

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. It is intended to call tenders for an addition to the existing building during the fiscal year 1966-1967, subject to the provision of funds by parliament.

2. We anticipate that the following departments will occupy this building: Post Office Department, Department of National Revenue, Department of Labour, unemployment insurance commission, Department of Citizenship and Immigration, Department of Forestry, Department of Finance (public works treasury).

3. The estimated cost will not be known until plans and specifications have been completed.

CONSTRUCTION OF STORAGE DAMS, ALBERTA

Question No. 2,319—**Mr. Horner (Acadia):**

1. Has the Alberta government made requisition either through P.F.R.A. or through ARDA, for assistance in construction of a water storage dam near the town of Hanna on Fox lake, so as to enhance the water conditions in the area?

2. Has the Alberta government made a request under P.F.R.A. or ARDA for a dam (known as Cameron dam) north of Youngstown, Alberta, on Sounding creek?

3. Has the Alberta government water resources board granted P.F.R.A. permission for construction on Blood Indian creek, south of Youngstown and, if so, when will construction on this project begin?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. The government of Alberta requested, under P.F.R.A., assistance in the construction of a water storage dam near the town of Hanna, Alberta.

2. The government of Alberta requested that a preliminary investigation be made of the feasibility of the Sounding creek project. The report was completed by P.F.R.A. in June 1962 and was forwarded to the government of Alberta.

3. The Alberta water resources board has granted permission for the construction of the Blood Indian creek community water storage project. Tenders are being called and construction is expected to commence early next year.

ISODELE BELFONT—DEPORTATION PROCEEDINGS

Question No. 2,320—**Mr. Howard:**

1. Have any deportation proceedings been instituted against one Isodele Belfont (nee Dreckman)?

2. Has any representation been made by the government of the United States regarding Isodele Belfont?

3. What are the reasons for the deportation proceedings?

4. Is the government aware that Isodele Belfont is a married woman and is her husband included in the said proceedings, or are there separate proceedings relating to him?

[Mr. Coates.]

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. Yes.

2. No.

3. This woman has been ordered deported under section 19(1)(e)(ix) of the Immigration Act in that she returned to Canada contrary to the provisions of the Immigration Act after a deportation order had been made against her. Mrs. Belfont has entered an appeal against this order and her case is being considered by the immigration appeal board.

4. Yes, the government is aware that Isodele Belfont is a married woman. Her husband is a Canadian citizen and is not subject to the deportation provisions of the Immigration Act.

SALARY OF CHAPLAIN, FEDERAL PENITENTIARY

Question No. 2,321—**Mr. Matheson:**

1. What is the annual salary of a chaplain serving in a federal penitentiary?

2. Does a chaplain receive a residence in addition to salary?

3. What amenities, if any, are provided to a chaplain free of cost?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): 1. Chaplains serving in a federal penitentiary are paid $5,400 per annum if employed on a full time basis and $3,500 per annum if employed on a part time basis.

2. No.

3. None.

DEATH OF MAPLE TREES

Question No. 2,322—**Mr. Matheson:**

1. Has the government any statistics respecting the dying of maple trees during the past several years?

2. Has any study been undertaken to counteract maple decline and, if so, with what results?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): 1. A conspicuous dieback of maples has occurred in recent years throughout southern Ontario. Sample plots have been under surveillance for several years by the Department of Forestry and these show that the condition is restricted to exposed trees along highways, secondary roads, and streets in urban areas and does not extend into natural stands of maple. The severity of dieback varies from year to year and between areas but observations in 1964 show that a high proportion of the roadside trees are in various stages of decline at locations in the lake Erie, lake Huron, Lindsay, and Tweed forest districts.

2. Studies to date indicate that a number of factors are involved including: drought, chemicals used along highways to control dust, ice, and weeds; low winter temperatures when there is deficient snow cover; and the age of trees. Studies are in progress to determine the relative importance of these factors. Once this is established, appropriate means of prevention or treatment can be developed.

EXPORT CREDITS INSURANCE CORPORATION

Question No. 2,325—**Mr. Basford:**

1. What are the names, addresses and principal occupations of the directors, executive officers and members of the advisory council of the Exports Credits Insurance Corporation?

2. With regard to cash financing agreements made under section 21A of the Export Credits Insurance Act, from January 1, 1964 to the present, either by Canada alone, or as part of a joint venture, or international consortia, what are the (a) countries and importers (b) products financed (c) name and address of exporter, and (d) amount authorized to be financed by Canada?

3. Where in Canada does the Export Credits Insurance Corporation maintain branch offices?

4. What factors militate against a branch office of E.C.I.C. being located in Vancouver, B.C.?

Mr. Jean-Luc Pepin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. Directors: J. H. Warren, Ottawa, Ontario, deputy minister of trade and commerce (chairman); R. B. Bryce, Ottawa, Ontario, deputy minister of finance; L. C. Audette, Ottawa, Ontario, chairman tariff board; A. F. W. Plumptre, Ottawa, Ontario, assistant deputy minister of finance; A. E. Ritchie, Ottawa, Ontario, under secretary of state for external affairs; D. Harvey, Orleans, Ontario, assistant deputy minister of trade and commerce; H. T. Aitken, Ottawa, Ontario, president and general manager of E.C.I.C.

Executive officers: H. T. Aitken, Ottawa, Ontario, president and general manager; A. W. Thomas, Ottawa, Ontario, vice president; T. Chase-Casgrain, Ottawa, Ontario, secretary.

Advisory council: Hon. J. V. Clyne, Vancouver, B.C., chairman of the board of the MacMillan, Bloedel and Powell River Limited; G. L. Harrold, Calgary, Alberta, president of Alberta wheat pool; A. T. Lambert, Toronto, Ontario, president of the Toronto-Dominion Bank; Paul H. Leman, Montreal, Quebec, executive vice president of the Aluminum Company of Canada; F. C. Mannix, Calgary, Alberta, president and chairman of the board of Mannix Co. Ltd.; A. F. Mayne, Montreal, Quebec, executive vice president of the Royal Bank of Canada; Ian F. McRae, Toronto, Ontario, chairman of the board of Canadian General Electric Company Limited; P. A. Ouimet, Montreal, Quebec, legal adviser to Iron Ore Co. of Canada; C. Ritchie, Montreal, Quebec, vice president and general manager of Montreal Engineering Company Limited; Fletcher S. Smith, Halifax, Nova Scotia, A. M. Smith & Company Limited; H. S. Sutherland, Montreal, Quebec, president of Shawinigan Chemicals Limited; R. B. Taylor, Hamilton, Ontario, vice president and treasurer of The Steel Company of Canada Limited; F. Homer Zwicker, Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, president and managing director of Zwicker & Company Limited.

2. Please see page 11202 for answer to question No. 2.

3. Montreal and Toronto.

4. The volume of contact work in Vancouver does not justify the salaries and expenses involved in maintaining a branch office in Vancouver. The corporation is represented by the west coast office of the Department of Trade and Commerce in Vancouver.

FINANCING AGREEMENTS MADE UNDER SECTION 21A OF THE EXPORT CREDITS INSURANCE ACT FROM JANUARY 1, 1964

Country	Importer	Order in council (Date of contract)	Products financed	Exporter	Amount authorized	Type of financing venture
Chile.....	Compania Manufacturera de Papeles y Cartones	P.C. 1964-1541 (Oct. 16, 1964)	Pulp mill equipment and engineering	H. A. Simons (International) Ltd., Vancouver, B.C.	$ 2,820,000	Joint venture IADB—Canada (addition to previous financing agreement)
India.....	Indian Aluminium Co. Ltd.	P.C. 1964-282 (June 11, 1964)	Foil mill and smelter equipment	Aluminum Company of Canada Ltd., Montreal, Que.	$ 900,000	Consortium commitment (addition to previous financing agreement)
India.....	Hindustan Steel Ltd.....	P.C. 1964-1314 (Oct. 16, 1964)	Industrial furnaces	Amco Furnace Contractors Ltd. Rexdale, Ontario.	$ 1,960,000	Consortium commitment (balance of equipment for steel mill supplied and financed by Japan)
India.....	Department of Atomic Energy	P.C. 1963-1763 (April 27, 1964)	CANDU nuclear reactor and engineering services	Montreal Engineering Co. Ltd., Montreal, and Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. Ottawa.	$ 37,000,000	Consortium commitment
India.....	Cominco Binani Zinc Limited	P.C. 1963-920 (May 27, 1964)	Zinc smelter and equipment	Consolidated Mining and Smelting Co. of Canada Ltd. Trail, B.C.	$ 1,600,000	Consortium commitment
India.....	National Aeronautical Laboratory	P.C. 1964-836 (July 2, 1964)	Trisonic wind tunnel	Canadian Vickers Ltd., Montreal, Que.	$ 4,200,000	Consortium commitment
Mexico.....	Fabricas de Papel Tuxtepec S.A.	P.C. 1964-456 (May 12, 1964) Services	Paper mill equipment and engineering	Parsons & Whittemore (Contractors) Ltd., Montreal, and Sandwell and Company, Vancouver, B.C.	$ 2,973,000	Canadian alone
Mexico.....	Ferrocarril del Pacifico S.A.	P.C. 1964-1275 (Aug. 31, 1964)	Steel rails	Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation, Montreal, Que.	$ 3,013,000	Canadian alone
Philippines.....	Philippine Long Distance Telephone Co.	P.C. 1964-984 (Sept. 22, 1964)	Telecommunications equipment	Automatic Electric (Canada) Limited, Brockville, Ont.	$ 13,500,000	Canadian alone
				Total	$ 67,966,000	

MEDICAL SERVICES, MILLBROOK INDIAN RESERVE, N.S.

Question No. 2,326—**Mr. Howard:**

1. Since January 1, 1954, what is the name of each medical doctor who attended Indians on the Millbrook Indian reserve in Nova Scotia and the dates upon which each such doctor assumed his duties with respect to the said reserve?

2. Are Indians on the said reserve free to attend a doctor of their own choosing and, if so, will any medical bills so incurred be paid by any branch or agency of the government?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. The following are the physicians designated by the Department of National Health and Welfare for attendance to the medical needs of the Indians of the Millbrook reserve near Truro, Nova Scotia: Doctor J. B. Reid Sr., from world war II until his death in the fall of 1954; Doctor J. B. Reid Jr., 1954 to December 31, 1958; Doctor R. F. Ross, January 1, 1959 to September 30, 1963; Doctor J. B. Reid Jr., October 1, 1963 to the present.

2. Indians, like any other Canadian citizens, are free to make whatsoever arrangements they choose for their own medical care. However, when a Canadian Indian wishes to receive necessary medical care at public expense, he is expected to follow the arrangements which have been made by the Department of National Health and Welfare. It should be noted that in emergencies and other unusual situations a certain amount of leeway is permitted the Indian in obtaining urgently required medical attention.

REPAIRS TO C.C.G.S. "WOLFE"

Question No. 2,328—**Mr. MacEwan:**

1. Were tenders called for repairs on C.C.G.S. *Wolfe*?

2. What firms were asked to bid and what were the amounts of their bids?

3. To what firm was the contract awarded?

4. In what period of time will the work be completed?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Yes.

2. Saint John Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Co. Ltd., $13,146; Purdy Bros., Halifax, $14,904; Ferguson Industries Ltd., Pictou, N.S., $19,436; Steel & Engine Products, Liverpool, N.S., $20,558; Halifax Shipyards, $22,810.

3. Saint John Shipbuilding and Drydock Co. Ltd.

4. Eight days.

REFIT OF C.C.G.S. "SAUREL"

Question No. 2,330—**Mr. MacEwan:**

1. Were tenders called for the supplementary to annual refit of C.C.G.S. *Saurel*?

2. Where had the C.C.G.S. *Saurel* been operating during the last six months?

3. What firms were asked to tender and what was the amount of each tender?

4. To what firm was the contract awarded?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1, 3 and 4. The need for supplementary work on any particular refit becomes apparent only after the ship is in the hands of the commercial firm doing the work and the machinery is opened up or the hull exposed. In order to return the ship to operational service, it is, therefore, necessary to carry out immediately any additional work thus revealed and this must be arranged for by negotiation as an extra to the original contract. The original contract was let by tender to J. R. Weir Ltd., Montreal.

2. Upper St. Lawrence river.

REPAIRS TO C.C.G.S. "EIDER"

Question No. 2,331—**Mr. MacEwan:**

1. Were tenders called for supplementary refit and supplementary to dry-docking damage repairs to C.C.G.S. Eider?

2. What type of ship is the C.C.G.S. *Eider* and where has it been operating during the last six months?

3. What firms were asked to tender and what was the amount of each tender?

4. To what firm was the contract awarded?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1, 3 and 4. The need for supplementary work on any particular refit becomes apparent only after the ship is in the hands of the commercial firm doing the work and the machinery is opened up or the hull exposed. In order to return the ship to operational service, it is, therefore, necessary to carry out immediately any additional work thus revealed and this must be arranged for by negotiation as an extra to the original contract. The original contract was let by tender to Marine Industries Ltd., Sorel, P.Q.

2. (a) Northern supply vessel, (b) Hudson bay and Labrador coast.

REFIT OF H.M.C.S. "ALGONQUIN"

Question No. 2,332—**Mr. MacEwan:**

1. Were tenders called for the refit, repairs or conversion of H.M.C.S. *Algonquin* and, if not, to what firm was this work allocated?

2. If tenders were called, what were the names of the tenderers and the amount of each tender for refit or conversion of H.M.C.S. *Algonquin*?

3. To what firm was the contract awarded and is the contract amount a firm price?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): 1 and 2. Tenders were not called for the refit, repairs or conversion of H.M.C.S. *Algonquin*.

This work was allocated to Marine Industries Limited, Sorel, P.Q.

3. The contract was awarded in November 1964 to Marine Industries Limited. The contract provides a target incentive with ceiling price for labour and materials, and a firm price for overhead and fee.

EFFECT OF INSECTICIDE PHOSPHAMIDON ON WILDLIFE

Question No. 2,334—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Is the government aware of surveys made for the Canadian wildlife service on the effects of the use of the insecticide phosphamidon in New Brunswick?

2. Did the survey report that a large number of birds were killed in the area sprayed by phosphamidon?

3. Is the government considering the banning of the use of phosphamidon at least until further testing is done?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. Yes, Dr. C. D. Fowle, head, department of biology, York University, Toronto, carried out surveys for the Canadian wildlife service on the use of phosphamidon in New Brunswick in 1964. Dr. Fowle has submitted a preliminary report, the contents of which were presented to the interdepartmental committee on forest spraying operations on October 27.

2. The data obtained by Dr. Fowle indicated a marked reduction in bird song and activity and in numbers of birds seen following the spraying of phosphamidon at the rate of one half pound per three quarters of a United States gallon per acre. Numbers of dead and sick birds were found by the investigators as well as by residents of the area; however, some of the sick birds recovered.

3. The government regarded the use of phosphamidon in 1964 as experimental. Results of the 1964 experiments suggest that phosphamidon applied at the lesser rate of one quarter pound per three quarters of a United States gallon per acre or phosphamidon plus a penetrant applied at one half pound per acre do not seriously affect bird or fish populations. The governmental agencies responsible for assessing the effects of forest spraying operations in New Brunswick are presently considering the 1965 program; however, no decision has yet been made.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS TO G. A. BOULET LTD.

Question No. 2,336—**Mr. Douglas:**

1. How many contracts has G. A. Boulet, Limitée St. Tite, Co. Laviolette, P.Q., received from the Department of National Defence in 1962, 1963 and 1964?

[Mr. Drury.]

2. Was G. A. Boulet, Limitée the low bidder on all such contracts and, if not, what was the bid submitted by G. A. Boulet, Limitée, and who submitted the lowest bid and for what amount?

3. What contracts is G. A. Boulet, Limitée working on at the present time?

4. Is a strike in progress at the G. A. Boulet, Limitée plant?

5. Does the government know if the reason for the strike is the refusal of G. A. Boulet, Limitée to bargain with their employees?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. 1962, 1; 1963, 4; 1964, nil.

2. Yes.

3. Contract GK.18-351044 for dress shoes, contract GK.20-351915 for dress shoes.

4. Not at the present time. It is understood there was a strike at this plant between August 20 and September 11, 1964.

5. This dispute is under provincial legislation. To the best of our knowledge some bargaining did take place prior to the strike but was terminated by the company.

TELEVISION STATION CFCF, MONTREAL—PROMISES ON OBTAINING LICENCE

Question No. 2,337—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Did the successful applicants for the private t.v. channel in Montreal (CFCF) promise the B.B.G. that if successful in getting the t.v. rights for Montreal they would devote certain percentages of their programming to educational programs, children's programs, public affairs programs, drama programs and, if so (a) what percentages of programming were allocated to each of the above types of program (b) since beginning operation, what proportion of CFCF's programming has actually been devoted to the above types of program?

2. Did the successful applicants for the private t.v. channel in Montreal (CFCF) promise the B.B.G. that if successful in getting the t.v. rights for Montreal they would devote a certain percentage of their prime viewing time to programs qualifying as having Canadian content and, if so (a) what percentage of Canadian content programs did they promise to provide (b) what percentage of Canadian content programming has station CFCF provided since they began operations?

3. Did the successful applicants for the private t.v. channel in Montreal (CFCF) promise the B.B.G. that if successful in getting the t.v. rights for Montreal they would devote a specific percentage of their programming to local live Canadian programming and, if so (a) how much time and what percentage of the total was promised to the B.B.G. (b) how much local live Canadian programming has station CFCF provided since it began operations?

4. Did the successful applicants for the private t.v. channel in Montreal (CFCF) promise the B.B.G. that if successful in getting the t.v. rights for Montreal they would devote their morning televising, if any, to some form of educational television in association with Sir George Williams University and, if so (a) is station CFCF televising in the mornings (b) how much educational television has station CFCF televised since it began operations?

Questions

Answer: 1. In their brief the applicants indicated that they planned to devote certain percentages of their programming to educational, children's, public affairs, and drama programs. (a) The following percentages were allocated: Educational, 7.8 per cent; children's, 14.8 per cent; public affairs, 5.8 per cent; drama, 38.7 per cent. (b) The board does not keep a continuous detailed record of the material broadcast by the station since it began operating and is not, therefore, able to provide the information requested.

2. The applicants proposed to devote a certain percentage of their prime viewing time to programs having Canadian content. (a) The applicants proposed 55.7 per cent. (b) The board does not keep a continuous detailed record of the material broadcast by the station since it began operating and is not, therefore, able to provide the information requested. The station has, however, continuously met the regulations of the board governing Canadian content in prime time.

3. (a) In their brief the applicants indicated that they planned to devote 53.6 per cent of their programming to local live Canadian programming. (b) The board does not keep a continuous detailed record of the material broadcast by the station since it began operating and is not, therefore, able to provide the information requested.

4. No. In their presentation at the public hearing the applicants made the following statement:

As to what use we might put such morning time on a permanent basis when we would expand back into the morning hours, I don't think there is any category—any single category—under which that program would fall. Morning time would lend itself to, and we have had discussions already, particularly with Sir George Williams University—it would lend itself very well to some form of educational television. As a matter of fact Sir George has been studying with some interest the experience of the group in California which is, in fact, doing television education on a very formal basis, and presenting courses for which credits are approved. We would see morning programming as being general programming, family programming, and with some educational material.

(a) Yes. (b) The board does not keep a continuous detailed record of the material broadcast by the station since it began operating and is not, therefore, able to provide the information requested.

WAGES OF CLEANERS, SAGE SITE, NORTH BAY

Question No. 2,338—**Mr. Douglas:**

1. What was the rate of pay for cleaner service men at the SAGE site in North Bay as of January, 1964?

2. Have any people employed as a cleaner service man received less than the amount advertised in civil service circulars?

3. Did civil service circulars advertising the position of cleaner service man indicate a wage increase every six months until a maximum was reached?

4. Have all cleaner service men received their wage increase at the end of each six month period?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): The following information in answer to parts 1 and 3 of question No. 2,338 has been supplied by the civil service commission and relates to competition 63-0-617, cleaning service men, government departmen in January 1964 were $2,900, $3,050, $3,200, $3,350, $3,500. These rates were in effect from October 1, 1963.

1. The salary rates for all cleaning service men in January 1964 were $2,900, $3,050, $3,200, $3,350, $3,500. These rates were in effect from October 1, 1963.

2. No.

3. A civil service circular advertising positions of cleaning service man in departments at North Bay, indicated the salary as $2,850 to $3,300 with semi-annual increases up to $3,150 and one annual increase to the maximum of $3,300. This circular was issued prior to October 1, 1963, and therefore did not quote the rates mentioned in answer 1, above.

4. No, one cleaning service man was denied an increase October 1, 1964 as he was not performing the duties of his position satisfactorily.

PAYMENTS UNDER CONTRACT, MOORE'S TAXI, WINNIPEG

Question No. 2,340—**Mr. Cowan:**

What are the dates of payments and the amounts received each time by the Department of Transport from Moore's Taxi Ltd. under the contract with the Department of Transport covering ground service transportation between Stevenson field and Winnipeg, from April 1961 to November 1, 1964?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):

	1962	1963	1964
January	$ 500.00	$808.83	$773.22
February	500.00	660.95	637.64
March	500.00	716.14	713.87
April	675.56	679.02	696.49
May	733.28	816.94	674.32
June	864.69	879.21	710.89
July	865.38	746.63	709.32
August	919.86	826.64	766.65
September	1,075.78	945.70	864.60
October	894.05	883.24	
November	730.89	712.95	
December	728.11	754.29	

Questions

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, EGG ISLAND, B.C.

Question No. 2,342—**Mr. Howard:**

1. For each year since January 1, 1962, how much money has been spent for (a) maintenance (b) new construction, and (c) supplies for or at Egg island in B.C.?

2. Since January 1, 1962 what volume of lumber by size, grade and value was destined for shipment to Egg island and did it all reach its destination?

3. If some of it did not so reach its destination what explanation exists?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):

1.

	1962	1963	1964
(a)	$ 67.88	$ 2,805.25	$ 85.92
(b)	1,910.00	149,920.08	701.17
(c)	585.14	1,005.29	175.96

2.

10,000 FBM 2 x 12	spruce, common	$ 800.00
4,000 FBM 4 x 4	spruce, common	364.00
6,092 FBM 4 x 12	spruce, common	
2,997 FBM 4 x 4	spruce, common	636.23
2,056 FBM 2 x 12	spruce, common	
640 FBM 4 x 4	spruce, common	188.72
340 FBM 4 x 4	cedar, rough, common	28.90
1,000 FBM 2 x 4	cedar, rough, common	85.00
1,864 FBM 2 x 6	cedar, rough, common	
22,464 FBM 2 x 12	cedar, rough, common	
4,811 FBM 4 x 4	cedar, rough, common	
1,664 FBM 4 x 12	cedar, rough, common	2,082.29
20 sheets sheathing	½ x 4 x 8	88.00
3 sheets sheathing	¾ x 4 x 8	19.08
3 sheets sheathing	¼ x 4 x 8	11.28
500 FBM forest siding	1½ x 10 cedar	66.30
176 FBM S4S	2 x 8 x 16	16.72
43 FBM hemlock	2 x 8 x 16	3.66
14 sheets sheathing	U/S ¾ x 4 x 8	92.54
50 sheets sheathing	U/S ½ x 4 x 8	218.00
1,050 FBM forest siding	1½ x 10 cedar	115.00
13 pcs. (843 FBM)	8 x 8 rough, cedar, common	83.04
		$4,978.76

All of this lumber reached Egg island except 47 sheets of sheathing.

3. The sheets of sheathing were retained at the Prince Rupert workshop for the prefabrication of a small supply and storage building which will be delivered to the light-station next year.

DECOMMISSIONING OF R.C.N. ESCORTS, HALIFAX

Question No. 2,349—**Mr. Coates:**

Have any of the ocean escorts of the Royal Canadian Navy based in Halifax been issued decommissioning pennants and, if so, how many and when will they be decommissioned?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Five ocean escorts of which two are being converted have been paid off since 1 January 1964. In the same period one new destroyer escort and one converted destroyer escort entered operational service and an additional new destroyer escort will be commissioned on 19 December 1964.

INCINERATOR TENDERS, ANIMAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE, HULL, QUE.

Question No. 2,350—**Mr. Loney:**

1. What are the names and addresses of the tenderers in connection with the tender for alterations to incinerator and treatment tank, animal diseases research institute, Hull, Quebec?

2. What was the price quoted by each tenderer?

3. Was the lowest tender accepted and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1 and 2. Russ Wilson Company Ltd., Ottawa, $15,495; Beaudoin Construction Ltd., Ottawa, $15,873; Deljac Construction Co. Ltd., Ottawa, $15,950; A Lanctot Construction Co., Ottawa, $23,735.

3. The tenders are being reviewed and a contract award has, therefore, not yet been made.

INVITATION TO FINANCE MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,357—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Minister of Finance receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): No.

INVITATION TO NORTHERN AFFAIRS MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,361—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources receive an invitation to visit

Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Yes, this invitation was received from the city of Prince Rupert.

The reply made by telegram on November 3, 1964 is as follows:

Mayor P. J. Lester
City Hall
Prince Rupert, B.C.

Regret I cannot be with you on November 5 to welcome one hundredth ship to visit Prince Rupert harbour this season. It is an important bench mark in the development of your city which has an assured and prosperous role in the life of British Columbia. Five years from November 5 I think you will see a season with two hundred ships. Regret none of my colleagues in federal cabinet were able to be present. Kind regards.

Arthur Laing, Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources.

INVITATION TO LABOUR MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,365—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Minister of Labour receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): No.

INVITATION TO FISHERIES MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,367—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Minister of Fisheries receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Yes, from the city of Prince Rupert. Reply expressed appreciation for invitation; regret of inability to attend because of previous engagements; and congratulations on the occasion.

INVITATION TO HEALTH MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,370—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Minister of National Health and Welfare receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): No.

INVITATION TO JUSTICE MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,372—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Minister of Justice receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): No.

INVITATION TO FORESTRY MINISTER TO VISIT PRINCE RUPERT

Question No. 2,376—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the Minister of Forestry receive an invitation to visit Prince Rupert to participate in the celebrations surrounding the 100th deep sea ship to call at that port this year and, if so, from whom was the invitation received and what reply was given thereto?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): No.

OPENING OF AIRPORT TERMINAL, LONDON, ONT.

Question No. 2,378—**Mr. Irvine:**

Has a date been established for the official opening of the new airport terminal in London, Ontario, and, if so (a) what is the date (b) who will officiate?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): No date has been established and no plans have been made as yet for the official opening of the new airport terminal in London, Ontario.

CONTRACT TO MOORE'S TAXI, WINNIPEG AIRPORT

Question No. 2,380—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. When was the contract between the Department of Transport and Moore's Taxi Ltd., giving that company exclusive rights to pick up passengers at the Winnipeg international airport signed?
2. Were tenders called before the contract was awarded and, if so, how many companies tendered and, if not, for what reasons were tenders not called?
3. What are the terms of the contract?
4. Has the Department of Transport received any complaints that the provisions of the contract are not being lived up to?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. October 1962.

2. The company had been operating the concession under authority of the Winnipeg-St. James airport commission. Since the company already had a licence from the provincial motor carrier board and on the strength of a strong recommendation from the air lines the department negotiated the present contract with the company.

3. The contract is for a period of five years effective January 1, 1962. Under the contract the company paid the department a fixed fee of $500 per month for the period January 1 to March 31, 1962; thereafter the company paid the department 10 per cent of gross revenue. Recently the department renegotiated the payment clause whereby the company will pay the department the following fixed annual amounts: 1964, $10,000; 1965, $11,000; 1966, $12,000.

4. No.

ENGAGEMENT CALENDARS PRODUCED BY QUEEN'S PRINTER

Question No. 2,384—**Mr. Pascoe:**

1. How many engagement calendars for 1965 have been produced by the queen's printer?
2. What is the price thereof?
3. Have order cards been sent out to industries across the country to encourage sales thereof?
4. How many orders have been received to date?
5. What is the justification for a government department competing with private industry in the production and sale of such calendars?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. 10,000.

2. $2.50.

3. Yes.

4. 6,000.

5. The production of these engagement calendars is one of the means taken by the national gallery of Canada to make its collection known to the Canadian public.

VANCOUVER ISLAND SECTION, TRANS-CANADA HIGHWAY

Question No. 2,385—**Mr. Barnett:**

1. What is the total mileage of the trans-Canada highway on Vancouver island?
2. What is the total cost to date?
3. Of this, what is the total paid or approved for payment by the federal government?
4. Is the Vancouver island section of the highway completed and, if not (a) what is the estimated additional cost of completion, and (b) the federal government's share?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. 69.31 miles.

2. Total shareable cost to date is $13,972,436.70.

3. Total payment made by Canada to date is $6,986,218.35.

[Mr. Cantin.]

4. The Vancouver island section of the trans-Canada highway is completed.

STUDY OF CRAB FISHERY, NOVA SCOTIA

Question No. 2,386—**Mr. Barnett:**

1. Has the Department of Fisheries investigated and come to any conclusion concerning the possibilities of establishing a commercial fishery for deep sea red crab along the continental shelf in the waters offshore from Nova Scotia southward?
2. If not, is such a study contemplated, either by the department itself or in conjunction with the U.S. bureau of commercial fisheries and, if such a study has revealed possibilities for a commercial fishery, what steps are being taken to assist the establishment of a deep trawling operation?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): 1. Deep sea red crab is unknown. The spider crab exists in gulf of St. Lawrence waters. The department is experimenting in use of various types of traps for taking of this species, particularly in the vicinity of Magdalen islands and Anticosti island, with the object of lengthening the season of operation and earnings of lobster fishermen. The common rock crab is indigenous to inshore waters from Labrador to South Carolina. No investigation as to its commercial potential is being carried on.

2. Answered by No. 1.

FEDERAL BUILDING, JOLIETTE, QUE.

Question No. 2,388—**Mr. Pigeon:**

Does the Department of Public Works intend to enlarge the federal building in Joliette (post office) or to erect a new building and if, so, when, and what will be the approximate cost of the work?

[*Translation*]

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): The matter is under study.

[*Text*]

EMPLOYMENT FOR PERSONNEL OF JOLIETTE REGIMENT

Question No. 2,389—**Mr. Pigeon:**

Does the government intend to provide employment for persons who worked as guards or in other capacities for the Joliette regiment prior to its disbandment?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): The disbandment of the Joliette regiment will affect 16 civilian watchmen and three caretakers part time. The watchmen are casual employees employed under section 88 of the civil service regulations and are not eligible for transfer into other positions in the civil service.

The caretakers part time will, in all likelihood, be kept on pending termination of

leases. It is not possible to offer them alternative employment at this time because of the location of these armouries. Their names will be placed on civil service commission lay-off lists and they will be given consideration by the commission for re-instatement should suitable vacancies occur.

[*Text*]

RIDING MOUNTAIN PARK—HAY AND GRAZING PERMITS

Question No. 2,390—**Mr. Mandziuk:**

1. How many special hay permits were granted for the Riding Mountain national park, in 1964?
2. How many regular permits were granted in 1963 and 1964?
3. What was the permit price per ton in 1962, 1963 and 1964?
4. How many cattle grazing permits were granted in the Riding Mountain national park in 1962, 1963 and 1964?
5. What were the grazing fees in 1962, 1963 and 1964?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. Thirty one.

2. Fifty one in 1963 and 38 in 1964.

3. Fifty cents in 1962 and 1963. Fifty cents from Jan. 1 to July 15, 1964. Five dollars since July 16, 1964.

4. Sixty one in 1962, 59 in 1963 and 60 in 1964.

5. The grazing fees charged in 1962, 1963 and 1964 were as follows:

For each head of cattle per month, 25 cents.

For each horse not owned by a person licensed to operate a livery in a park, per month or fraction thereof, 50 cents.

For each horse owned by a person licensed to operate a livery in the park, per month or fraction thereof, 50 cents.

MILITIA PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,391—**Mr. Doucett:**

1. What is the total number of personnel in the militia of Canada?
2. What is the total number of personnel in the militia in each province?
3. What is the total number of units of the militia in each province?
4. What is the total number of officers in the militia in each province?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): 1. 47,660.

2. British Columbia, 3,613; Alberta, 4,087; Saskatchewan, 2,420; Manitoba, 2,078; Ontario, 17,751; Quebec, 9,852; New Brunswick, 2,924; Nova Scotia, 3,541; Prince Edward Island, 550; Newfoundland, 798; Yukon Territory, 46.

3. Excluding militia group headquarters, medical and dental advisory staffs: British Columbia, 25; Alberta, 29; Saskatchewan, 19; Manitoba, 17; Ontario, 99; Quebec, 63; New Brunswick, 17; Nova Scotia, 22; Prince Edward Island, 3; Newfoundland, 3; Yukon Territory, 1.

4. British Columbia, 472; Alberta, 631; Saskatchewan, 209; Manitoba, 308; Ontario, 2,454; Quebec, 1,420; New Brunswick, 305; Nova Scotia, 433; Prince Edward Island, 68; Newfoundland, 84; Yukon Territory, 6.

INCREASED COST OF FRANKED MAIL

Question No. 2,392—**Mr. Webb:**

1. How many governmental departments have been assessed an increased amount for the carrying of franked mail?
2. What is the total amount of this increase?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): 1. Twenty.

2. $708,000.

R.R. NO. 2, COLEMAN, P.E.I.

Question No. 2,393—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. On what date were tenders called for the conveyance of mails on Coleman R.R. No. 2 (P.E.I.)?
2. What are the names of persons submitting tenders and the amount of each tender?
3. Who was awarded the contract?
4. When will his duties commence?
5. How much notice was given to the present contractor?
6. What is the usual notice period of such contracts?
7. What were the reasons for making temporary arrangements for delivery after contract expiry?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): 1. Twenty first August 1964.

2. Miss Verna Irene Wallace, Coleman, $825; Hugh Dodd MacPhee, Coleman, $894; Lorne A. Lockhart, Coleman, $960; Robert Bruce MacNaught, Coleman, $984.

3. Miss Verna Irene Wallace.

4. As soon as arrangements can be completed.

5. Notice was given on the 20 August 1964.

6. There is no specific requirement regarding the giving of notice where an expiring contract is not being renewed.

7. Due to inability to complete new contract arrangements in time.

BREAKWATER CONSTRUCTION, INGONISH BEACH, N.S.

Question No. 2,394—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

What consideration has been given by the government to the construction of a breakwater at Ingonish Beach, Victoria co., N.S.?

Questions

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): None.

DREDGING OF HARBOUR, INGONISH BEACH, N.S.

Question No. 2,395—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

What consideration has been given by the government to the required dredging of the harbour at Ingonish Beach, Victoria co., N.S.?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Consideration will be given when the report of a survey, presently under way, has been received.

DREDGING OF CLYBURN RIVER, N.S.

Question No. 2,396—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

Is it the intention of the government to carry out a dredging program at the Clyburn river, Victoria co., N.S., for the benefit of the fishermen concerned.

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Consideration will be given when the report of a survey, presently under way, has been received.

SKIDWAY CONSTRUCTION, CLYBURN RIVER, N.S.

Question No. 2,397—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

Is it the intention of the government to construct a skidway at the Clyburn river, Victoria co., N.S., for the benefit of the fishermen concerned?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): No.

ROYAL COMMISSIONS APPOINTED UNDER MR. ST. LAURENT

Question No. 2,398—**Mr. Nugent:**

1. How many royal commissions were appointed during the term of office of Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent?

2. What were the names or subject matters of each of the said commissions?

Mr. Jack Davis (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): 1 and 2. There were 21 royal commissions, as follows: Cases where revocation of citizenship is under consideration. Transportation. National development in the arts, letters and sciences. Floods in Red river valley, Manitoba. Fire damage to towns of Rimouski and Cabano, P.Q. Rents payable on leased lands in townsites and subdivisions in Banff and Jasper national parks and minimum value of buildings which may be erected therein. Claims arising out of world war II (Mr. Chief Justice Ilsley). South Saskatchewan river project. Staking of areas and application for permits re exploring petroleum products by Sun Oil Co. and California Standard Co. Claims arising out of world war II (Mr. Chief Justice Campbell). Criminal law relating to defence of insanity. Criminal sexual psychopaths. Quartz mining and placer mining in Yukon Territory. Agreed charges under part IV of the Transport Act. Patents, copyright, trade marks. Humber river valley flood. Coasting trade in Canada. Long term prospects of the Canadian economy. Broadcasting in Canada. Dispute between Canadian Pacific Railway and brotherhood of locomotive firemen and enginemen. Financial position of Newfoundland.

[Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria).]

WAGE INCREASES, BEDFORD MAGAZINE, HALIFAX

Question No. 2,399—**Mr. Coates:**

When can workers at the Bedford magazine, Halifax county, expect increases in wages that are presently under review since workers at H.M.C. Dockyard have received consideration in this regard?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): The matter is under consideration and when any decision is reached, the workers at the Bedford magazine will be advised in the usual manner.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT PURCHASE OF CHINAWARE

Question No. 2,400—**Mr. Pigeon:**

1. Since May 1, 1963, did the Department of Public Works purchase any chinaware and, if so (a) was it of Canadian or foreign origin (b) what was the total amount of purchases in each case?

2. If the department did purchase chinaware of foreign origin, for what reasons was Canadian made chinaware not purchased?

[*Translation*]

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes. (a) Partly of Canadian origin, partly of foreign origin. (b) Canadian, $56,634.46; foreign, $29,623.04.

2. Because purchases were for replacements of broken items originally purchased in a foreign country and not obtainable elsewhere or because the china required by the user department is not available in Canada.

[*Text*]

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION PURCHASE OF CHINAWARE

Question No. 2,402—**Mr. Pigeon:**

1. Since May 1, 1963, did the Department of Citizenship and Immigration purchase any chinaware and, if so (a) was it of Canadian or foreign origin (b) what was the total amount of purchases in each case?

2. If the department did purchase chinaware of foreign origin, for what reasons was Canadian made chinaware not purchased?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. Yes. (a) Both. (b) Canadian, $98; foreign, $596.48.*

2. Tenders are obtained from hotel and restaurant suppliers and the lowest bid is accepted.

*U.K. manufacture.

OTTAWA—FRANCHISES FOR SERVICE TO APARTMENT BUILDINGS

Question No. 2,410—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Have representations been made to the director of investigation and research under the Combines Investigation Act, requesting investigation of franchises by milk, bread and cleaning firms in Ottawa apartment buildings and, if so, how many such representations have been received?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Yes. There has been one question in the House of Commons inquiring whether an investigation had been undertaken and a number of informal inquiries from representatives of news media. Of the latter, one could be considered as a representation.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY PSYCHOLOGIST POSITION

Question No. 2,412—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Regarding the position of psychologist, vacant at the Kingston penitentiaries since April 15, 1959 (a) what salary was offered for this position in 1959 (b) what salary is now being offered, and (c) has the government considered increasing the salary offered?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): (a) $4,830-$5,370; (b) $7,540-$8,440; (c) no, not at the present, since the last salary increase was granted on July 29, 1964.

EDMONTON, ALTA.—SHORTAGE OF STEEL FOR FEDERAL BUILDING

Question No. 2,413—**Mr. Lambert:**

1. Has a delay occurred, or is one anticipated, in the construction of the postal terminal building in Edmonton, Alberta as a result of a shortage of structural steel and, if so, to what extent will construction be delayed?

2. When was it first indicated that the structural steel of the type required was in short supply and could not be obtained in Canada in accordance with the construction schedule for this building?

3. What efforts are being made, if any, to obtain structural steel from other sources than in Canada?

4. Are there any penalties provided in this particular construction contract for delays resulting from the shortage of structural steel or other major building material?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. No.

2. At the commencement of the contract the steel supplier indicated that there was a possibility of a delay because of short supply of some sections. However, this delay did not materialize.

3. None.

4. There is a provision in all contracts for penalties for delays, but not specifically relating to the shortage of structural steel or other major building materials.

BAY ST. LAWRENCE, N.S.—RESCUE EQUIPMENT ON WHARF

Question No. 2,415—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

Is it the intention of the Department of Public Works to renew the life ring and throw ropes on the wharf at Bay St. Lawrence, Victoria county, N.S. and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): This matter is now under investigation.

BAY ST. LAWRENCE, N.S.—SHEATHING ON BREAKWATER

Question No. 2,416—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

Is it the intention of the Department of Public Works to place corner sheathing on the west breakwater at Bay St. Lawrence, Victoria county, N.S. and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): This matter is now under investigation.

BAY ST. LAWRENCE, N.S.—WHARF CONSTRUCTION

Question No. 2,417—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

Is it the intention of the Department of Public Works to construct two wharves in what is known as the inner pond at Bay St. Lawrence, Victoria county, N.S., for the convenience of the fishermen in that area and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): This matter is now under investigation.

BAY ST. LAWRENCE, N.S.—BREAKWATER TIMBERS AND LADDERS

Question No. 2,418—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

Is it the intention of the Department of Public Works to renew cap timbers and ladders on the west breakwater at Bay St. Lawrence, Victoria county, N.S. and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Work will be undertaken next year.

Questions

BAY ST. LAWRENCE, N.S.—RETAINING WALL

Question No. 2,419—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

Is it the intention of the Department of Public Works to construct a retaining wall along the east side of the channel at Bay St. Lawrence, N.S. and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): This matter is now under investigation.

BAY ST. LAWRENCE, N.S.—CHANNEL DREDGING

Question No. 2,420—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

Is it the intention of the Department of Public Works to dredge the channel at bay St. Lawrence to a depth of six feet of water at low tide and continue up to points where the craft of the fishermen who use this locale are moored, and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): This matter is now under investigation.

REMOVAL OF MEANS TEST FOR VETERANS ALLOWANCE

Question No. 2,422—**Mr. Mather:**

Is consideration being given to removing the means test from persons qualifying for war veterans allowance at the age of 65?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): No.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS BY MAX AND ADOLPH SEFKIND

Question No. 2,423—**Mr. MacInnis:**

Arising out of the investigation into bankruptcy frauds now in progress in Montreal, has the government secured any information showing that the records and documents connected with bankruptcy proceedings by Max and Adolph Sefkind and/or their companies disclose contributions for campaign purposes to any cabinet ministers or other members of parliament, and, if so, to whom and in what amounts?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): The government does not have, on its own files, nor has it secured, arising out of investigation into bankruptcy frauds now in progress in Montreal, any information showing that the records and documents connected with bankruptcy proceedings by Max and Adolph Sefkind and/or their companies disclose contributions for campaign purposes to any cabinet ministers or other members of parliament.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DRUG MANUFACTURING COMPANIES

Question No. 2,425—**Mr. Mather:**

Do regulations administered by the food and drug directorate of the Department of National Health and Welfare, the Department of Industry or any other federal agency control the establishment of new drug manufacturing companies and the sale of their products and, if not, is consideration being given to the inauguration of a licensing system making the registration of such firms mandatory?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): In so far as the Department of Industry is concerned there are no regulations that control the establishment of new drug manufacturing companies or the sale of their products and the department is not aware of such regulations administered by other federal agencies. No consideration is being given by the Department of Industry at the present time to the inauguration of a licensing system.

There are no regulations administered by the food and drug directorate of the Department of National Health and Welfare which control the establishment of new drug manufacturing companies. However, drug manufacturing facilities and control, as well as the drug products, are subject to the requirements of the Food and Drugs Act and regulations. Certain injectables, such as liver extract injectable and insulin, listed in schedule C to the Food and Drugs Act, and other products such as living vaccines for oral or parenteral use and antibiotics for parenteral use, listed in schedule D to the Food and Drugs Act, may only be manufactured by the manufacturer to whom a licence has been issued.

Consideration is being given to a system under which it would be mandatory for all pharmaceutical manufacturers to supply the food and drug directorate with a list of all the drug products which they manufacture.

RIVERS, MAN., TAXI STRIP—QUALITY OF CONCRETE

Question No. 2,426—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

In connection with the contract to construct a taxi strip at C.J.A.T.C., Rivers, Manitoba, awarded to Tallman Construction Co. Ltd., of Winnipeg, Manitoba, was construction halted temporarily because of the inferior quality of the concrete mix?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): In so far as the Department of Defence Production is concerned, Defence Construction (1951) Limited reports that there have been no delays for any reason whatever in connection with the construction work being carried out by Tallman Construction Co. Ltd., on this project.

VITAMIN D FOOD SUPPLEMENTS

Question No. 2,427—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. Does the government exert any control over

the amounts of vitamin D added as supplements to foodstuffs and, if so, what limits are imposed?

2. Is the government conducting or supporting research into the cumulative effects on humans of excessive ingestion of vitamin D and, if so, what have been the findings to date?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. Yes. Present regulations of the Department of National Health and Welfare require that if vitamin D is added to foods, the amount thereof must be not less than 400 international units nor more than 800 international units in a reasonable daily intake. Recent amendments to the regulations have reduced the number of foods to which vitamin D may be added.

2. No.

EFFECT OF VITAMIN D ON PREGNANT WOMEN

Question No. 2,428—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. Is the government conducting or supporting research into the relationship between mental retardation and excessive intake of vitamin D by pregnant women and, if so, at which institutions, and under whose direction is such research being conducted?

2. What have been the findings of such research?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. No.

2. See answer 1 above.

MANIWAKI INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,433—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Maniwaki Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

QUEBEC REGIONAL H.Q. INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,434—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Quebec regional H.Q. Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No.

POINTE-BLEUE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,435—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Pointe-Bleue Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

SEVEN ISLANDS INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,436—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Seven Islands Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

SOUTHERN ONTARIO REGIONAL H.Q. INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,437—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the southern Ontario regional H.Q. Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No.

Questions

BERSIMIS INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,438—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Bersimis Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

ABITIBI INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,439—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Abitibi Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said hand or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

P.E.I. INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,440—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the P.E.I. Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No.

ST. JOHN RIVER INDIAN AGENCY— DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,441—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the St. John river Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

FISHER RIVER INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,442—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Fisher river indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

DAUPHIN INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,443—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Dauphin Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

CLANDEBOYE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,444—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Clandeboye Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded

directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No.

MANITOBA REGIONAL H.Q. INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,445—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Manitoba regional H.Q. Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

SIOUX LOOKOUT INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,446—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Sioux Lookout Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings were held but opinions were not recorded.

SAULT STE. MARIE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,447—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Sault Ste. Marie Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

PORT ARTHUR INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,448—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Port Arthur Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

NIPISSING INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,449—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Nipissing Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings were held but opinions not advanced.

NAKINA INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,450—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Nakina Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

MANITOULIN ISLAND INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,451—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Manitoulin island Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian

affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

KENORA INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,452—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Kenora Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

JAMES BAY INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,453—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the James Bay Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

FORT FRANCES INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,454—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Fort Frances Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded

[Mr. Howard.]

directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings were held but opinions not advanced.

CHAPLEAU INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,455—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Chapleau Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings were held but opinions were not recorded.

NORTHERN ONTARIO REGIONAL H.Q. INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,456—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the northern Ontario regional H.Q. Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

WALPOLE ISLAND INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,457—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Walpole island Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

TYENDINAGA INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,458—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Tyendinaga Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

ST. REGIS INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,459—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the St. Regis Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

SIX NATIONS INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,460—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Six Nations Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

BRUCE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,461—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Bruce Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

SARNIA INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,462—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Sarnia Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No.

PETERBOROUGH INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,463—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Peterborough Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings were held but opinions were not recorded.

SIMCOE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,464—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Simcoe Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs

branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

YUKON INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,465—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Yukon Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No.

WILLIAMS LAKE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,466—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Williams lake Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No special meetings were held but discussions were held with individual Indians but not formally recorded.

WEST COAST INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,467—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the west coast Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said

[Mr. Howard.]

superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings were held but opinions not advanced.

VANCOUVER INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,468—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Vancouver Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

TERRACE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,469—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Terrace Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings were held but opinions not advanced.

STUART LAKE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,470—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Stuart lake Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch,

or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No.

SKEENA RIVER INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,471—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Skeena River Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings were held but no opinions were recorded.

QUEEN CHARLOTTE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,472—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Queen Charlotte Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings were held but opinions not advanced.

OKANAGAN INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,473—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Okanagan Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

NICOLA INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,474—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Nicola Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands of Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

NEW WESTMINSTER INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,475—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the New Westminster Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

LYTTON INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,476—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Lytton Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

Questions

KWAWKEWLTH INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,477—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Kwawkewlth Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings were held but opinions were not recorded.

KOOTENAY INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,478—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Kootenay Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings were held but no opinions were advanced.

KAMLOOPS INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,479—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Kamloops Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings held but opinions not recorded.

[Mr. Badanai.]

FORT ST. JOHN INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,480—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Fort St. John Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings were held but opinions were not recorded.

COWICHAN INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,481—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Cowichan Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No.

BURNS LAKE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,482—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Burns Lake Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

BELLA COOLA INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,483—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Bella Coola Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings held but no opinions were recorded.

BABINE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,484—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Babine Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

YELLOWKNIFE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,485—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Yellowknife Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

FORT SMITH INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,486—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Fort Smith Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

FORT SIMPSON INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,487—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Fort Simpson Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

AKLAVIK INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,488—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Aklavik Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

DISTRICT OF MACKENZIE H.Q. INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,489—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the district of Mackenzie H.Q. Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament,

and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings held but no opinions were recorded.

STONY-SARCEE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,490—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Stony-Sarcee Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

SADDLE LAKE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,491—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Saddle Lake Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings were held but opinions not advanced.

PEIGAN INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,492—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Peigan Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

[Mr. Howard.]

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

LESSER SLAVE LAKE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,493—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Lesser Slave Lake Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were the opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

HOBBEMA INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,494—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Hobbema Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

FORT VERMILION INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,495—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Fort Vermilion Indian agency of any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings held but opinions not recorded.

EDMONTON INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,496—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Edmonton Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

BLOOD INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,497—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Blood Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings were held but no opinions were advanced.

BLACKFOOT INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,498—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Blackfoot Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

ATHABASKA INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,499—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Athabaska Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No.

ALBERTA REGIONAL H.Q. INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,500—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Alberta regional H.Q. Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings were held but no opinions were recorded.

TOUCHWOOD INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,501—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Touchwood Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were the opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No.

MEADOW LAKE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,502—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Meadow Lake Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian

affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

SHELLBROOK INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,503—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Shellbrook Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No.

PELLY INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,504—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Pelly Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No.

FILE HILLS-QU'APPELLE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,505—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the File Hills-Qu'-Appelle Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

[Mr. Howard.]

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

DUCK LAKE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,506—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Duck Lake Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

CROOKED LAKE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,507—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Crooked Lake Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

CARLTON INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,508—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Carlton Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

BATTLEFORD INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,509—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Battleford Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

SASKATCHEWAN REGIONAL H.Q. INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,510—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Saskatchewan regional H.Q. Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

THE PAS INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,511—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of The Pas Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,512—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Portage la Prairie Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No.

NELSON RIVER INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,514—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Nelson River Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meeting was held but opinions not advanced.

ISLAND LAKE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,515—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Island Lake Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings were held but opinions not advanced.

Questions

PARRY SOUND INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,516—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Parry Sound Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands, or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

GOLDEN LAKE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,517—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Golden Lake Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

CHRISTIAN ISLAND INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,518—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Christian Island Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No.

RESTIGOUCHE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,519—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Restigouche Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

OKA INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,520—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Oka Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

TIMISKAMING INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,521—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Timiskaming Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands, or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Meetings were held but opinions not advanced.

CARADOC INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,522—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Caradoc Indian Agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said

superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

ODANAK-LORETTE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,523—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Odanak-Lorette Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parilament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

CAUGHNAWAGA INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,524—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Caughnawaga Indian agency or any other officer, of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No.

SHUBENACADIE INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,525—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Shubenacadie Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No.

ESKASONI INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,526—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Eskasoni Indian agency or any other officer, of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

THE MIRAMICHI INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,527—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the Miramichi Indian agency or any other officer, of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Yes.

MARITIME REGIONAL H.Q. INDIAN AGENCY—DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,528—**Mr. Howard:**

Did the superintendent of the maritimes regional H.Q. Indian agency or any other officer of the Indian affairs branch hold any meetings with, attend any meetings of, or in any way discuss with any of the Indian bands or Indian people in the said agency the provisions of Bill C-130 introduced during the 1963 session of parliament, and if so, did the said superintendent or other officer record the opinions of the said band or bands or Indian people and were these opinions transmitted or forwarded directly or indirectly to the Indian affairs branch, or any other department or branch of government in Ottawa?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No.

Questions

STATUS OF F.L.Q. MEMBERS SENTENCED TO JAIL

Question No. 2,531—**Mr. MacRae:**

What is the present status of the five members of the front de libération Quebecois who were sentenced to prison after the so called letter box bombings in Westmount in 1963?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): One member of the front de libération Quebecois was paroled on November 18, 1964, under the provisions of the Parole Act and five others are inmates in federal penitentiaries in the province of Quebec.

PROSECUTION OF TAXI DRIVER, WINNIPEG

Question No. 2,535—**Mr. Cowan:**

What progress is being made by the government in its prosecution of Gabriel Robert Johnson, the taxicab driver who has been accused of picking up a fare at Stevenson field, Winnipeg, despite a monopoly contract given to Moore's taxi service in that city?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): On December 7 the Manitoba court of appeal upheld a ruling of the trial magistrate rejecting a preliminary objection by the defence, and the matter has been referred back to the magistrate's court for plea and hearing.

CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING ONOFRIO MINAUDO

Question No. 2,536—**Mr. Scott:**

1. What correspondence was received from (a) His Honour Judge Bruce J. S. McDonald, chairman of the Ontario police commission, or (b) attorney general of Ontario by the Department of Citizenship and Immigration in regard to one, Onofrio Minaudo?

2. What were the dates of such letters?

3. What reply, if any, was made to these letters, and when?

4. Did the letters disclose to the Department of Citizenship and Immigration the criminal record of the said Minaudo?

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. Two letters dated November 18, 1963, and December 12, 1963, from His Honour Judge Bruce J. S. McDonald addressed to Hon. Guy Favreau, minister of citizenship and immigration, and one letter from Mr. F. M. Cass, attorney general of Ontario, dated January 13, 1964, addressed to Hon. Guy Favreau, minister of citizenship and immigration.

2. See answer to number 1.

3. Reply by Hon. R. Tremblay, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, on March 12, 1964, to Mr. Percy Milligan, Q.C., who had succeeded His Honour Judge Bruce J. S. McDonald indicating that Minaudo had been deported to Italy on March 11, 1964. A similar letter was also sent to Mr. Cass by Mr. Tremblay on the same date.

4. The letters from His Honour Judge Bruce J. S. McDonald and Mr. Cass did not disclose the criminal record of Minaudo. (However, they did indicate that some police authorities considered Minaudo a friend and associate of persons believed to be engaged in crime in Michigan, U.S.A. The letter from Mr. Cass indicated that Judge McDonald was anxious to ascertain the status of Minaudo, whether a visitor or immigrant to this country.)

GUISEPPE CATALANOTTE—RESIDENCE IN CANADA

Question No. 2,537—**Mr. Scott:**

1. When did Guiseppe Catalanotte, one-time resident of 288 Hall avenue, Windsor, Ontario, enter Canada?

2. Did he have an immigrant or non-immigrant visa?

3. Was he granted a visa in December 1961 and, if so, for what period?

4. Was any order made for his deportation and, if so, what was the date of the said order?

5. What action was taken to execute the said order and was any warrant issued for his apprehension?

6. When was the last record of his having resided in Canada?

7. When was the Department of Citizenship and Immigration informed of his convictions in the United States of threats of extortion, gambling, and narcotics offences?

8. When was the government informed that the said Catalanotte had been ordered to be deported by the United States?

9. Was the government aware of his association in Cuba with one Onofrio Minaudo?

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. The immigration file discloses that Guiseppe Catalanotte entered Canada at Malton airport on May 15, 1958, at Dorval airport on May 27, 1958, and at Malton airport on October 21, 1961.

2. On each of these three occasions he was in possession of a non-immigrant visa.

3. No. The non-immigrant visa which he obtained to gain entry in 1961 was issued on October 18, 1961. A Canadian non-immigrant visa is made valid for presentation at a Canadian port of entry for a prescribed period. The visa itself is not valid for any period of temporary stay in Canada. The period of stay to be authorized can only be determined by the examining immigration officer at the Canadian port of entry.

4. Yes. September 24, 1964.

5. Deportation was effected to Italy under escort on November 5, 1964. Warrants for his apprehension and arrest had been issued on 14 July, 1958, 13 January, 1961, and 20 March, 1964.

6. November 5, 1964.

7. On June 26, 1958, the Department of Citizenship and Immigration was informed of this man's criminal record which included convictions in the United States for threats of extortion and illegal possession of narcotics.

8. June 26, 1958.

9. Yes.

DEPORTATION OF ONOFRIO MINAUDO

Question No. 2,538—**Mr. Brewin:**

1. Was one Onofrio Minaudo, deported from Canada on or about the 11th of March, 1964?

2. When was the order of deportation made?

3. What were the reasons for the order?

4. When did the same Onofrio Minaudo enter Canada and when he entered Canada did he have an immigrant or a non-immigrant visa?

5. Is the said Onofrio Minaudo the same person who lived at 301 Belleperche street in Riverside, Ontario, and was the said Minaudo deported from the United States?

6. Was the said Minaudo convicted in absentia in Italy on charges of murder, armed robbery and double murder and sentenced to 30 years to life imprisonment?

7. Was the said Minaudo convicted when working for one Santo Peronne on conspiracy to violate the state labour law and fined $1,000 with two years' probation?

8. Was the Department of Citizenship and Immigration made aware of his association with the Detroit Mafia?

9. Who, if anyone, made representations on behalf of the said Onofrio Minaudo in connection with his deportation or status in Canada?

10. When was the fact that the said Onofrio Minaudo was resident in Canada first called to the attention of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration?

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. Yes, on March 11, 1964.

2. February 9, 1961.

3. Section 19(1)(e)(ix) of the Immigration Act in that he returned to or remained in Canada contrary to the provisions of the Immigration Act after a deportation order had been made against him.

4. The immigration file discloses that Minaudo entered Canada at Malton airport on May 22, 1955, June 24, 1956 and on June 25, 1960. On each occasion, he was in possession of a non-immigrant visa.

5. Yes.

6. Yes, however, no request for extradition was ever received and the sentences were later declared prescribed.

7. Yes.

8. The department was aware of allegations to this effect.

9. Mr. Ross Riddell, Q.C., of Windsor, Ontario, as solicitor for Minaudo from time to time between 1957-1961; the late D. F. Brown, M.P. for Essex West, in 1957; Mr. R. D. Thrasher, M.P. for Essex South, in 1958; Mr. Paul Martin, M.P. for Essex East, in 1960-61; subsequently, in September 1963, after being advised of information not previously known to him about Minaudo, he informed the minister that he wished to be dissociated from representations concerning the case; Mr. Bryce Monaghan, chief of police, Riverside, Ontario, in February 1961, also later withdrawn.

10. The fact that Minaudo was resident in Canada was first called to the attention of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration in 1956.

OLD AGE PENSIONERS PREVIOUSLY RECEIVING OLD AGE ASSISTANCE

Question No. 2,540—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Of those who became eligible for the old age pension in the year ended March 31, 1964, what percentage had previously been receiving old age assistance?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 25.03 per cent.

CENSUS ENUMERATION, 1964

Question No. 2,541—**Mr. McBain:**

1. Did the government in November, 1964, conduct a census enumeration through the dominion bureau of statistics or is it now conducting one in December and, if so, what is the nature of the enumeration?

2. Where are these census tests being conducted?

3. How many persons are employed in these tests?

4. Were these persons selected through the national employment service and, if not, how were they selected?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. The dominion bureau of statistics is now conducting a test in preparation of the 1966 census of population. The enumeration portion commenced on November 25 and involves testing some new operational procedures and the questionnaire.

2. A section of the central part of the city of Ottawa.

3. Thirty eight.

4. No. Two were selected by the dominion bureau of statistics to act as census commissioners and the balance were selected on the basis of a test prepared by the dominion bureau of statistics and administered by the

census commissioners. This procedure is similar to that used in previous censuses and is in accordance with section 5 (1) of the Statistics Act.

RENTAL OF KALADAR BUILDING, OTTAWA

Question No. 2,542—**Mr. Douglas:**

1. Has the federal government rented the Kaladar building on Kaladar street, Ottawa, and if so, from whom did it rent the building?
2. For what purpose is this building being used?
3. What annual rental is being paid by the federal government for this building?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes, from Kaladar Realties Limited, Ottawa, effective April 1, 1961.

2. Accommodation for the Canadian government exhibition commission of the Department of Trade and Commerce.

3. $88,500 per annum for an area of 76,000 square feet.

OPERATION OF SHIP "JOHN GUY"

Question No. 2,545—**Mr. Douglas:**

1. What company or person owns the boat *John Guy* operating mainly between St. John's and Bell island in Newfoundland?
2. Does the government of Canada pay any subsidy for the operation of the *John Guy* and, if so (a) to whom is the subsidy paid (b) what amount has been paid each year since 1958?
3. Has the *John Guy* been overhauled or repaired at the C.N.R. docks in St. John's since 1958 and, if so (a) what was the cost of each overhaul or repair job for the *John Guy* (b) what were the dates of such overhauls or repairs (c) what were the dates of payment and by whom were payments made?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Canadian maritime commission advises as follows:

1. The government of Canada owns the *John Guy* operating between Portugal Cove and Bell island, Nfld., only.

2. Yes. (a) Newfoundland Transportation Company Limited, P.O. Box 5626, St. John's, Newfoundland. (b) Subsidy was paid for the operation of two vessels, the M/Vs *John Guy* and *Kipawo*, as follows: 1958-59, nil; 1959-60, nil; 1960-61, nil; 1961-62, $274,385; 1962-63, $150,200; 1963-64, $223,285. Of this amount, $114,097.80 charter hire was paid to the Department of Transport.

3. Yes.

(a) (1) $671; (2) $1,221.85; (3) $8,268.80; (4) $31,564.50; (5) $14,097.32; (6) $23,268.99.

(b) (1) September 1960; (2) November 1960; (3) February 1961; (4) May 1962; (5) May 1963; (6) May 1964.

[Mr. Sharp]

(c) (1) January 18, 1961, by Dynamic Engineering Co. Ltd., Montreal, Que.

(2) March 30, 1962, by Ferguson Industries Ltd., Pictou, N.S.

(3) March 30, 1962, by Newfoundland Transportation Co. Ltd., St. John's, Nfld.

(4) By Newfoundland Transportation Co. Ltd.:

August 22, 1962	$6,564.50
Sept. 17, 1962	5,000.00
Nov. 13, 1962	2,000.00
Jan. 2, 1963	5,000.00
Feb. 26, 1963	5,000.00
March 30, 1963	3,000.00
April 24, 1963	1,375.67
May 21, 1963	3,624.33
Total	$31,564.50

(5) Nov. 30, 1963	$4,803.30
Dec. 27, 1963	4,276.02
Jan. 4, 1964	5,000.00
	$14,079.32

(6) not paid as of December 8, 1964.

N.C.C. PROPERTY PURCHASE, OTTAWA

Question No. 2,546—**Mr. Douglas:**

What was the price paid by the national capital commission for property on Boteler street, Ottawa that had belonged to Zelikovitz Bros.?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): The national capital commission paid Zelikovitz Bros. Limited $215,000. This amount represented compensation for acquisition by the national capital commission of the lease which the company had with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for property on Boteler street, Ottawa, plus business disturbance, the value of immovable equipment and for the value of the buildings on the property.

N.C.C. PROPERTY SALE, OTTAWA

Question No. 2,547—**Mr. Douglas:**

What was the selling price per acre for land on the Innes road, Ottawa, sold by the national capital commission to Zelikovitz Bros.?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): The national capital commission did not sell any land on the Innes road, Ottawa, to Zelikovitz Bros. Limited.

ATLANTIC PROVINCES—STORM DAMAGE TO WHARVES

Question No. 2,551—**Mr. Coates:**

What action is the Minister of Public Works taking to determine the degree of damage to wharfage

facilities in the Atlantic provinces as a result of recent storms, and what action is planned to effect immediate repairs to these facilities?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Officials of the department are now carrying out investigations to determine the damage, if any, caused to wharfage facilities in the Atlantic provinces by recent storms. Emergency repairs which may be required will be undertaken without delay.

HEATING SYSTEM, SPRINGHILL PENAL INSTITUTION

Question No. 2,554—**Mr. Coates:**

What type of heating system will be installed in the young offenders penal institution at Springhill and what type of fuel will be used to fire the heating system in question?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): A high temperature hot water system fired by coal will be installed.

EXPENDITURES ON CULTURAL CENTRES, CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Question No. 2,555—**Mr. Choquette:**

Does the government intend to spend any sums additional to those in the budget already established in connection with the construction of cultural centres for the celebration of Canada's centennial?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): No.

[*Text*]

CIVIL SERVICE COMPETITION 64-T2019

Question No. 2,558—**Mr. Loney:**

What are the names an addresses of the successful candidates of civil service of Canada competition No. 64-T2019?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I have been given the following information by the civil service commission. The names of the successful candidates are shown in order of merit, as they appear on the eligible list, as a result of competition 64-T2019, inspectors 1, record of performance, various centres in Ontario.

Ellis, Frederick Leonard, 97 Glen avenue, Ottawa 1, Ontario.

Scott, Mervin Kenneth, c/o Jarvis Hereford Farm, R. R. #3, Jarvis, Ontario.

Kelly, William Basil, Present Address: Huntingdon, Quebec. Address as of closing date of competition: R. R. #3, King, Ontario.

Farrell, Lloyd Gordon Dale, R. R. #2, Ripley, Ontario.

Beverley, Robert John, 131 Kingswood Road, Toronto 13, Ontario.

Pregent, Roger, Lefaivre, Ontario.

Cavanagh, James Keith, R. R. #1, Almonte, Ontario.

Down, Richard Walter, R. R. #2, Woodville, Ontario.

Hobbs, Robert John, 81 Ossington avenue, Ottawa, Ontario.

Heyink, Henry John, Eden Mills, Ontario.

Hall, Murray Campbell, Carlsbad Springs, Ontario.

Jentz, Kenneth Alvin, Box 56, Lynden, Ontario.

Rutley, Dwayne Brown, R. R. #1, Newington, Ontario.

Jolliffe, Robert Edward, R. R. #1, Glanworth, Ontario.

Crozier, Burleigh, Box 256, 79 Walnut street, Paris, Ontario. (Mr. Crozier's appointment subject to satisfactory medical examination prior to employment.)

McIlraith, George Alexander, Sprague Haven Farm, R. R. #4, Galt, Ontario.

Smith, Allan James, R. R. #3, Mt. Albert, Ontario.

Ball, Harold Francis Eric, R. R. #1, Con. 2, Lot 33, Dundas, Ontario.

Southam, Kenneth Richard, R. R. #2, Nanticoke, Ontario.

Note: The first ranking candidate, Mr. Frederick Leonard Ellis, is entitled to the statutory preference for veterans.

ESTABLISHMENT OF REHABILITATION WORKSHOP, SASKATOON

Question No. 2,559—**Mrs. Jones:**

Anticipating a national program of assistance based on the recommendations of the Hall commission to provide partial rehabilitation and occupational help to those with permanent mental and physical handicaps, would the government try to determine the most effective means of ultimately providing this assistance by immediately allocating a special grant to establish in Saskatoon a sheltered workshop as a pilot project?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The Minister of National Health and Welfare would be glad sympathetically to consider the question of federal assistance for this project when the details are available. Certain aspects of developments of this nature may come within the terms of reference of the national health grants or other federal programs. It would be necessary to have a detailed project to determine the most appropriate manner of providing federal assistance, if the project qualifies for support.

Questions

TENDERS FOR WATCH HOUSES

Question No. 2,560—**Mr. Loney:**

1. What are the names and addresses of the tenderers, tender for watchhouses 2D12-15?
2. What was the price quoted by each tenderer?
3. What the lowest tender accepted and, if not, for what reason?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. and 2.

Names and addresses of tenderers	Price quoted by each tenderer
John M. Donald, Campbellford, Ont.	$ 9,900
L. Van Dyk Construction Ltd., Parkhill road w., Peterborough, Ont.	13,589
William Arch & Sons, Streetsville, Ont.	14,157
Leslie George Construction Services, 881 Kawartha drive, Peterborough, Ont.	14,790
Atco Industries, 1243—48th ave., N.E., Calgary, Alberta.	14,958
F. R. Armstrong & Son, P.O. Box 162, Stirling, Ont.	16,975
Carl Jorgenson, 72 Kawartha Heights blvd., Peterborough, Ont.	17,380
Bar-Way Marine Ltd., 1222 York Mills road, Don Mills, Ont.	22,500
Ruliff Grass Construction Ltd., Thornhill, Ont.	23,700
D. W. Clarke, 748 Armour road, Peterborough, Ont.	24,800

3. The matter is still under review by the department.

BILINGUAL ANNOUNCEMENTS, RADIO STATION C.B.A., SACKVILLE, N.B.

Question No. 2,562—**Mr. Coates:**

What is the explanation for C.B.A. radio Sackville, N.B. announcing station identification and news broadcasts in both French and English?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that the announcements in both languages occur after midnight during the all night service when C.B.A. carries the program and news service common to all stations across Canada, connected to the emergency broadcasting network.

TRANSLATION OF OLD AGE PENSION APPLICATIONS, TORONTO

Question No. 2,563—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

When applications for the old age pension are submitted to the Toronto office of the Department of National Health and Welfare, accompanied by supporting documents in French, are these documents sent to Ottawa for translation and, if so, for what reason?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The policy of the old age security division of the Department of National Health and Welfare is to have French language documents translated locally in regional offices. Only under unusual circumstances would such documents be sent to Ottawa for translation.

TELEPHONE LISTING OF RAYMOND DENIS

Question No. 2,566—**Mr. Coates:**

As the Minister of Justice stated that Raymond Denis left the employment of the ministry of citizenship and immigration "on or about October 1", what is the explanation for Raymond Denis being listed on the private telephone listing of staff of cabinet ministers as executive assistant to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration on October 7th, 1964?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): The listing of the names and telephone numbers of the staffs of cabinet ministers is prepared periodically in the Prime Minister's office for the convenience of ministers and departments. A routine revision was prepared during the last week of September 1964. At that time Mr. Denis was still nominally on the strength of the minister's office although he had not served in it after he had been given leave on August 31.

REQUEST FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF HALL COMMISSION REPORT

Question No. 2,576—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Has the government received representations from the Port Coquitlam New Democratic party club, supported by 546 signatures, requesting immediate implementation of the recommendations of the Hall commission report, and, if so, what has been the reply?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Yes. The reply of the Minister of National Health and Welfare indicated that 14 committees in the department are engaged in a detailed study and analysis of the Hall commission report; referred to the constitutional responsibilities which the separate provinces have in the health field which necessitate very close collaboration between the federal government and the provincial governments in the formulation of a national health plan; and reiterated the government's announced aim to be in a position to present its proposals to the provinces early in the new year.

SUBSIDY PAID FOR VESSEL CONSTRUCTION

Question No. 2,577—**Mr. Tucker:**

What was the total amount paid by the Canadian maritime commission for the construction of vessels for the fiscal years ended (a) March 31, 1962 (b) March 31, 1963 (c) March 31, 1964, and (d) since April 1, 1964?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Canadian maritime commission advises as follows: (a) March 31, 1962, $2,025,261.36; (b) March 31, 1963, $22,500,000; (c) March 31 1964, $40,000,000; (d) since April 1, 1964, $19,130,384.37.

PURCHASES OF FURNITURE

Question No. 2,579—**Mr. Winkler:**

1. How many purchases of furniture have been made by the government since April 1963?
2. From what firms was this furniture purchased and what was the amount of each purchase?
3. Were tenders called for each order?
4. Who writes the tenders for these orders?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Question No. 2,579 covers perhaps a dozen government departments as well as crown agencies. As far as the public work department is concerned, it is impossible to answer this question now because of the tremendous amount of research involved, and I am told by my officials, that unless this question is clarified, it would take 300 man days of work, in Ottawa only, to answer the question as drafted.

This being said, the Department of Public Works reports that since April 1963, there was no purchase of any kind from the companies controlled or managed by the Sefkind brothers, and they never even bid on any tender calls for furniture.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO EASTER ISLAND INVESTIGATION

Question No. 2,303—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

What has been the government contribution, financial or otherwise, to the current Canadian investigation of Easter Island?

Return tabled.

SCHOOLS ATTENDED BY INDIAN CHILDREN

Question No. 2,307—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How many Indian children in each Canadian province were attending the following types of elementary schools in each of the past ten years (a) Indian residential schools (b) segregated day schools for Indian students (c) public or separate schools in the regular school systems?
2. How many Indian children in each Canadian province were attending the following types of high schools in each of the past ten years (a) Indian residential schools (b) segregated day schools for Indian students (c) public or separate schools in the regular school systems?

Return tabled.

FEDERAL CONTRACTS TO HALIFAX SHIPYARDS

Question No. 2,317—**Mr. Coates:**

What is the total amount of contracts awarded to Halifax shipyards by the federal government for the fiscal years from 1957-58 to 1963-64 and the total amount of awards to date for the fiscal year 1964-65?

Return tabled.

FOOD SUPPLIERS FOR C.C.G.S. "ALEXANDER MACKENZIE"

Question No. 2,341—**Mr. Howard:**

1. Since January 1, 1962 what are the names of each food supplier in Prince Rupert, B.C. who provided (a) meats, and (b) other foodstuffs, for the H.M.C.S. *Alexander MacKenzie* and for each month, how much money was paid to each such food supplier?
2. Are tenders called for the supplying of such provisions to the *Alexander MacKenzie* and, if so, when was the latest tender called and who were the bidders and the amounts of the bids and, if not, why were tenders not called?

Return tabled.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege in connection with questions. The hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) can speak for himself, but his question No. 1,214 dealing with the C.B.C. has been on the order paper since June 3. Question No. 1,642 asked by the hon. member for Portage-Neepawa (Mr. Enns) and also dealing with the C.B.C. has been on the order paper since July 31. Question No. 1,705, asked by the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Madill) and again dealing with the C.B.C., has been on the order paper since August 12. The delay in replying to those questions is inexcusable and cannot be justified in any way.

I would also point out that starred question No. 1,889 asked by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Coates) and dealing with the flag question has been on the order paper since September 9. No matter how many questions are answered, the fact remains that the failure to provide answers to these questions cannot be justifiably explained away, and in particular those questions respecting the C.B.C.

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, on the question of privilege may I say that there has been discussion with the three members who asked questions concerning the C.B.C., and I believe all three members understand the difficulties—

Mr. Diefenbaker: What are the difficulties?

Mr. Stewart: —which are involved. In one or two instances there was difficulty in getting in touch with the hon. members.

CANADIAN COMMONWEALTH FLAG

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SEVENTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Tuesday, December 15, consideration of the motion of Mr. Batten that the seventh and final report of the special committee on a Canadian flag presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, be now concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton).

Some hon. Members: Question.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérald Laniel (Beauharnois-Salaberry): Mr. Speaker, as a member from the province of Quebec and the representative in this house of a riding whose population is more than 75 per cent French speaking, I feel I should express my views on the debate under way, and especially on the motion for concurrence in the seventh report of the flag committee asking us to recognize the union jack, the union flag, as the symbol of our membership in the commonwealth and our allegiance to the crown.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to restrict my remarks to the amendment now before us, and I hope that you will appreciate that most of the points I will make will apply to the original report as well as to the Conservative amendment.

All through the flag debate the Liberal members were blamed for their silence and it has been said that we were muzzled, that we were afraid to stand up, as the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Fane) said last Thursday, while it was very well known that there was, within our party, a very great unanimity on the matter, and not only a virtual majority, to use the words of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker).

The same thing applies to the seventh report. We needed only a few speeches to express the general opinion, and as other speakers could refute the numerous false accusations from the opposition, we were quite satisfied to listen patiently to the Conservatives and their nonsense.

Just imagine, if every member had made an average of three speeches, we would still have to listen to them until Easter, and that without interruption.

The great majority of the population, and even the press, are unanimous in saying that the official opposition has abused freedom of speech and that it will certainly be judged on its attitude and be held responsible for having tarnished the image of parliament—

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

We are now on an amendment to the seventh report. The hon. member who has the floor has no right to speak of our activity during the debate on the sixth report.

Mr. Laniel: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will have patience for two or three seconds, I think he will be satisfied.

Mr. Speaker, some people claimed that the flag itself was but another concession to the province of Quebec; this is entirely false.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Laniel: I do not intend to dwell on that matter—

[*Text*]

You listen to what I want to say.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is patently out of order. We are discussing an amendment concerning the red ensign, which has been moved to the motion dealing with the seventh report, and whether or not we are going to adopt it. The hon. member is patently out of order and he should be brought to order.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I have listened very carefully and I must say that the hon. member was a little wide of the mark, but I understand he is now coming back on the rails.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laniel: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that I did not intend to dwell on that matter.

Now that we are on the seventh report and the amendment moved in that regard, we are told that the Liberal members have to pay the price for the adoption of a distinctive national flag by adopting this seventh report. I hasten to deny that, and this applies to the seventh report as well as to the amendment.

Yesterday, we gave ourselves a distinctive national flag which will be the pride of all Canadians, a flag they will be able to salute and fly it with honour—

Mr. Grafftey: Why two flags?

Mr. Rock: You are for the red ensign.

Mr. Laniel: Mr. Speaker, let me say that the English speaking Liberal members are precisely those who put on the most pressure —I would even say all the pressure—on the Prime Minister in order that this distinctive national flag measure be brought forward this year.

We, the Quebec members, wanted, of course a distinctive flag, but we also hoped that our feelings in this regard would be shared by all members from the other provinces. And today we are most happy to say to the people across Canada that we are glad to have placed our confidence in them.

Mr. Grafftey: Explain it to the Quebec voters.

Mr. Laniel: I would ask the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi to explain to his own voters why he abstained when one of the last votes were taken on the flag.

Mr. Grafftey: But you are not answering my question.

Mr. Laniel: We are now considering the motion for the adoption of the final report of the flag committee constituted by unanimous decision of the house. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the Conservative amendment, I believe we should ask ourselves two questions:

1. Does our country need this second standard, emblem or symbol of our membership in the commonwealth of nations and our fidelity to the Queen of Canada?
2. Would the union jack or the red ensign or something else be a more proper symbol?

The first spontaneous reaction of many people is to ask why we should consider the adoption of a second flag now that we are on the verge of having a distinctive national flag, particularly in view of the following facts.

Canada is recognized as a self-governing and independent country and we are steadily on the way to achieving nationhood; our central government, in co-operation with the ten provincial governments, has agreed upon a formula to amend our Canadian constitution, a fact which should soon lead to its repatriation; and, with the growing pains we are going through at the present time, we witnessed the development of a Canadian spirit which a better dialogue, at the federal-provincial level, has definitely promoted.

In short, we become better Canadians, we are more concerned with the future of our country, with Canadian unity, without for all that forgetting our origins, even though they have much less importance in this country.

I would venture here to quote from two articles published in the Montreal *Star* on December 15. First, here is the conclusion of an editorial headed: "Enough is Enough". I quote:

[*Text*]

What this country has wanted is a flag. The particular design was not that important. What it has got after 97 years is a flag, and we should be proud of it. A new generation with new ideas has taken over. Mr. Pearson has shown himself a contemporary figure.

[*Translation*]

The second item is by Peter Newman, of the same newspaper. It is headed: "Transfer of Power", and I quote:

[*Text*]

The debate which marked a turning point in the evolution of our nationhood: The transfer of power from one generation of Canadians to the next.

[*Translation*]

And further on, Mr. Newman—

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is reading from an editorial on the sixth report of the flag committee. I insist that the hon. member be called to order, for he should be dealing with the amendment to the seventh report of the flag committee now under consideration, and he is dealing with the sixth report of the committee.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I suggest that hon. members leave it to the Chair to do the insisting.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, I plead with the Chair and ask for a ruling immediately. The member is discussing in great detail the procedure with regard to the sixth report of the committee respecting a distinctive national flag. We are now discussing an amendment to the seventh report of the committee. We are now discussing whether we are going to have a second flag, and we are going to be very interested in learning whether the hon. member will support this amendment or whether he considers the union jack to be the flag of England. He must confine himself to this particular report. I was held very strictly to the seventh report yesterday.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the hon. member have anything to contribute on this point?

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has just been doing what you have forbidden during the last two or three days, the quoting of editorials.

Mr. Speaker: The point is well taken and I was about to mention it. The hon. member has anticipated the Chair.

An hon. Member: When?

Mr. Laniel: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, perhaps hon. members would think back to the two questions I asked. Did we need a second flag in this country to identify us as members of the commonwealth, and which one of the two flags should be chosen? We are becoming more Canadian at this time, and I am just presenting some facts found in editorials to prove that we are becoming more mature and more Canadian. I will be coming to the point in a moment. I do not see why they do not permit me to speak.

Mr. Speaker: I think the point is that a few days ago, if not last week, the Chair ruled that exact quotations from editorials giving opinions for or against various flags should not be used at this time, that members are here to give their own opinions and not to quote the opinions of others. If I remember correctly that was the exact ruling.

Mr. Laniel: If that is the only point I will put aside these statements and carry on with my own remarks.

[*Translation*]

All this goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that Canadianism has been substantially developed in recent years, even among English speaking Canadians. I might add, without wishing to offend anybody, that French speaking Canadians enjoy a certain advantage perhaps over the others when it comes to adapting oneself to those changes, to that evolution. Our ties with France were broken a long time ago. We have had to adapt ourselves to a world influenced to a great extent by British institutions. While we managed to keep our mother tongue, at the same time, we developed a personality of our own which is neither French nor British, one which I sometimes call the Canadian personality, having regard to the country itself, its history and its future.

As such, Mr. Speaker, as a French speaking Canadian and also as a Canadian in the proper meaning of the word, am I of the opinion, as an individual, that it is absolutely essential to recognize an official symbol of our membership in the commonwealth? I answer that it might not be absolutely necessary, but I am convinced that such a move is advisable.

I am aware that the house is far from being unanimous on this matter, but I think most Canadians will be pleased with this decision. This will provide us with something which will serve on certain occasions as a reminder of our associations with the member countries of a group of nations which has surely acquired an international renown; it will show our loyalty to the Queen and finally, will be a testimonial to our predecessors—

An hon. Member: Oh, oh.

Mr. Laniel: I hear a member wailing over there—who succeeded in establishing and in maintaining in this country a democratic system which has protected everyone, the powerful and the weak, and has brought us peace and prosperity. One would have to be blind or dishonest to deny this.

As such, we should be proud to be members of the commonwealth. Is Her Majesty Elizabeth II the Queen of Canada or not, as well as the Queen of most of the commonwealth countries? Personally, I was proud that Her Majesty came to this country in October last, and I would add that I was thrilled to pay her my respects during her last visit in the capital. I am a Quebecker just the same, and nobody can refuse me the right to believe in our institutions and to respect them.

Mr. Speaker, would you kindly allow me to refer directly to the choice of the flag and to quote the words uttered by Hon. Jean Lesage on December 6 last? He said:

> The sad irony of it all is that actually, only those in favour of the 1867 status quo could have taken part in demonstrations against the Queen. Her very title shows that our country is master of its own destiny and that it has been decolonized. But, amidst the vociferations, it was not easy to understand the deep meaning and the lasting effect of a sentence spoken by the Queen in Quebec: "The role of the monarchy is to guarantee the execution of the will of the people".

Mr. Speaker, these last words correspond directly to my aspirations as a Canadian from the province of Quebec and I am not willing to sacrifice my country's future to agitators or to philosophies that could lead us I know not where.

The right hon. Prime Minister of Canada said:

> Patriotism by some does not exclude patriotism by others.

Therefore, I think it is possible for us to have different opinions or feelings on certain matters, but I think that we must be concerned with building, with preserving what we have, with seeking solutions that unite instead of dividing.

We have been accused of tearing down the red ensign; well, I say that we did not tear down anything; on the contrary, we have mainly made greater the national symbol that is our flag, we have replaced it by a standard that will strengthen and unite the country, and now that this has been done, I suggest that the distinctive national flag does not exclude other outward signs which may link us with our past and attest our institutions.

As I am convinced of this fact, I am sure that Quebeckers, when they salute our distinctive national flag, will not object to recognizing, beside it, under special circumstances, another symbol which, after all, has indirectly helped and contributed to lead us until now, in a Canada which is growing stronger from day to day.

However, I cannot accept the Conservative amendment, which makes me think that the official opposition is looking for some way to continue the fight on the flag which I believe to have lasted long enough, instead of joining those who stand for it, like the majority of Canadians will do.

We need unity. Therefore, let us act seriously, as true Canadians, and avoid any protraction of this fight which has lasted many months. This house has voted on a distinctive national flag, a standard which, in my opinion, meets the aspirations of the majority of Canadians and which we will soon see unfurled over all public buildings, over parliament buildings and also during any public demonstration throughout Canada. No one wishes to vilify or depreciate the red ensign, because it has served our country well. But it must give way before a purely Canadian flag, a symbol of national unity and a pledge of our future.

Some may be more inclined than others to use our second flag, besides our distinctive national flag, but, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this will change with the years and that very shortly the maple leaf flag will be honoured, not only on public buildings, but in the hearts of all Canadians.

For this purpose, and also to avoid misuse of the flag which is proposed in the seventh report, I believe that the government, through an order in council, should define and set out the various circumstances under which the union jack could be flown besides our distinctive flag. This would not exclude its being used in other circumstances, but it would foresee doubtful situations and prevent criticism on the part of those who wish to deride the adoption of this second symbol which will identify us to the other nations of the commonwealth and recall our allegiance to our Queen. I hope that my suggestion will be taken into consideration and that the right hon. Prime Minister will implement it, once this seventh report is concurred in.

Coming back to the expression "price to pay", it is used mostly by those who do not want to make an effort to preserve national unity and I am strongly opposed to it. It is only meant to divide us and I say to those who use it that, if they insist on using it, I am ready to answer them in their own language and that I am ready to pay that price. The people in Quebec have paid a lot more before the present administration came into office, and it is in our own province that you will probably find the greatest understanding and the strongest wish to strengthen national unity.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) charged, in the course of the debate on the sixth report, that we had to rely on the Créditistes' support for most bills which we submitted to the house. I wish to point out to him that the group led by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) is not in the Liberal party's pay but that the sole purpose of its action is to serve its own election interests, without any consideration for anyone, not even national unity. The hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), in the speech he made last night, was trying much more to ridicule than to find means to unify our country. He made fun of some words used in the report showing his obvious lack of understanding and that his only desire was to rouse the feelings of French Canadians.

As to the French speaking Conservatives, I fail to understand clearly why they would abstain on the amendment. They want to have their cake and eat it too by abstaining to vote on the Conservative amendment concerning the adoption of the red ensign instead of the union jack, while they intend to vote

against the seventh report moved by the government.

In my opinion, they should be consistent and I do not believe that they can allow themselves not to vote against the Conservative amendment which, in fact, changes nothing at all to the matter of principle which they do not approve. Are they for or against it?

Mr. Grafftey: Would the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. Laniel: When my remarks are finished.

Mr. Grafftey: Thanks a lot.

Mr. Laniel: Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to say that I am very much concerned with the problem of Canadian unity, like most of us, and certainly as much as the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) (Mr. Groos) with whom I fraternize from time to time; it is even my first concern as a member from Quebec, and I ask all hon. members of this house, as well as all Canadians, to look for the solutions which will be pledges of our unity, not to go too fast and live with patience and understanding through the coming years, which will lead us to a better and stronger Canada, a Canada of ours with an increasing reputation throughout the world.

Mr. Grafftey: I would like to put a question to the hon. member who just delivered a great speech. Now that he indicated his desire to vote against the Conservative amendment, I would like to know whether he feels, with most of his fellow citizens in the province of Quebec, that the union jack is the flag of England, as is the case for most people outside Quebec?

Mr. Laniel: In answer to the hon. member, I do believe that this is a matter of judgment and common sense. We had a flag known as the red ensign and we have replaced it by a new one, one with a maple leaf which represents the future. Surely we are not going to continue the fight, as I said in my speech. We feel that the only distinctive national flag is the one with a maple leaf, but now we want a symbol of our membership in the commonwealth and our allegiance to the Queen. Certainly, such a symbol must be recognized and used by the majority of the other members of the commonwealth.

The red ensign has never been unfurled by Australia or New Zealand, while the union jack is generally used throughout the commonwealth. The Queen's flag should be recognized as the symbol of our membership in the commonwealth and our respect for Her Majesty.

[*Text*]

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, three or four minutes will suffice for what I have to say in this particular debate. I should like to correct an impression left by the previous speaker, the hon. member for Beauharnois-Salaberry (Mr. Laniel). He kept referring to the Conservative amendment. I should like to tell him that had the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton not introduced this amendment, the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott) was prepared to do so and I was prepared to second a similar amendment.

I have been very disturbed by events in the house recently during the bitter debate which took place on the previous report of the committee. It seems to me this could well be avoided in discussing the particular report which we are at present considering.

It also seems to me there is a strong suspicion that when the vote is taken on the amendment the Liberal party is going to vote as a block. This is very surprising, because we all know many individual Liberal members who prefer the red ensign to the union jack. Some French speaking members of the Liberal party have said they would abstain on such a vote, yet I think I can predict that when the vote is taken they will vote as a party. Because of this it is very hard to convince me and others that it will be a free vote.

I should like to appeal to the Prime Minister to make certain there is a free vote; because I am convinced that if there is, then the vast majority of the members of this house will support the red ensign as the flag to represent our association with the commonwealth.

An hon. Member: Let us vote now and you will find out right away.

Mr. Prittie: I shall not keep you very long. After the rather bitter debate which took place on the sixth report of the flag committee I feel a free vote on the seventh report would do much to remove some of the bad feeling created during the past week. I agree we should have a flag to represent our association with the commonwealth, and I am convinced that in a free vote the red ensign will receive the support of the large majority of members in the house.

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I suppose that to all intents and purposes we

should be celebrating the birth of our new flag. Now that some of the dust has settled and the house has returned to a more friendly frame of mind, I wish to say that I think we have a flag, a distinctive Canadian flag; and as I promised in six earlier speeches, that new flag will have my unqualified support.

It has never been my practice to stand up one day and recommend something, and then overnight change my mind. I hope I will not be considered as being stubborn or narrow-minded. I believe in principle; I believe in being consistent, and I shall try to be consistent today. I am one of those who have always believed that one country needs only one flag. But of course I am here to represent the great district of Athabasca and to vote yea or nay on every subject that comes before the house.

I should like always to be able to decide between right and wrong. I would like to have clearcut principles, but on this subject I find the question proposed to me is something like this: which of your brothers would you like to murder, your brother Ted or your brother Walter? I do not believe in fratricide; therefore I cannot say which of my brothers I prefer to murder. As I am a lawyer some people may say this is legal jargon, and if they wish it explained I shall relate it to the question before the house; which of two designs, among second flags, do I want? The answer to that is very plain.

For this great country of ours, this young and virile nation, we need only one flag, but I am forced by principle to vote yea or nay between two designs which I do not want, now that the main question has been settled. How does a man vote on principle when he is presented with this problem? I shall vote when the time comes, but first I believe we are here to discuss the principles behind the whole issue.

As I have said, I accept the new national flag. I hope every citizen in Canada will rally to it whenever their services are needed. Here again I will be consistent. I have tried to serve the glorious old red ensign well, and I shall try to serve Canada under this new flag so long as I draw breath. But that is not the problem before us today. We are forced to vote on a two flag proposition, no matter what you call it. You may call it a one flag proposition if you like, but we are asked to sanctify or give legal acceptance to a second flag proposed by those very people who said the new national flag would be so representative of the whole nation, would be so distinctive that no person in the world could possibly make a mistake when seeing it flying at the mastheads of our ships, painted on the fuselages of our airplanes, or waved by children on parade.

I hope this is so. I hope that as the years go by the citizens of Canada, men and women, young and old, will serve this new flag with the same distinction with which they served the old one, until 100 years from now it will be truly loved and revered, not as a mere empty act of parliament but as one of the symbols of our nation.

I have never criticized the maple leaf as a symbol of Canadian unity, but I have asked that we recognize those other symbols of our past. There are some people who scream to get rid of anything British. I am not thinking of anyone in particular, but it has been said in this house that all vestiges of British colonialism must disappear. I happen to be of British blood. I have a great respect for British justice and their sense of fair play, and even for their colonialism which is classed as the finest the world has ever seen. No other empire in the history of the world gave so much of its strength and brains to develop other countries and set them free.

After Canadians showed in no uncertain fashion on the battlefields of Europe, particularly in world war I, that they had grown up, the old lion was mighty proud of her cub. *Punch* magazine of that day produced a wonderful cartoon showing the old lion lying inside her cave watching this great, mighty young lion striding forth to become independent and free. At no time in history has the mother of parliaments denied those necessary, and perhaps slow, steps required to bring a colony to nationhood. This is why I revere the British flag. I also revere it because it is something more than a mere symbol of empire. As has been said in this house on numerous occasions the flag of Britain, the noble union jack, is nothing more or less than the combination of three great Christian crosses.

I disagree with those who say we should do away with all that is old and revered just to have something new. There is no education without history, without rehearsing the folklore, the poetry and the great literature of our forefathers, both French and English. We said that we wished to retain in our Canadian flag those vestiges of our past. We did this in no small way. We did this in no petty, partisan way. We had a free vote, at least in the party to which I belong. I am not here to cast aspersions on any other party. We are a positive party. We are a building party. We do not recommend anything in this party of

ours which in any way tears down the achievements or the beliefs of any other people. We oppose that which is negative but we do not turn down anything that is positive. We are the builders, and now that we have a new flag I appeal to each and every hon. member to put away any acrimonious feelings which may have been felt and to build for the future. Let us have a new dynamic program of building in Canada. Let us eliminate poverty in Canada. When I say we have a new flag, I wish something more to go with that flag. There should be real equality in this country—equality for every man, woman and child, economically as well as in matters concerning religion and race. This is a program we must carry out. I do not expect we shall have to resort to socialism or anything connected with it in order to put this program forward.

I come from a race of pioneers, from a race of adventurers—gamblers, if you will, if you call it gambling to get into a leaky ship, cross 3,000 miles of stormy sea and walk into the bush with nothing but a gun and an axe. I do not think that spirit is dead in Canada. That is why I am able to accept this maple leaf flag as a symbol of those who stepped out into the hardwood forests of Ontario as pioneers and settlers. When pioneering in the east was finished, my grandfather went further west. When my grandfather was at Lac la Biche the flag which flew over his fort looked a great deal like the Canadian red ensign though, in fact, it had the letters H.B.C. in the corner. He was law and order. He was priest, educator, businessman. He was everything in that part of the country. And he did not hold his position because the people were afraid of him. At the time of the rebellion they allowed him to walk out unscathed because he was a man of honour. These same native people loved our red ensign and I am sure that in time they will learn to love the maple leaf flag. If necessary, they will fight for it as they did for the red ensign in three great wars. I am going out to sell them the idea of Canadian unity. But even more important than this idea of Canadian unity I should like to bring them economic equality and economic freedom so that they will no longer be mere wards of the government; so that each and every one may grasp the one thing which, I hope, our race has given them—the idea that a man can stand on his own two feet and make his way in the world. Then, I hope, they will be willing to fight, if necessary, for all those things which a generous nation has put within their grasp.

We cannot call ourselves generous today. Yes, we can pat ourselves on the back and say we have seen the birth of a new flag. But that new flag is like a child, innocent of reputation. Let it not be a foundling child. If members opposite believe in it—and they have commended it, if only by their silence—let them work to establish it. I should not say they did not have the opportunity of a free vote. I would hate to think any Canadian would do anything at any time to prevent his voting freely on such a subject. It took us 2,000 years to get this free vote and I will be the last to suggest that any member of the party opposite would dare give up this heritage. If he did, the men who died at Vimy Ridge and in the battle of Britain must have died in vain. Even now they speak to us when they say:

> To you from failing hands we throw
> The torch; be yours to hold it high.
> If ye break faith with us who die
> We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
> In Flanders fields.

These are words which should not be forgotten. This is part of our British heritage.

I do not think it is necessary to fly any flag alongside this new democratic flag we have chosen to prove that we are, in fact, a nation, or to prove that each and every one of us is dedicated to that new nation. If the introduction of this new flag, the one and only symbol of our national pride, represents Canada's birthday, let us not sully it by pretending it needs to be bolstered up. Surely those who wanted a distinctive flag should be the first to say, now that we have a distinctive flag: The House of Commons voted on this flag, and now we have it. I who come of British stock will be the first to say we need not shore it up except with our devotion, our acts and our imagination. We shall go forward and build in the northern half of the North American continent the greatest nation which ever flew any flag.

Some say we need this second flag to show equality in the commonwealth. We do not need any flag to show equality in the commonwealth. The nations of the commonwealth look to Canada for leadership. All through the years they have looked to us for leadership and we have shown that leadership. This is why we are not afraid, now, to launch out on our own; this is why we have cut the umbilical cord. This is why we now have a Queen of our own, and she is a Queen of our own choosing. We are not trammelled

here. Any person in this house can preach in favour of a republic if he wishes. But I will not; I will be consistent in that. Australia and New Zealand know that we are first among equals. That is a good phrase. That is what Canada is in a position of leadership within the commonwealth; she has never asked for a special place but she has earned a place in front because she is marching down that great road at the end of which all men will have equality, dignity and those economic advantages which we ourselves have found in this land of ours. Let us have no more talk about marking our association with the commonwealth by a flag.

We had a beautiful and distinctive one, in my opinion; and if you will bear with me, Mr. Speaker, because I do not see any other occasion on which I could say this, I have a suggestion to make with regard to it. I think that one of these days, perhaps Vimy day or on July 1, 1965 we should set aside the whole day to honouring this great red ensign of ours and to honouring the boys who served it so well. I would suggest that our great Governor General, General Vanier, should be given the privilege of laying our red ensign where it belongs—in the peace tower, where the names of those who gave their lives are graved in stone or written in letters of gold. As long as one stone stands on another and as long as we honour these men the flag will remain there as a lasting tribute to their love and devotion—the great old flag they served so well.

If we are to have a flag to show we are a member of the commonwealth, why not a special flag to show we are a member of NATO? I think the members of NATO know Canadians will be there, should the defence of western Europe make it necessary. Why should we not be asked to approve a special flag to show our membership in the United Nations? I may say that had I been in the committee which was concerned with choosing a flag I might well have suggested designs which would have shown our devotion to the United Nations—I do not know whether any were put forward or not. I think our contribution in money and in devotion to the idea of one united world might well require that we take the lead and incorporate in a new flag the United Nations banner and, in this way, let Canada be the first to recognize the brotherhood of man. But we have chosen otherwise in democratic conclave, in committee meetings. I have never been of the opinion that a committee was the best way of proceeding. I would much have preferred that we should have discussed this matter for as long a time as was necessary and then come to a conclusion in the house. I cannot understand how we could expect 15 men chosen by parties to sit behind closed doors and decide something which we could not decide here. Nevertheless, the committee did come up with this report. We have had a debate in the house, and we have a new flag. Surely, if we thought a committee could do it, we must say they have done it.

They have made that decision. We abdicated our decision to that committee and they came out with a report and gave us a flag. They must have given us a distinctive flag, a flag to serve under and love, and one which requires no bolstering up. I am quite sure this is what the committee intended to do, because the first time the question was raised they voted 14 to 0 for this very proposition. I am not going into the motives behind their change of heart but I suggest that on that occasion they showed their true principle, which is the principle that I suggest again should lie behind this whole question.

I must get back to the proposition before us, Mr. Speaker. The amendment is, of course, a method of trying to get a little more reason out of what I consider to be an entirely impossible proposal, namely that we should have two flags. However, if we must have two flags and are back again between the devil and the deep blue sea, I suggest that the red ensign of Canada is far and away ahead of any other flag, if we must have a second, distinctive flag for our country. I am going to have to vote, and I am quite sure the people of Athabasca want me to vote on this question; they want it settled as quickly as possible. However, we cannot settle things as important as this as quickly as some people may desire, because every member of this house certainly has as much right to speak on the subject as I have. I do not think I am trying to make cloth out of old rope; I am trying to be positive. I suggest that nothing can be gained by weakening the position of our new flag and it is my hope that when I try and celebrate, as I hope to do, the new flag for our great nation we shall not be torn between that flag and a second choice of any kind. I am sure many hon. members will vote in favour of the red ensign as a second flag—I know members on both sides of the house are going to do so—but this will only be Hobson's choice.

I have great respect for those sections of the country which have a particular love for the old union jack. Newfoundland has not been long in the dominion, just since 1949. I hope that the way we have treated Newfoundland is appreciated and understood. We have offered them full partnership in our family. I believe nobody will deny that we have tried to be generous to them. I think we can appeal to the people of Newfoundland and say that if they feel wounded because we have turned down the idea of a secondary flag, it is because we have tried to build this country of ours into a great, united nation. I know that when the people of Newfoundland get together with those people in Canada who are not of British stock they will love them as I do, and will not forget their British heritage but will put this question in its proper perspective and put Canada first. Let us put our sentimental attachments, our family devotion, on one side and put Canada first, not only today but for ever.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Saltsman).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to rise today to speak on behalf of the red ensign as a symbol of Canada's relationship with the commonwealth. I would like to take a moment to express my appreciation to the voters of Waterloo South for having accorded me the honour of electing me to the House of Commons as their representative. I would also like to take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation to all members of the house for their very kind and friendly reception. I hope it may continue.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Saltsman: I am also extremely proud that I have been here on an historic occasion and one which will no doubt be long remembered by Canadians. I think the decision this house has made will be remembered long after the bitterness is forgotten. I am very proud to have participated in voting for the new Canadian flag. I think it is a good flag. Like most people, when I first saw it my feelings for the red ensign obscured the affection I might have had for the new flag; but every day as I look at it, it becomes more vital, it becomes stronger. I can see a united Canada in this flag and I am pleased and proud to have been able to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, as hon. members know, Waterloo South is an English speaking riding. It has very strong United Empire Loyalist roots; its people are proud and hard working; it is the home of the Highland Light Infantry of Canada, a great regiment with many battle honours; it has four branches of the Canadian Legion, all of them doing extremely well; and it is proud of the red ensign. I have followed this debate with great interest and great emotion, as hon. members will understand. I have spoken to many people in Waterloo South about the flag, and their feelings regarding it. I think the people in Waterloo South recognized very early that Canada needed a new flag, a flag that would not be hyphenated, a flag that would not say "French Canada", "English Canada" or any other Canada, but only one Canada. I believe this parliament has accomplished that; we now have that flag.

The people in Waterloo South could have waited for a flag. They could have waited, because they were most reluctant to transfer their loyalty from the ensign that they love to another flag which they will learn to love. But I think it should be recognized by many of the members of this house that we could have waited. There are other members of this house who could not wait. We recognized that fact and as good Canadians we said they had real, just grievances and we were prepared to meet those grievances. I refer to the grievances of French Canada. I believe we have shown our willingness to do this. We now ask those French Canadian members of this house to recognize, much as we understood their feelings and the justice of their cause, that we have very strong and real feelings for the ensign.

We have heard them say that if another flag is necessary and there was a flag representing the world, this is the flag we should accept and honour rather than one which only recognizes our commonwealth relationships. When that day comes and that flag is ready to be accepted, a flag that represents the brotherhood of man, the universality of all people, I will be one of the first to vote for it if I am fortunate enough to be here. But until we reach that point it must be recognized that we do have a flag that means a great deal to us, a flag we have given up voluntarily on behalf of Canadian unity. I think that flag should be retained in our affection and on our flagpoles as a symbol and sign of our relationship with the British commonwealth.

It is my opinion and my feeling, and I think the feeling of many members of this house who voted on this matter, that if the red ensign is retained as a symbol of our relationship with the commonwealth, that connection with the past will go a long way toward recognizing and accepting the new flag. I would ask whether those members in this house who were so willing to ask for a new flag—and I was one of them—would be equally as willing to recognize the affection in which we hold the red ensign? If they are, then when the vote comes they will have an opportunity to heal the wounds, and we may yet reach a unanimous decision on the retention of the red ensign.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have just listened with a great deal of pleasure to the maiden speech of the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Saltsman). I should like to congratulate him on entering into the debates in this chamber. From listening to him and from having talked to him on other occasions I am expecting him to add a great deal to the deliberations of this house; and I am sure he will add to the opinions of the New Democratic party something which is required—some new ideas and a fresh outlook on life. I congratulate him on his effort today knowing, as we all do, how difficult it is to make that first speech in the House of Commons. Subsequently he may become like some of the rest of us here as the years go by, but I hope he will pick out a proper model to follow. I am not sure whether or not he will find it in his own party.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: Well, I am not being discourteous to his own party, but he can make a choice from 264 other members.

I am rising to speak in this debate today, Mr. Speaker, but not because I desire to enter once more into the flag question for any purpose other than to express my regret and my sorrow that the issue has come to what I consider to be a very sorry pass. I should like to point out in the beginning, that yesterday we were prepared to bring to a vote the amendment which is now before the house to the seventh report of the committee. We had presented our case and put forward our amendment. Our members were ready for a vote last night, and I regret very much that that permission was not granted to us by other members in this house.

As far as our position today is concerned, hon. members in this house realize that quite a number of our members are absent attending the funeral service of Senator Horner in Saskatchewan, whom we will miss and to whom the Conservative party owes a great debt of gratitude over the years. In deference to those members who are absent we feel that the vote should not be held today because they want to record on *Hansard* their position regarding an issue which has concerned them very much. So let no one accuse me or anyone else of prolonging the debate today simply for the so-called purpose of filibustering; that is not in anybody's mind.

Mr. McIlraith: I wonder whether the hon. gentleman would permit a question. I very much appreciate his remarks concerning the late Hon. Senator Horner. The late Hon. Senator was one whom I met when he first came to Ottawa as a senator, and I have known him rather well over the intervening years. May I say I also join with other hon. members in expressing my sympathy to his family.

My question is this. I quite see the difficulty which is exercising the hon. gentleman, but it would seem that delay of the vote on the amendment is probably delaying the conclusion of the pre-Christmas part of our proceedings, because several members wish to speak after it is taken, and before holding a final vote on the main motion. I am wondering whether the hon. gentleman would consider permitting the vote on the amendment to go forward on the understanding that we could then have the speeches, which I am informed are coming on the main motion, delivered today. We would, of course, understand that there would be no vote on the main motion until tomorrow, when hon. members who are away will return. Would that meet the situation which is troubling the hon. gentleman?

Mr. Churchill: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, it would not. Our members who are away today want to vote on the amendment which we proposed yesterday; that is the point I am making. We were prepared to do this last night, but as I mentioned, last night there were two members of the Liberal party who were anxious to get the floor, which happened to be given to the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire). So I just wanted to make it clear, in view of all the accusations that we have had over weeks and months that we are trying to delay the business of the house, that that is not the case, and it is

certainly not the case today. I want that thoroughly understood. However, this does not hinder me from discussing the present situation, the work of the committee, the report it made, and some other matters which I will deal with as I go along.

I notice that in its seventh report—and this has been dealt with by others—the committee started off with the proposition that the second flag to be proposed for Canada should be the Canadian red ensign. Last night the information was given to us that the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) proposed that motion in the committee. Certainly as far as our members on that committee were concerned, if there had to be a second flag this is the one they favoured. Then along came the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) and reversed the position by putting before the committee an amendment which is almost word for word the resolution on the order paper which was put there six months ago. So the committee was put right back in the position which the government took six months ago. The hon. member for Leeds reversed the suggestion of his colleague for Vancouver Quadra.

Our committee representative, the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming), explained the position of our members on that committee and why they abstained from voting. First of all, they were of the opinion that only one flag was to be chosen. Second, when it became evident that the committee was not going along with that idea but was going to propose a second flag, they said this was just ridiculous and they were not participating in that vote in the committee. I thought that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) was unfair to the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton in ridiculing him the other night, or yesterday, when the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton was explaining his position as of the present moment, as contrasted with his position in the committee.

I ask, as members of the committee asked, what was the reason for suggesting that there should be two flags officially sanctioned by the parliament of Canada? When did we have to indicate by means of a special flag our allegiance to the crown? Have we not in all the years of Canada's history shown our allegiance to the crown by our activities both in war and in peace as citizens of this country? As members of parliament we swear allegiance to the sovereign. Must we now carry around a flag indicating that allegiance? It strikes me as being rather ridiculous.

What is the weakness in the proposed flag that does not show allegiance to the crown? There must be troubled consciences on the other side of the house in the Liberal party in that they must realize that the flag which they proposed and which at this present moment has not been accepted as the national flag of Canada shows only allegiance to the Liberal party. That is all it shows at the present time. It has not been accepted by parliament. It has not been authorized by the crown.

Miss LaMarsh: What about your co-leader?

Mr. Deschatelets: It is the committee's flag.

Mr. Churchill: The second thing is this, Mr. Speaker—I did not hear those interruptions.

Mr. Deschatelets: It is not the flag of the Liberal party, it is the committee's flag. It is the committee's recommendation.

Mr. Churchill: They are shielding behind the committee again. That is why an opportunity was given the other day by our amendment to the other report for members of the Liberal party to stand up and be counted with regard to whether or not they wanted to destroy the red ensign, and with one exception they said yes, we want to destroy the red ensign. They are going to have another chance this week to stand up and be counted with regard to whether or not they are going to complete the destruction of the red ensign. That is one of the purposes of the amendment now before the house.

An hon. Member: A political purpose.

Mr. Churchill: The other thing is that the second flag for Canada is to indicate our membership in the commonwealth of nations. When has there been any doubt about our membership in the commonwealth of nations? Why do we now, in December, 1964, have to indicate our membership in the commonwealth of nations? We are one of the founding nations of that commonwealth and in 50 years we have not had to produce a special flag to show that we are a member of the commonwealth. Everybody in the world knows that we are a member and a senior partner in the commonwealth. It is a guilty conscience that produces reasons like those put forward by the Liberal party for having a second flag.

We hear talk about Canada suddenly getting its independence now, as if it were just emerging from colonial days. Canada entered upon the world stage in the period 1914-1918. That is when Canada's name became famous around the world. Perhaps some of you were

listening last Sunday to the C.B.C. radio program broadcast at one o'clock which commemorates the activities of Canadians in the first world war. Despite all the criticism we hear of the C.B.C. I should like to commend them because this is one of the best programs I have ever heard. On that program we hear from the lips of survivors of that conflict about their experiences in that war. Last Sunday we heard from survivors of the battle of Saint-Julien. That was the occasion of the first gas attack in the history of the world. We heard from survivors what happened in those momentous days when the allied armies in Europe were in as great peril as they were in the March retreat of 1918. The Canadians held their ground and stood firm and, as the commentator said, in newspapers throughout the world the name of Canada was blazoned in great letters. That is when Canada entered upon the international scene and became known as a country in her own right.

At the peace conference at Versailles Sir Robert Borden insisted that Canada should have a seat on that council. Canada entered upon the world stage at that time. That is when her independence was achieved and became known, and everything that has happened subsequently has just been a case of tidying up the documents to make it clear and evident that that independence is assured. So we have not just suddenly become a new and independent nation. This is ridiculous talk to which I have raised objection. I suggest that the flag proposed by the Liberal party—

Mr. Benidickson: The committee.

Mr. Churchill: —by the Liberal party shielding behind the committee has serious weaknesses. It does not show, according to the Liberal party, our allegiance to the crown. It does not show our membership in the commonwealth. I say it is not even distinctive because it closely resembles the flag of Peru with the colours red, white and red. The main difference is that the proposed Liberal flag has a larger expanse of white, but at a distance it will be hard to distinguish it from the flag of Peru. So it is not distinctive. The great search for a distinctive flag has failed. At a distance the maple leaf will not show up any more clearly than the coat of arms or diagram on the Peruvian flag.

It is much less distinctive than the present Canadian national flag, the Canadian red ensign. In the United Nations, in NATO, in the commonwealth, where flags are flown and where it counts to have a distinctive flag, the Canadian red ensign is unmistakably Canadian. It spells out the word "Canada" which we have heard about from the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) and from the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson). The message of Canada is spelled out right now by the present Canadian red ensign. You can examine the flags of those nations in the commonwealth, in NATO and in the United Nations and you will see that is true and that it cannot be mistaken. It stands out very clearly.

I suggest that because of these weaknesses in the flag proposed and forced on this country by the Liberal party they have tried to come up with something else that will satisfy various elements in this country, and they are suggesting to us in the seventh report of the committee that we have a second flag. The committee is suggesting that that flag should be the union jack and we are suggesting that it should be the Canadian red ensign. We would have preferred to have a flag chosen for Canada that would have incorporated the very emblem which the Liberal party now says must be shown somehow or other in Canada, namely the union jack. We would have preferred that. We wanted a flag that represented something of our history and our traditions. We wanted the union jack on it. We also wanted the fleur-de-lis and the maple leaf on it, and we have said so time and time again. If such a flag had been proposed we would not now require a second flag to show our membership in the commonwealth or our allegiance to the crown, or another flag that would convey some other meaning. But our suggestions were not accepted.

As I mentioned in an earlier speech, and I am not going to repeat what I said, we were wrong. I admitted I was wrong, along with hundreds of thousands of people in Canada, in thinking that a compromise was possible incorporating the symbols of our past history. This was the initial mistake that we made months ago. This initial mistake was carried on right down through the work of the committee. I sympathize with our members who were on that committee because they conscientiously and seriously thought that a compromise could be effected incorporating the union jack and the fleur-de-lis, as well as the maple leaf, in our flag.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a rather sad period in our history when we have to consider two flags for this country because the flag proposed by the Liberal party fails in its purpose. We have to select another flag for the reasons they have advanced. We would have preferred, as I said, one flag;

but faced in the house with this juggernaut of the Liberal party supported by their associates, chiefly the Créditistes, we find ourselves in a situation where another flag is going to be selected by the House of Commons. Under those circumstances, then, we have to make a choice. Our choice is the preservation of the Canadian red ensign. This is the reason our amendment has been placed before the House of Commons.

I noticed that when the hon. member for Beauharnois-Salaberry (Mr. Laniel) was talking, he quoted from some newspaper or other to the effect that the particular design of the flag is not of importance. This is Créditiste doctrine: Anything at all on the flag; it does not matter what is on the flag. I am surprised that the hon. member who spoke a little while ago should have quoted with approval that sentiment from some newspaper or other. Then he talked about the emergence of a new generation. I do not know which generation the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) represents. He represents an older generation than the one to which I belong. Is he a member of the new generation that is going to be in evidence in Canada now for the next 30 years? I think not. However, we hear from the hon. member for Beauharnois-Salaberry that a new generation is now taking over. Well, who is leading this new generation—the Prime Minister of Canada? When I belonged, many years ago, to the new generation a person of his age appeared to me to be very senior indeed.

I suggest, sir, that we are going to be in difficulty in the future with regard to the two flags. Where are they to be flown? Are they to fly conjointly? What flag will be on the peace tower? Is it to be this new flag imposed by force on the Canadian people? Will we see the Canadian red ensign pulled down from the peace tower and this other flag run up which has not behind it the majority opinion in this country? The Prime Minister has said, and I could quote his exact words, that the majority of the people in this country favour a new flag. He said, as recorded on page 11148 of *Hansard*, that he believed the majority of Canadians wished to have a Canadian national flag which could not be mistaken for the flag of any other country. Then he picks one that looks like the flag of Peru. How does he know the majority of Canadians want this flag? Nobody knows that. We have not had an opportunity to find out, and that is the very thing to which I object. Do the majority of the people in this country want the Canadian red ensign pulled down from the peace tower, the greatest shrine that we have in this country? This is a shrine to which hundreds of thousands of visitors come every summer as we have seen, year after year. Every public building in this country will have the Canadian red ensign pulled down, I suppose. I do not know what will be done with regard to the schools, province by province. I do not know what will be done in the court rooms of this country. What will be done in the citizenship courts? The red ensign comes down, does it, and perhaps the new flag will be put up in its place?

What happens in so many of our churches in this country in which we have deposited Canadian flags of another era representing the sacrifices of the people in wartime? Are those flags to be taken down now and replaced by this new flag? Well, the ramifications of this are not known yet to the Canadian people. We have never been a flag conscious people. We have not been saluting our flag every day. Now we are becoming flag conscious and we are going to be confused with the multiplicity of flags in this country.

I have been distressed during the course of this debate by the evident intent of the Liberal party to destroy the red ensign. I have been distressed by the references we have heard from some corners of this house to the fact that we, in the Conservative party, are not real Canadians. The hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire)—I regret that he is not here, although if he were I would be interrupted every other minute—stated the other day, as recorded on page 11186 of *Hansard*, that they are perhaps the most Canadian of Canadians. We have had suggestions from that corner of the house that just because members of the Conservative party have supported the Canadian red ensign they were not true Canadians. We, they say, are second class citizens and represent a declining minority in this house. This is the position in which we have been placed because we have fought the proposal of the Liberal party.

Now, I do not know how you determine between a real and an unreal Canadian. I do not know why the member for Lapointe and his friends consider they are more Canadian than we are. How do you become this? I thought we were attempting to recognize in this country that there was no distinction among Canadians by race, class or creed or anything else. I thought we were

all Canadians, all honouring our country, all anxious to work for the benefit of our country and all of us honouring the crown. Why do we have to be divided into first class citizens and second class citizens? The hon. member for Lapointe and some others are going to find it very difficult indeed to relegate us to an inferior position. We will do our part, as we have done in the past, for Canada.

There has been a great deal of bitterness in the course of this debate. We are asked to forgive and forget. We saw the spectacle just the other day—though it seems longer it was only on Tuesday morning—of the Prime Minister asking not to have a vote, to all join together in favour of the flag which his party put out.

Mr. Macaluso: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member keeps saying the flag put out by the Liberal party, by the Prime Minister's party. The flag was put out by the committee and was voted upon by every party in the house.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Macaluso: On a further point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member says "on a further point of order". Certainly the first was not one.

Mr. Macaluso: On a new point of order I would suggest that under the rules of the house the hon. gentleman is not speaking to the amendment that is now before the house.

Mr. Churchill: The hon. member who has interrupted of course has a guilty conscience.

Mr. Macaluso: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel guilty about any vote I have cast in this house, and never will. I am very proud of the vote I cast in the house. The hon. gentleman cast aspersions against every other hon. member in the house and I suggest he keep his innuendos to himself, and to those within his own party whom he has also slandered.

Mr. Churchill: I have offended the sensitivities of the hon. member. It is my opinion he is suffering from a guilty conscience. I am entitled to say that. I should not have said he is, but it is my opinion; and he wants to shield, as I see it, behind the committee.

Mr. Macaluso: Small man.

Mr. Churchill: This was the purpose of the Liberal party the other day, to shield behind the committee, and we moved an amendment and said, "Stand up and be counted in regard to the Canadian red ensign. Put your names down on *Hansard* permanently with regard to the flag you are about to destroy." They were very embarrassed, and it showed. Then the Prime Minister was pleading with us to all join together, forget all these differences and join behind the flag which he, on second thought, discovered was the flag he desired. At the same time we had a noose around our necks, the noose of closure, and he was pulling on this and was throttling us. He thought we would then say, "It is all right, Mr. Prime Minister. We are sorry about all the things said in the debate and we bow to your will."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. Perhaps I should refer to the point of order raised a moment ago by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Macaluso) which to some extent was justified. It seems to the Chair that the hon. member at the moment is to some extent reflecting on a vote of the house, a vote which was taken on Monday or Tuesday, and in present circumstances the debate should be restricted to the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming).

Mr. Churchill: I did not think I was reflecting on the vote, Mr. Speaker. I thought I was stating the Prime Minister did not want to have a vote so that the names of the members of the Liberal party would not be recorded on *Hansard* for this generation, and subsequent generations, to see what they have done in our country.

I said that there was bitterness engendered during the course of this debate over all these months, bitterness in the hearts of many people, and sorrow in their hearts. Thousands of people in this country have been hurt by the action of the Prime Minister and it is too early to say, let us forgive and forget.

I have known nothing in the history of the world that corresponds to this action—the imposition of a flag on a country without the will of the people behind it. This has only been done by a foreign conqueror. Yet here, Canada, which resisted foreign conquerors in the past, has had imposed upon it, by the action of the Prime Minister and the Liberal party, a flag which has not been desired by the majority of the people of this country because they have had no opportunity to express their opinions on it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have to interrupt the hon. member again. I brought to his attention a moment ago that what he is discussing now is a subject matter on which there has been a vote of the house. What we have before us is an amendment proposed by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton, and it seems to me the hon. member is not dealing with that at the moment.

Mr. Churchill: There would be no need for this second report of the committee had it not been for the fact that a flag, foreign to our nature, is being imposed upon us, and I am relating it to that. I say this has been the failure of the Prime Minister. He talks about unity; he creates disunity.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: He is attempting to impose upon Canada a flag we do not desire. He wants us all to join behind it, and then he says, let us have a second flag to placate certain elements in this country, and he confuses the issue by so doing. I think it is a real failure in statesmanship. This is not the purpose that should be served by a Prime Minister who should act for all the people of Canada and not just for party political purposes.

So let me conclude, Mr. Speaker. When people say, "Let us all rally around now and forget the past," they are speaking prematurely. I know enough about human nature to know that this particular incident will not be forgotten for many years, no matter how charitable people want to be. I tell you, sir, a hurt has been done to hundreds of thousands of people in this country, and that is not easily banished.

In this house we have suffered a political defeat which some people are crowing about. Some elements of the press are displaying, by way of cartoons, a political defeat. It is an unfortunate way to deal with an issue which has created so much trouble within this country. But, sir, if you have suffered a political defeat and have any courage in your bones the next step is defiance. I am not going to say at this moment that I will accept this flag which the Liberal party has produced—

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Churchill: —and forced upon us.

Mr. Benidickson: The committee produced it.

Mr. Churchill: I am not going to accept it at this stage, and there will be thousands of people who won't accept it; and we will defy the Liberal party in the future—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Churchill: —and make them suffer for their sins.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Scott: Mr. Speaker, as a member of the flag committee I want to protest the despicable remark which the hon. member has just made, that this was a Liberal flag. This was the work of an all-party committee.

Mr. Churchill: Well, there is another member who wants to shield behind the committee, and that committee was a hand picked committee. Why was that member for that party put on the committee? Why not the member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge)—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Churchill: —and we would have a different result.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. The hon. member's remarks are not relevant to the question now before the house.

Mr. Deschatelets: Why not the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer)?

Mr. Churchill: I am prepared to discuss the question before the house, but these interruptions occur and surely I am entitled to reply to them.

Mr. Scott: It was a cheap, scurrilous remark.

Mr. Churchill: Would the hon. member withdraw those remarks—cheap, scurrilous remark? Will the Speaker intervene on my behalf on this occasion?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I do not know to what remarks the hon. member is referring.

Mr. Churchill: Perhaps the Speaker did not hear. I don't know who the member was. Let him stand up and repeat that statement.

I heard it: Cheap and scurrilous remark. Has he the courage to stand up and say it?

Mr. Scott: I will be happy to repeat it. The hon. member who has just spoken said that I and probably some others have tried to shelter behind the committee. I say that the committee which chose this flag consisted of members of the house who worked long, honestly and sincerely, and any reflection on that committee such as the hon. member has just made is a cheap, scurrilous, political remark.

Mr. Churchill: I congratulate the hon. member on finally having the courage to stand up and say openly what he was mumbling so that Your Honour and other members could not hear.

Mr. Scott: If he did not hear, I will be happy to repeat it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre has the floor.

An hon. Member: The truth hurts.

Mr. Churchill: You can see how sensitive some people are with regard to these issues.

Mr. Scott: We would rather be sensitive than stupid.

Mr. Churchill: Perhaps Your Honour will hear those other interruptions. People are attempting to prevent me from speaking.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: But I know my rights in this house and I intend to continue. I was talking about the failure of leadership on the part of the Prime Minister in a matter which affects Canada so seriously. When I see that there is bitterness, that there is hurt, and that these things will not easily be forgotten, I ask this question: What is the next step which will be taken by the Prime Minister and by the Liberal party? They have ridden roughshod over the people in this country who respect Canada—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I must bring to the attention of the hon. member that his time has expired.

Mr. John R. Matheson (Leeds): Before addressing myself directly to the question before us I should like to refer to the remarks made by the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Saltsman) who spoke effectively, briefly and from the heart in a way which moved us all. I am sure the good wishes of all members of the house go to this new representative of an historic riding.

My friend the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Bigg) during his speech a little earlier in this debate talked about consistency. I would point out that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and a number of us who had the privilege of serving on the flag committee like to think that we have in fact been consistent. A number of years ago it was the policy of the Liberal party as, indeed, it was of other political parties, that a distinctive Canadian flag be adopted. During a general election in 1963—I am referring now to Liberal party policy—party literature was distributed in my own riding. Under the heading "Positive Canadianism" were these words:

> The new Liberal government will submit to parliament a design for a flag which cannot be mistaken for the emblem of any other country.

These words also appear:

> The union jack will be flown on appropriate occasions as a symbol of our membership in the commonwealth.

I would point out that in the sixth report of the flag committee we recommended the adoption of only one national flag. The vote was 14 to 0. I stress the word "national" because this word was used repeatedly in the course of our committee discussions. I think it is entirely consistent with the first purpose set out in the policy of the Liberal party—namely that we adopt a flag which cannot be mistaken for the emblem of any other country; in other words, a distinctive national flag.

Subsequently in the flag committee there was a motion to the effect that the government be authorized to take such steps as might be necessary to provide that the Canadian red ensign may continue to be flown as a symbol of Canada's membership in the commonwealth and of our allegiance to the crown. This was moved by my colleague the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman). I did not share this view, and I may say that within our committee and within party groups throughout the process of the six weeks deliberation a number of different viewpoints were expressed from time to time. I myself moved an amendment substituting the words "royal union flag generally known as the union jack" for the words "Canadian red ensign". This amendment carried by a vote of 7 yeas to 2 nays with 5 abstentions—and the members of the official opposition have indicated they abstained on the vote. The motion as amended then carried by a vote of 8 yeas, 1 nay with the same 5 abstentions.

I think therefore that the position we have taken as a party and the one I have taken personally is a position which has been entirely consistent. Perhaps it would be helpful to explain why I moved an amendment against the motion of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, to substitute the royal union flag for the suggested Canadian red ensign. I think it is clear that in the sixth committee report, the report which on Tuesday was adopted by this house in convincing

fashion, what we did was establish a national flag clearly distinguishable from the flag of any other country. I do not pay particular attention to comments with respect to its similarities to other flags; I can assure hon. members that the committee spent six weeks considering this matter very carefully. Incidentally the design finally approved was suggested as early as March, 1964, by a former lieutenant colonel in the army, a man with seven years historical training at Oxford; he is a Canadian with an exceptional academic background.

Why would it be inappropriate at this time to approve an amendment respecting the Canadian red ensign as the flag to denote our relation with the commonwealth and with the Queen? I think it is perfectly clear we wanted one national flag, not two; and the Canadian red ensign is, after all, the "Canadian" red ensign. If we brought this flag back now all we would be doing, in effect, would be to create two national flags.

We have heard a great deal of argument, particularly from the official opposition, that two flags are a mistake. I think it would be wrong certainly to have two national flags. However, I am not against several flags for different purposes. I think that is entirely proper. The hon. member for Athabasca referred to the flag of the Hudson's Bay Company. Many old companies have their own flags. The provinces have flags, in several cases, and a number of municipal corporations have their own flags. We know there is a NATO flag which occasionally flies here in Ottawa and elsewhere over our various headquarters. And there is, of course, the United Nations flag which, I am glad to say, flies over some schools in Brockville. This is a sign of the times. Flags serve various purposes. But surely it is our purpose to have one national flag. Many years ago we obtained permission to use the red ensign by an admiralty warrant granted on the 2nd day of February 1892. I have studied the communication that was sent to Evan MacGregor by the under secretary of state, colonial office, dated February 2, 1892, where they answer the query as to whether it would be possible for a warrant to be granted empowering ships of Canadian registry to fly the red ensign of the royal navy defaced with the arms of the dominion. Although there were strong objections to any defacement of the traditional sea flag, as a result of strong representation from Canada permission was in fact granted. May I read to the house the significant words of the admiralty warrant of that date. It says:

> Whereas we deem it expedient that Canadian registered vessels shall be permitted to wear the red ensign of Her Majesty's fleet with the Canadian coat of arms on the fly thereof.
>
> We do therefore by virtue of the power and authority vested in us hereby warrant and authorize the red ensign of Her Majesty's fleet with the Canadian coat of arms in the fly, to be used on board vessels registered in the dominion.

Perhaps because I was raised as a boy in Quebec city and spent a good deal of time, as a young fellow, on the water I have always been led to think that the merchant service flag is a sea flag. If anybody has any doubt in this matter I suggest that they read the important text "Flags of the World" edited by H. Gresham Carr, in which he sets out the various countries of the commonwealth that use the red ensign for specifically that purpose. I am not going to take any more of the time of the house to dwell on that aspect of the matter. However, Mr. Speaker, may I raise the question as to the proprieties, in contrast to the Canadian red ensign, of using the union jack for the specific purposes which have been set out in this report. May I refer to correspondence respecting the flag to be flown on land by British subjects. A letter was written by John F. Stedman of Ebenezer, Saskatchewan, Canada, March 11, 1911, to the secretary of His Imperial Majesty, King George V, in effect asking what flag was appropriate for Canadians to fly. The answer was given by L. Harcourt in a letter addressed to His Excellency, Right Hon. Earl Grey, G.C.M.G., C.G.V.O., etc. May I read to the house the substance of the communication which came from Downing street under the date May 21, 1912. This communication is to the Governor General, His Royal Highness, the Duke of Connaught and of Strathearn, K.G., K.T., K.P. It says:

> I have the honour to transmit to Your Royal Highness a copy of a letter from Mr. G. S. Hodgins in regard to the flag which should be used by private persons who are British subjects.
>
> 2. I should be glad if you would be good enough to cause Mr. Hodgins to be informed that the union flag is the national flag of Canada as of all other parts of His Majesty's dominions, and may be flown on land by all British subjects: and that the red ensign, with the arms of the dominion of Canada in the fly, is intended to be used only by Canadian merchant vessels.
>
> I have the honour to be,
> Sir,
> Your Royal Highness's most obedient,
> humble servant,
> L. Harcourt.

Perhaps my hon. friends on the opposite side will suggest that this is a little out of date, but I would point out to them that those members on the government side of the house who have been interested in this important matter for not only some weeks or months but indeed years have gone into this question rather thoroughly and have been advised by a great many authorities to which we referred that the union flag is an appropriate flag in these circumstances for any subject of Her Majesty anywhere in the commonwealth of nations. It is perfectly true, as certain hon. gentlemen have indicated, that in recent years it has become popularly thought of as the flag of the United Kingdom, but this is not legally its status.

May I give the house the view of a knowledgeable Canadian, Alan B. Beddoe, O.B.E., who served for some years as commander in the navy and has done a great deal of research on this subject. His views are expressed in this way:

> In the first place, the so-called "union jack" is actually a "royal badge", usually applied to a banner or flag, or as an "augmentation of honour" to certain coats of arms...It is today one of Her Majesty's personal badges. It is not, as is erroneously thought by many, the flag of all British people everywhere, in spite of its long and unauthorized use in this way. Since its advent on January 1, 1801, no permission has been given by the crown for the public at large to display it, except by King George V in 1933, when His late Majesty declared that the "union" might be flown publicly on the national day and on the King's birthday, the national day in this case being St. George's day and St. Andrew's day. The "union" is not the national flag of the United Kingdom, as many are prone to believe, for the simple fact is that the United Kingdom has no national flag. England has one, and Scotland, but not the U.K.

This is perhaps a purist view, but we are hearing here the opinion of a recognized authority on the matter. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to something that has come to us under the hand of Sir Anthony Wagner, Garter, Principal King of Arms, under date May 26, 1964. After all, he is Her Majesty's highest heraldic authority; it is his responsibility to offer advice on these matters. I think that what he says here tends to confirm in general what we have read in various flag texts as, for instance, the Observer's "Book of Flags", wherein it is stated that the union jack now is commonly used as the flag of the United Kingdom and a flag of the commonwealth of nations. Sir Anthony Wagner puts it this way:

> The difference between the arms of England and the St. George's cross, or between the present royal standard and union flag is not a difference of ownership, but a difference in the uses to which they are applied by the sovereign to whom they alike belong.
>
> One sometimes sees a distinction drawn in this context between the sovereign and the nation, on the lines that the royal standard is the sovereign's flag but the union the nation's. Such a distinction is alien to our constitution. For us the sovereign is the representative of the nation and the nation has and can have no flag but the sovereign's.

That is the view of Sir Anthony Wagner namely that the union flag is the flag of the sovereign. I listened carefully to my friend the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) last night and I thought he made a very logical and compelling address on this matter. I think one might reasonably contend that we do not need any symbol of commonwealth association to prove our loyalties to this commonwealth family of nations, and indeed the flag which we have selected as our national flag is a perfectly appropriate banner and will always be so regarded as an indication of the devotion of loyal Canadians, to the sovereign of Canada.

A few minutes ago we heard a respected privy councillor in this house who had served in world war I, and I believe in world war II as well, speaking feelingly with respect to symbols of the past. I am not in his age group; I am perhaps in between being old and being young. I am sure that for my children the Canadian flag alone would be quite adequate, but I believe there are many Canadians who will want this other symbol, the union jack preserved. Certainly in our churches, Legion halls and places like this there will be a great wish to preserve some precious symbol of this association which we value and treasure.

In conclusion, I would point out this interesting fact relating to flags authorized in war. On June 3, 1963, question No. 142 asked the government:

> What flags, or flags, were flown by the armed forces of Canada in world war I and world war II, and upon what authority?

The answer with respect to world war I is quite categorical: "The Canadian army flew the union jack." I am quite prepared to concede that there may have been occasions when other flags were flown, but this was the official answer. With regard to world war II the answer was:

> The union flag (jack) which was the flag officially prescribed in king's regulations and orders, 1939, for the Canadian army until superseded by the Canadian red ensign.

Hon. members will, of course, recall that on January 22, 1944 the Liberal government

made provision for the Canadian red ensign to be flown by all units of the Canadian army serving with the forces of other nations.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is surely not the case of tearing down the Canadian red ensign. I am sure that we have enough wisdom and reverence for the past that at commemorative ceremonies and at places hallowed in the memories of those who fought in world wars I and II we will drape both flags at appropriate sites of remembrance. But as a continuing recollection of our British associations, of which we are so proud, I am sure that many of us will be very happy—certainly the people in Leeds constituency, which is a noted United Empire Loyalist community, will be—about flying with our new Canadian flag the old union flag of our sovereign. I think that in my constituency the union jack will always fly, and I am sure in other parts of Canada this will be so, as well.

I know we have heard expressions from certain members which indicate that this would not be acceptable to them. However, I would ask my good friends from the province of Quebec, who are not on this side but on the other side of the house, those not sympathetic to this view, to remember that being generous is the only way to build this nation. I think the French speaking people in Canada are as generous, as understanding and as sympathetic as any of us. Perhaps this is one of the characteristics of an ethnic minority. Perhaps they are more sensitive, more kindly, and more understanding of the feelings of others. So in order not to perpetuate two national flags I would ask hon. members to vote down this amendment and be prepared to show a generous support for an ancient banner, which has been described by Sir Anthony Wagner and the authorities to whom I have referred as being a royal badge.

Mr. Pugh: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Matheson: Yes, certainly.

Mr. Pugh: I just want him to clear up one point. The hon. member was talking about the older people and he referred to the Legion and to churches and said they might want to fly a flag. To which flag is the hon. member referring?

Mr. Matheson: On every official building under the control and auspices of the Canadian government—for example post offices, armouries and buildings like that—naturally our national flag would fly. But I agree that there are many occasions when the union flag could be flown; in some places it will continue to fly anyway. We are not going to find much change regarding the flying of the union jack, which I think is a good thing. In this connection, I cannot imagine the Carleton county home making any change.

May I point out in reply to the proposition of my hon. friend that there is a theory with respect to flags to the effect that a flag once in existence never really ceases to exist. My children go to a Gaelic college every summer and the flag flown there is always the St. Andrew's cross. I have friends who regularly attend the St. George's society, and the flag they fly is still the fine old flag of England. I am sure that in other places we will find the historic old flag of France. These flags are flown for a particular and peculiar purpose. The union flag has special recognition accorded to it in the permissive terms of the motion, but it does not conflict with or in any way diminish the importance of our national flag. This is exactly in accordance with the hopes and aspirations of King George V as he indicated in conversations prior to his death. I have as authority for that one Lewis Grant McNab, 4250 Sherbrooke street west, Montreal 6, Quebec, if the hon. member is interested.

Mr. Pugh: I just wanted a short answer to my question, Mr. Speaker. I did mention the Legion and churches. The hon. member also mentioned the older people, shall we call them the older generation, and contrasted them with the young people. Is he suggesting that the royal union flag should be flown over Legions?

Mr. Matheson: By the law of our Canadian realm a subject is free to fly any flag he wishes so long as it does not convey an erroneous message. I submit that, in those circumstances, that liberty is not being interfered with by the action we are taking. The clause creates a special permissive use and gives us a guide as to what is appropriate with regard to any occasion relating to our British connection or to Her Majesty.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak in this debate, and our group had agreed not to delay further the discussion on the amendment proposed by the Conservative party concerning the red ensign.

But after the Conservative leader told us that we must absolutely continue this debate until at least six o'clock, I would like to take a few minutes to state once more the views

of our party concerning this amendment which was moved by the Conservatives.

First of all, I thought that after such a long fight to obtain a distinctive national flag the government would rest after such a painful labour without making a mess of everything and giving new headaches to the house with its second resolution, by endeavouring to have us accept through the back door a second flag for Canada.

Everyone knows our views on this matter. Every time we spoke on the flag issue, we plainly stated that we wanted only one distinctive national flag for Canada.

That is the fight we led throughout. We were accused of supporting the party in power in order to ensure the success of that idea. We did not accept anything, either from the party in power or from any other group. We merely defended the views of our constituents, the views of our province, and we finally accepted the opinion of the majority of the house, and we were very happy in doing so. I must congratulate the Conservative members who accepted the vote; I heard some this afternoon say that they accepted the decision of the majority, and I am happy to congratulate them for that.

I sincerely hope that this new flag will bring complete unity in Canada from one ocean to the other. I deplore that the Prime Minister and his government have brought forth this second resolution which was disapproved during our discussions on this second resolution dealing with a second flag, under the pretext that it would show our membership in the commonwealth nations.

In this respect I believe that the Conservative amendment does not make any more sense than the proposal of the Prime Minister concerning the adoption of the union jack, while the Conservatives propose the red ensign. Where is the difference between the two?

The union jack would bring back the memories of the colonialism we rejected in 1945 after the developments which then occurred. I congratulate those men who then set aside the union jack in order to adopt a new flag which was accepted at that time—namely, the red ensign. Today, there are those who would bring us back to the days of colonialism. We refuse to accept this.

The Conservative party offers us the red ensign which has been flying over Canada for the last 24 years. I am not ready to admit that the Conservatives are really wrong. As a matter of fact, I believe that the red ensign would more adequately represent our membership in the commonwealth than the union jack, since the red ensign, if it were approved, is, at least, a commercial flag, and would therefore stand for our commercial and military union with the other commonwealth countries. Neither would I say that the Conservatives are wrong in comparison with the Liberals, because I think that even if parliament were to accept the Conservative suggestion and retain the red ensign, that flag would be more acceptable than the union jack.

The red ensign, which was accepted in 1945, has just been put aside by parliament —which does not mean that we spurn it, nor indeed, the union jack—because this country is entering a new period of evolution in order to grow and attain a new status in the eyes of the world.

We were glad to accept this evolution, as were the parliamentarians of 1945 when they accepted the red ensign as a symbol of a new evolution in Canadian politics. We were very pleased with this evolution. We always worked in that direction, and we supported the government with all our might so that the single red maple leaf flag might become a reality throughout Canada.

Now, it has become a reality, and we are proud of that. I congratulate all members of the House of Commons who now support the decision of the committee, for I am not ready to say, as some claim, that this is a government flag. No, far from it. This is the flag of the committee specifically appointed to choose a design. We have agreed with the committee proposals to the effect that we accept this design.

Therefore, it is not the flag of one party in particular. It is the flag that stands for the national concept. We represent here the Canadian nation as a whole, the people of all provinces. We have had a majority vote and, as in all sound democracies, we must accept the wish of the majority, and this was accepted by most. I find there are but a few exceptions, people who have probably been in politics too long to keep pace with the evolution now taking place. That is somewhat the impression I get from those who are telling us today: we do not accept this flag.

I blame those old people who lack the required flexibility to get behind our new nation, which has taken a real step towards an evolution that will prove beneficial to the Canadian people.

As I said, if the house could accept a second flag to show our membership in the commonwealth of nations—I am saying if

parliament could accept, could order—because I believe that parliament does not have the necessary powers to dictate anything to the commonwealth of nations, no more than this parliament has the power to impose a flag on NATO or the United Nations—it is up to the council of the commonwealth of nations to select an emblem for itself, and if and when they do make a selection we will accept it as we have accepted all the emblems of the organizations to which Canada belongs.

I have yet to see this parliament refuse to accept the emblem of the organizations which Canada has voluntarily and deliberately joined. When we reach the stage where such a decision should be taken, when all commonwealth countries will have decided upon a flag, no matter if it is the British flag, the red ensign or another one, it will be up to them and not to us to make such a decision, for we are not even entitled to decide upon such a matter. Why then is the Prime Minister and his cabinet so bent on doing something which we are not empowered to do? What strikes me and startles me is to see our governors so determined to take the place of others and decide for them while they are only associated with other countries composing the British commonwealth, countries who have to decide for themselves what emblem they should have.

I am not against an emblem representing all commonwealth countries or the commonwealth partnership. And I am also very proud to see the United Nations flag. We accepted it without the slightest action on the part of parliament, just as we do not need any legislation in order to accept the emblem for all commonwealth countries. I maintain that it does not rest with the Canadian parliament to choose this emblem.

I heard my friends opposite suggest that the union jack has always been considered generally as the flag of the commonwealth of nations. I would ask them to show me at least the resolution carried by all commonwealth countries which have agreed to recognize the union jack as the emblem of the commonwealth. If they are able to show it to me, I will be the first to follow them; but if they are unable to do that, we will maintain that the union jack represents England, which is our ally within the commonwealth. If, one day, it is decided to choose an emblem for the commonwealth, we will support it willingly, without need for regulations or laws. We will willingly support the decision of the commonwealth, as we accept the decisions of all the associations of which Canada is a member.

Mr. Speaker, in short, we do not support the Conservatives' amendment, not because it is weaker than the government's resolution, because in itself, the Conservatives' argument is stronger, but mostly for this reason: if the government lacks the power to propose the resolution, it also lacks the power to legislate on the amendment. The decision is not up to the government. We shall not support the amendment nor the resolution for the same reasons, because we feel that it is the responsibility of the leaders of the countries within the commonwealth of nations to select their own symbol. It is in that light that we consider the situation.

As for the second reason, to indicate our allegiance to the crown, we claim that if the Queen of England remains the queen of that country under the folds of the flag of England, why then would the Queen of Canada not remain the Queen of our country under the folds of the distinctive Canadian flag? Why again take a flag from our English friends to show the allegiance of Canada to their Queen? If the union jack can represent the allegiance of the English people to their sovereign, I maintain that our flag can indicate our allegiance to the Queen of Canada. Why was it chosen, if it is unable to represent us?

Mr. Speaker, this is all I wanted to say about the Conservative amendment and, for the above-mentioned reasons, we will not support the amendment nor the resolution which should never have been introduced, because it only spreads more confusion.

[*Text*]

Mr. Ralph Cowan (York-Humber): Mr. Speaker, it is now a quarter after five, and I realize that this house will rise at six o'clock. I desire to make some comments at this time, but I should like to point out sincerely that I have no intention or any desire to prevent a vote being taken on the amendment before the house. I realize that there are a large number of members in this house now in western Canada paying their last respects, not only to a late senator of this country, but paying tribute and honour to two sons and a nephew who are members of this house. I understand that a vote will not be taken under any circumstances today, and I admire the members of the house for their fine show of magnanimity and spirit in this connection. I, therefore, am prepared to make a few remarks on this amendment today knowing that

when I speak I am not deliberately postponing a vote. I sincerely hope that the comments I have to make will be received in the spirit in which they are uttered.

I am a Presbyterian, Mr. Speaker, whose family has lived for almost 200 years in the valleys of the Ottawa and St. Lawrence rivers. We first came into this country in 1792 by coming down the Richelieu from Vermont, following the American revolution, and the family spread down the Richelieu to its mouth, and up and down the St. Lawrence and the Ottawa, ultimately as far as Shawville. I am proud to say that my mother, who is still living at 85 years of age, was a cousin of the late Senator Ralph Byron Horner. We all came out of the Ottawa valley together. The fact that the senator was named Ralph Byron Horner, that one of our members here is Ralph Horner and my name is Ralph Cowan is no coincidence. There has been marriage and intermarriage up and down the Ottawa, up and down the St. Lawrence and our people know one another. All of these people lived on both sides of these three grand rivers, the Richelieu, the St. Lawrence and the Ottawa.

Now, when I tell you I am a Presbyterian, I should like to point out that since I was first elected to the house the members have been kind enough to make me a member of the private bills committee on two different occasions. I have found it very interesting to deal with the business coming before that committee. Amongst the bills coming before it have been bills involving religious denominations. In every case, those who were intensely interested in the subject of a bill took an interest in seeing it passed through the committee and then through the house. Those whose religion was slightly different remained quiet and provided the necessary majority for their friends who wished to have some work done.

I make no apology, when discussing an amendment to the flag resolution, for referring to these religious incorporations which have come before the private bills committee, and for this very simple reason. I believe that most men and women hold their religious convictions and their patriotic feelings practically on the same plane. The congregations to which I have belonged in the past—and at the present time I am a member of Victoria Presbyterian church in west Toronto—honour the battle flags of many battalions by enshrining them in the sanctuaries of the churches. I refer to this fact to show you that there is an intermingling of the spirit of patriotism and religious fervor that you cannot separate, and God help the country where the two are ever rent asunder.

As a Presbyterian working on the private bills committee, I had the honour of helping to pass through the house a bill regarding the Canadian conference of the Brethren in Christ Church, which received royal assent on June 18, 1964. During the discussion in committee on that bill, those of other than the Roman Catholic faith took part quite actively, and it received the assent the sponsors so greatly desired. Then, we had another bill coming before the committee which received royal assent on September 16, 1964, one respecting the Congregation of the Marist Sisters, who were transferring their headquarters from the province of New Brunswick to the city of Hull in Quebec. When the private bills committee met on two separate occasions, I regret to advise the house that we did not have a quorum. I, a Presbyterian, went out in the highways and byways as we have been instructed to do in the Bible and brought in a quorum. The quorum came in and this bill was discussed in great detail by those greatly interested in the work of the Congregation of the Marist Sisters. It was beautiful to see the feeling that existed between the members of the committee, in that there was no criticism of that bill by other than Roman Catholics, and the Roman Catholic supporters then put their bill through and had majority support all the way.

Again, in the private bills committee, we had a bill come forward known as The Good News Broadcasting Association of Canada, Bill S-17. This was a bill that was of the greatest possible interest to Protestants on the committee, and I can only report honestly that there was quite a bit of discussion on that bill. This discussion took place entirely among Protestant members of the committee. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) and myself took an active stand in the matter, and the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) was opposed to our attitude, but the Good News Broadcasting Association bill did not receive assent. It did not get third reading in the house due to the discussion engaged in by Protestant members of the committee, and I stand here and publicly thank the Roman Catholic members of that committee, and those of other religious faiths, who provided the necessary quorum, and the necessary votes; and the action that a majority wanted to see taken, was taken.

You may remember that the matter came up right on the floor of the house—

Canadian Commonwealth Flag

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I realize the hon. member's remarks are introductory in nature, but the introduction is getting rather long and I would ask him to get to the meat of the subject.

Mr. Cowan: Sir, I thank you for the reference to the introduction that I wish to make. Might I have this extra paragraph? I have mentioned that I am a Presbyterian. Some people call us continuing Presbyterians but I do not use that title. Some Presbyterians prior to 1924 discontinued and joined the United Church, but the Presbyterians went right on as they had been going for generations.

In 1924 on the floor of the House of Commons a bill was presented for the incorporation of the United Church of Canada. I was 22 years of age at the time, and I wish to state with all the sincerity I possess that I never held the parliament of Canada in higher esteem than at that time. We were told that the Roman Catholic members of the Canadian House of Commons practically withdrew from the house when the bill to incorporate the United Church of Canada was brought forward. Feelings ran very, very high but they were not feelings between those of the Catholic faith and those of other denominations. The feelings were in the other denominations.

I checked this point at the supper hour last night with the former hon. member for Marquette, Manitoba, hon. Senator T. A. Crerar, now in his eighty eighth year, and asked him if I was not correct in my understanding that in 1924, when the United Church of Canada Act was passed through the house, the Roman Catholic members stood aside.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Chair is prepared to be lenient with the hon. member but I would ask him to be relevant to the question before the house.

Mr. Cowan: Thank you, sir. I will say that my preface has been completed. Senator Crerar confirmed the opinion that I had, and that many millions of people had at that time.

Now I come to the meat of the subject. I am one who cast a vote in the house, when there were very few members present during discussion of private bills, to change the name of T.C.A. to Air Canada. I am the one who cast the deciding vote in the railway committee to have two French Canadians on the board of directors of the Ottawa Terminal Railway Company.

[Mr. Cowan.]

Mr. Fisher: We helped you; we were there too.

Mr. Cowan: I said I am one. The vote was 8 to 7, but I had people come to me and say, "Cowan, we did not expect you to vote that way." I think that is enough for a preface.

The hon. member for Mégantic (Mr. Langlois), who was a member of the flag committee, spoke in the house last night and, as recorded at page 11156 of *Hansard*, he stated, in connection with the deliberations of the flag committee:

> —I can even say that the selection of such a flag brought tears to the eyes of many.

I believe the hon. member for Mégantic wholeheartedly when he makes that report. I know it to be a fact also that there were tears in the eyes of many not on the flag committee. It was nice to know members of the committee were that much affected by the emotions of patriotism.

The hon. member for Mégantic went on to say:

> On the other hand, today we are presented with a flag which has so many ties for some groups across the country that it is intended to impose it as a second flag—

As a member of the house, as one who admires those members who use another tongue than mine, as one who has lived in peace and amity with them all my life, and will live on in that spirit for the remainder of the years which the Lord may give me, I, in all sincerity, in a question involving as much emotion as patriotism and in a question which, as the hon. member for Mégantic said, did bring tears to the eyes of the members of the flag committee—and I can assure you it brings tears to the eyes of many citizens of the Dominion of Canada—wish to make a request.

We had the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer) rise in his place the other night, a member of the official opposition, and ask the cabinet to impose the rule of closure. We have had the Prime Minister of this country rise in his place and ask if members of the House of Commons would not consider, if they could not vote for the one leaf flag design, to refrain from voting so, as he put it, there would not be a mark showing they had voted against what he stated at that time would be the national flag of Canada within short order.

We had voted in the House of Commons for a distinctive new national flag. If it is passed by the Senate by this time it is the official national flag of Canada today, and

it will be so honoured by the residents of the dominion. Now we have the opportunity of voting on a second flag. This was not my idea. The idea of two flags was introduced on May 28 and the resolution was divided into two on June 15. We are now considering the report of a flag committee that has recommended that there be two flags, and on the seventh report of that committee an amendment has been moved that the Canadian red ensign be chosen as a flag to show our allegiance to the British crown and our loyalty to the commonwealth.

The hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Pigeon) has been frank enough to state publicly on the floor of the house that he will not be voting on the amendment. I ask those French speaking Canadians who are members of the House of Commons if they will not seriously consider the action of those members of the House of Commons, in 1924, who absented themselves from the house? The total vote at that time was 148 out of a membership of 235, and those members allowed the question of a Protestant denomination being newly incorporated to be decided by that element in the house.

Now we are into a situation where speaker after speaker has referred to the union jack as a foreign flag. They refer to it as the flag of England. They refer to it as the flag of Great Britain, and others refer to it as the flag of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland. We who love the two flags that have flown over this country in the past, and which are still unfurled to the breeze, ask those of our compatriots in the house who are so wholeheartedly in favour of the one maple leaf flag, which the House of Commons has declared to be the official national flag of Canada and which will be so honoured in the future by all citizens, to abstain from voting and allow us who love the two old flags and hold them so dear, to make the decision to show which shall be the flag demonstrating our allegiance to the crown and our membership in the British commonwealth of nations.

I have never asked any favour of any man. I find it hard to ask a favour tonight but I would remind you, of the words of Burke, who, when speaking on the subject known today as conciliation with America said:

> Magnanimity in politics is not seldom the truest wisdom.

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire to hold up in any way the proceedings in the debate on this amendment, but I did not speak in the debate on the first part of the flag question and I think I might be permitted to say a few words at this time.

I have been distressed at the perseverance of some members of the house in their abusive attitude towards the fairly chosen selection of the flag committee which was approved by the house the other night. I thought, therefore, I would speak for a minute or so today. I do so, though my remarks do not represent the ripened fruits of meditation; I have not had the opportunity to give much time to the consideration of exactly what I would say. Nevertheless there are certain views I would express.

For Canada I see shadows, clouds and darkness if the efforts of some to divide this country are not abandoned. I can understand that in the highly emotional atmosphere which existed during the first part of this flag debate feelings could easily carry one away. But now we have come to the second part of the resolution we should, I think, all attempt to take a broad view of the situation, and seek to reach a decision on a suitable second flag to mark our commonwealth connection with singular unanimity and enthusiasm. It seems to me unfortunate that the house should appear to be divided on the question of whether the union jack or the red ensign would best serve our country for this purpose. While I am of Irish descent myself I do not accept the proposition that any member of this house holds any higher regard for our historic relationship with the British isles and with Britain. In Nova Scotia, which is my province, we have always been closer to England than have some other parts of this country because of our geographical proximity, because most of the inhabitants of our province are of British descent and because of our close and historic trade ties. Joseph Howe, whom I will quote later in my remarks, said more than a hundred years ago that loyalty to our British connection is, in Nova Scotia, an enduring sentiment. And I think it remains an enduring sentiment today some 120 years after his remark was made.

I am quick to admit I would have had difficulty in voting for the selection of a totally distinctive and new Canadian flag if the union jack was not also to be recognized by this legislation. I was in this position: I felt we did need a distinctive flag, one which could not be mistaken in any part of the world for the flag of another country, but at the same time all my background and

all my Nova Scotian sentiment favoured the reflection in some symbol of this country of a continuing connection with our mother country. I believe that the union jack which has been selected as the symbol of our commonwealth connection serves this purpose admirably. In these circumstances I felt I could vote for the selection of a distinctive flag. I believe most Nova Scotians would agree with me that we should have some symbol of our association with the commonwealth. I also believe that many Nova Scotians agree there is a need for a totally distinctive Canadian flag. In this regard I would quote the words of the hon. Robert L. Stanfield, premier of Nova Scotia, for whom I have great respect, although he is not of the same political faith as myself. Speaking on April 6, he said:

> Surely, however, it is not necessarily patriotic for me to insist that something I value highly must be adopted as a national symbol if it is objectionable as a national symbol to a large number of Canadians. Surely the Canadian thing for us to do is to find symbols which are mutually acceptable. Let us emphasize what we have in common. Surely we could have a national anthem and a flag which unites Canada.

Those were the words of the premier of Nova Scotia and while I do not dare speak for him I should be surprised if he, like many Nova Scotians, did not feel there is a place for a commonwealth flag, a flag which does show our tradition and our history.

In the course of a few minutes I will deal with the question whether that role is best fulfilled by the union jack or by the red ensign. Let me say that the selection of a distinctive flag is another step, although an important one, in the development of our nation, even as the change from the almost universal use of the union jack to a partial use of the red ensign was an earlier step. I had the opportunity of spending four weeks in the British House of Commons last spring in connection with the commonwealth parliamentary association and I came back from that visit with, if anything, even stronger feelings about our association with Britain than I previously felt. I treasure our relationship with the mother country and I do not accept the view that the use of a distinctive Canadian flag will in any way lessen those feelings or dishonour our relationship.

Let us now consider why we should choose the union jack rather than the red ensign. In the first place, the red ensign has been the Canadian flag since 1945 when it was adopted by order in council. The union jack has been the flag recognized as the symbol of the empire, and subsequently of the commonwealth, across the world from a much earlier date than that. The selection of the union jack would, I suggest, perpetuate our association with the British isles. The red ensign is a variation of that flag. I have no strong feelings on the question of whether the red ensign or the union jack should be the commonwealth flag. But on balance, after weighing the arguments in each direction, I have no difficulty in making my choice in favour of the union jack. If we wish to retain a symbol of all our past, of all the years of our past, what better symbol could there be than the flag which flew here on this hill in 1867, long before the red ensign had come ashore? At that time the union jack was the flag which reigned in Canada, as it was for a large part of our history. So if we are to choose a symbol of our past, why choose something which is a symbol of only part of our past? Why not designate the flag which flew at the time of confederation—a flag which to this day is used in my province, I would say, more widely than is the red ensign. I think the same is true of the other maritime provinces.

The red ensign, though of more recent vintage, deserves honour and respect. But even the words of the order in council at the time it was adopted show that it was to be of a transitory nature. On the other hand the union jack has always been flown in this country. It was under this flag that British justice and British culture spread across the world creating the political climate under which free nations such as Canada have been able to grow and prosper. I think it more fitting that the union jack should be selected as the flag symbolizing our ties with the commonwealth. The hopes and aspirations of the people who founded this federation were fulfilled under the union jack.

These are the few words I wanted to say on this subject today, Mr. Speaker. In common with all members of this house, I am sure, I am extremely grateful to the many Canadians who took the time and trouble to write to us during the months the flag question was topical in this nation, to express their views and help us in reaching our decisions. I received many letters on this subject. There were many letters that favoured the selection of a totally new flag, many that favoured the retention of the red ensign, many that favoured other designs. With regard to those who wrote to me in favour of the red ensign or the retention of a flag that

contained the union jack, I hope they will in time see, as I honestly feel, that we are right and that their purpose and desire to not tear away the ties of history is best expressed by the adoption of the union jack as the commonwealth flag; but that as a great and growing nation of citizens of many races we need and badly need, a flag which will be recognized in all parts of the world as nothing but Canadian.

Speaking of the people who did write to me on this subject and specifically those who favoured the red ensign. I know that many of them, as is the case with many of my good friends on the Conservative side of the house, had strong, honest, sincere and deep feelings on the matter. On the day we had the flag vote, I received from a friend of mine, with whom I grew up from early boyhood, a telegram which read:

> It is not right that the red ensign which is treasured and loved by so many Canadians throughout the country should be taken from us.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Regan: Yet, while I honour his views I feel that had he been here and had the opportunity to participate in this parliament and spend two or more years in Ottawa, his views of the nation as it exists, how it is evolving and where it is going might have been different. I hope he will find as time passes that what he is concerned about, namely not abandoning our past, is dealt with adequately by our legislation with reference to the union jack.

My final words will be in support of a suggestion that has been made by two or three members who spoke about the red ensign in the general debate on the first part of the resolution. I agree that the ensign did serve as this country's flag for a period of time, and when the legislation on the flag passes the Senate and comes into force and the ensign is lowered from the tower of this building, let it be done in dignity and let it then be conveyed with pomp and ceremony to an appropriate site of permanent honour.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I see that the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) wants to take the floor, and during the few moments I have I would like to set forth a few ideas.

As most hon. members know, I was chosen to represent my party on the flag committee. I took part in the discussions of the committee and I had to take a stand on several occasions. It is precisely about that stand that I wish to speak briefly for a few minutes.

By concurring in the sixth report, we voted for a distinctive national flag, and as far as I am concerned, I am convinced that it is our distinctive national flag which will remain.

I must pay a tribute for that to the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), and those who followed him in this venture, for it was really a venture. I also want to pay a tribute to him for having had the courage, at this stage of Canadian history, to initiate those talks and, even at the risk of being the only French Canadian to support the second proposal, namely to adopt this emblem of our membership in the commonwealth, I will do it, if it were only to prove to the other members of the committee that I keep my word, that I abide by the opinions I set forth, and somehow to show them my unique faith in the circumstances. On the other hand, I would not like my words to be construed as meaning that this profession of faith or of opinion merely expresses my gratitude to the government or is inspired by the fact that at any time during the debate, I might have come to an arrangement with the government.

Far from it, but in the light of everything that has been said during those long debates and, as the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) explained so well a while ago, perhaps the government did not need a symbol to represent our allegiance to the commonwealth. I hope that Canada will take the initiative—I know that the right hon. Prime Minister is able to do so—to suggest at the next conference of the commonwealth which should take place very soon, the adoption of a symbol which could help the countries of the commonwealth to join in a trade bloc, because after all the commonwealth is, for all practical purposes, an economic union comparable to the union of South American states and that of European countries which is known as the common market.

It might be useful and wise for all these countries to unite and adopt a symbol to identify them and draw them closer in the policies they wish to adopt and implement.

Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, we are asked today to adopt a symbol of our membership in the commonwealth, which symbol I expect will only be temporary, because in years to come we will probably see this very commonwealth adopt a symbol of its own and, ipso facto, the symbol we are asked to adopt today will automatically be replaced.

Mr. Speaker, I also feel that all Quebeckers, even if they think that this question of an emblem to represent our membership in the commonwealth perhaps is not so important and, after all, does not mean very much, will appreciate that for the rest of English speaking Canadians, it will possibly be easier for them to accept, in coming years, this new distinctive Canadian flag we adopted last Monday night. In fact, if in order to be able to accept it gradually and more easily, they have to keep some symbol, I feel that to a certain extent—and that is my personal opinion—it would ill beseem us to deny them the right to a symbol which might, for a little longer, remind them of their past and their attachment to the British empire.

As for us, in Quebec, I think that it leaves us somewhat cold, because many generations ago, we cut our links with our mother country, which was France at the very beginning. Besides, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that, on the matter of feelings toward our mother countries, the Quebec group is probably two generations ahead. In fact, I am sure that two generations ago, if we had wanted to choose a national and distinctive flag, it is very likely that the citizens of our province would have asked for a symbol of France on their flag.

But with the years, with the rising generations, such feelings have come to pass, and I am sure that with our present youth, and in the years to come, the new flag we have adopted will be accepted and will become something genuinely Canadian, while the symbol we want to accept at the present time, to indicate our membership, will gradually fall into oblivion and will be replaced by another symbol which will be selected by the commonwealth countries themselves.

Mr. Speaker, apart from England of course, Canada is the oldest commonwealth country, and I hope that Canada will be on the ground floor of such an initiative, without, however, exerting any undue pressure on any member of the commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment before the house suggests replacement of the union jack mentioned in the seventh report of the committee by the red ensign.

I for one would not have taken a strong stand in favour of one or the other, but when the decision was taken in the committee and I noticed that the division was so deep that there was danger of having to submit a minority report, I preferred to suport the resolution in favour of the union jack, so that a majority report could be submitted to the house. I do not regret my action at all.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the amendment under consideration my stand is as follows, and by this I am not binding any member of our party, since it was agreed at the beginning of the debate that everyone would be free to vote as he wishes. Personally, when the question was put to a vote in the committee, I voted in favour of the report as submitted to the house. I will take the same stand I then took and I will vote against the amendment moved by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming), because I definitely intend to support the resolution submitted by the committee.

An hon. Member: Question.

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I heard an hon. member say "Question".

According to the information we were given a while ago, no vote will be taken today, due to the absence of several Conservative members who wish to be present in this house when the vote is taken on their amendment.

I did not intend to speak on the seventh report of the flag committee dealing with a second flag, but after listening to the hon. members for Halifax (Mr. Regan) and York-Humber (Mr. Cowan), one suggesting that it is high time that we adopt a commonwealth flag, and the other asking that the French Canadians refrain from voting so as not to antagonize their English speaking fellow citizens, I thought I should make a few remarks.

I would only ask those people to give us the name of any member country in the British commonwealth of nations which, having a distinctive flag, has a second flag to show its allegiance to the crown or to the British commonwealth.

The British commonwealth of nations has no official flag. The union jack is the flag of England and not that of the British commonwealth of nations. Therefore, we cannot consider that flag today as the flag of the British commonwealth of nations. We would have no objection, however, if it were adopted as the flag of the British commonwealth of nations, provided it were so adopted by all member countries of that British community. We would have no objection to that.

But we do object to Canada having two flags. The mistake of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) was to place before us a resolution for the adoption of two flags, one to be flown every day of the week, the other

on Sundays. That is what the people do not understand.

A few moments ago the hon. member for Halifax was explaining to us the meaning of the union jack. We know and respect what it means. But we also respect what the red ensign stands for. We respect all it stands for.

But I believe that with our distinctive national flag we can, as Canadians—not as French Canadians or English Canadians, but as Canadians—show our membership in the British commonwealth of nations by using our own symbols.

Nobody in the world, no commonwealth country has adopted a second flag. In the last few years, we have seen small countries get their independence; their first action was to choose a distinctive national flag, but not a second or a third flag—they chose only one flag. And yet these countries have been members of the British commonwealth of nations from the very beginning.

We have no objection to the nations of this commonwealth meeting and adopting the union jack, if they wish, as the flag of the British commonwealth of nations. Then, I would be the first to vote in favour thereof, here in parliament.

Mr. Speaker, may I point out that it is six o'clock.

[*Text*]

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether hon. members would be agreeable to letting the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) complete his speech tonight, and not see the clock until his speech is concluded.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, if we were discussing something really earth shaking like the Canada labour code it might be a worthwhile venture. Otherwise I do not think so.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, December 17, 1964

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PERMISSION TO PHOTOGRAPH HOUSE WHILE IN SESSION

Mr. Speaker: I hope hon. members will not object if the national film board completes its project of taking one or two pictures during the next 15 minutes. Hon. members will recall that they gave consent for this educational project on November 27. These pictures are to be used in school classrooms and I am told there will not be much if any interruption.

PRIVILEGE

MR. HARKNESS—REPLIES BY PRIME MINISTER TO QUESTIONS IN HOUSE

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege which also affects the entire house. It concerns the memorandum sent by the Prime Minister to the Dorion commission in connection with the answers to questions which I directed to him on November 24. These appear on pages 10428 and 10429 of *Hansard* for that day, and I read the relevant questions and the Prime Minister's answers:

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister in order to clear up what appears to me to be an ambiguity, as I am sure it appears to other hon. members consequent upon some of the answers given to questions today. Was the Prime Minister informed by the Minister of Justice of any of the circumstances of this case, which is now going to be investigated, prior to those circumstances being brought out in this house yesterday?

Mr. Pearson: I think the Minister of Justice has dealt with this matter, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, the reason I asked the question is that it appeared from questions and answers that the Prime Minister had not been informed about his parliamentary secretary. It was not clear whether he had been informed about any of the other circumstances, and my question is this. Was he informed by the Minister of Justice in regard to any of the other circumstances of this case prior to those circumstances being brought to the attention of this house yesterday?

Mr. Pearson: I was informed by the Minister of Justice of some of the circumstances shortly before his estimates came before the house. He told me this matter would be before the house during the consideration of his estimates. He told me the facts of the matter. My parliamentary secretary, who has just resigned, has already indicated in his statement that he had not informed me of this matter until this morning.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's answer touched upon the ambiguity I mentioned, which was the reason for my question. When the Prime Minister said he was informed before the minister's estimates were put before the house, does he mean he was informed yesterday or a week ago? When was he informed?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I think I was informed on the day before his estimates were brought before the house.

—which would be Sunday, November 22. These questions and answers made it clear and definite that the Prime Minister had no knowledge of any of the circumstances—and I emphasize the word "any"—of this case until November 22.

In this morning's *Gazette* it is announced that yesterday the Prime Minister sent a memorandum which was read into the record of the Dorion commission. As it appears in the *Gazette* it reads as follows:

Mr. Pearson's memo filed with the inquiry said: During the evening of November 23 and the morning of November 24, I learned for the first time of the details of the allegations and of the contents of the R.C.M.P. report into the Rivard case.

As I told the house on November 24, I had not known until that day of the alleged involvement of my parliamentary secretary in this matter.

The member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) then asked me whether I was informed and, if so, when, of any of the other circumstances of this case prior to these matters being brought to the attention of the house November 23.

My answer on this point should be clarified. I made it clear that I first learned of the contents of the R.C.M.P. report shortly before the justice estimates were introduced November 23.

However, the Minister of Justice had informed me earlier, on September 2, that there were allegations of bribery involving the executive assistant (Denis) to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration; that these allegations were denied by the official in question; that they were being investigated by the R.C.M.P. upon the instructions of the Minister of Justice and with the knowledge, of course, of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration; and that the person in question had been sent on leave while the investigation was taking place.

Clearly those were the full and appropriate measures at that stage and they had been taken promptly. I was, therefore, content to wait for

the R.C.M.P. report of which, as I have already stated to the house, I was informed on November 23.

This statement is not, in my mind, a clarification but rather an admission that the information given to the house on November 24 was incorrect. I point out, Mr. Speaker, that had the correct information been given —that the Prime Minister was aware of the charges against Mr. Denis on September 2— I, and no doubt many other members, would have had further questions to ask him, and the whole course of the debate would have taken a quite different direction.

Not only has the house been misinformed and affronted in this way, but it has been further affronted by the Prime Minister not having made his new statement here, as he could have done at any time on a question of privilege rather than sending it in the form of a memorandum to the Dorion commission.

A further question of the Prime Minister's position vis-á-vis the House of Commons arises from the point of how long ago he realized he had made a misstatement to us, and thus how long he continued to leave us in ignorance as to the true facts.

This is a case, Mr. Speaker, which I think you should take under advisement.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): The hon. gentleman has raised a question of privilege which very definitely and directly concerns me; and I know, Mr. Speaker, that you will give me an opportunity to deal with it. I appreciate, if I may say so, the terms in which the hon. member raised the question.

Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to deny that I deceived the house in the answer I gave on November 24, either inadvertently or deliberately. When I answered the question on that day as put by the hon. gentleman concerning the circumstances surrounding this matter I was thinking of the circumstances surrounding the production of this report and the contents of this report in respect of members of parliament and others who were mentioned in the report.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Peters: The same as the uranium deal.

Mr. Pearson: Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but I am giving the facts of this matter without any reservation or qualification.

An hon. Member: Cover up.

Mr. Pearson: Perhaps members opposite would allow me to make my statement on this very serious matter without snide and smearing observations.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Howard: You are pretty thin-skinned over there.

An hon. Member: Oh, be quiet.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I left that afternoon for the west, and when I returned I was informed by the Minister of Justice that I had omitted to add some information which, while not in my mind dealing directly with the question of the report, with when it was received and with the contents of the report, concerned the background of the whole matter. I drafted a memorandum at that time which I had intended to read to the House of Commons when we got on to routine proceedings.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Speaker, that happens to be the truth.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: As hon. gentlemen know, the commission had been set up by the time I got back; the commission had been established and was about to commence its hearings. When the commission commenced its hearings last week and before the house reached motions, when these statements could be made, I realized that perhaps this matter would come up in evidence before the commission and that therefore I should tell the commissioner, as I did when I first met him on December 2 when he was appointed, that there was certain background information about my connection with this matter which should be in his hands. I sent him this memorandum without any request of any kind that it should be made public, but I felt he should have the information: As I said in my letter, I was going to make that information available to the house at the first opportunity.

I was entirely accurate when dealing with the circumstances of the matter in saying that I first heard of the R.C.M.P. report and of any of its contents on November 23. It is true, as I have already said, that the Minister of Justice mentioned to me on September 2, when we were on a plane returning from the Charlottetown conference, that there had been charges of bribery levelled against an official in a minister's office, that those charges had been denied and that the R.C.M.P. were investigating the charges. This seemed to me

the proper course of action to take. I must confess that the matter was then put in the back of my mind pending a report from the minister as to the result of that investigation. It is quite true that when I got on my feet on November 24 I had completely forgotten the earlier conversation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: Hon. gentlemen may laugh at that, Mr. Speaker, but it was a conversation on board a plane about a matter which was being investigated by a minister and the R.C.M.P., and I was informed that when the investigation had been completed I would be given the results. It is quite true that I did put the matter in the back of my mind from that time, and until November 23 I heard nothing further about it.

On November 24 I gave the house all the information I had—that I thought I had—at that time regarding the circumstances surrounding the production of this report and its contents. I am very sorry indeed, and I apologize to my hon. friend; because if I had had that matter in my mind at the time I would of course have added that information, even though it was relevant only to the original charge to the inquiry that was being made and not to the report of the police which I had not received at that time, or to the content of that report. I apologize for that omission; but believe me, Mr. Speaker, the information I gave was accurate, and I did not deceive the house in that information.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, if I might just say another word or two, the Prime Minister says he had forgotten he had been told this; but he has not told us and he has not explained to the house, and I think he has far from satisfied members, why when he remembered it—and he has not told us when he did remember it—he did not then make a clean breast of the whole matter in the House of Commons. Instead of that he said he told the commissioner about these particular facts on December 2 because by that time he knew this was going to come out in evidence.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we are still left in the position where the house has been kept in the dark. It was misinformed to begin with, and then it was kept in the dark ever since until it became apparent that it could not be kept in the dark any longer. I think this is a matter which Your Honour should take under advisement, and consider whether it should go to the committee on privileges and elections.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I entirely agree with the suggestion that Your Honour should take this matter under advisement and take any action which you see fit regarding it.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: May I ask, is this on the same subject?

Mr. Douglas: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I had intended to raise this matter on a question of privilege, but in view of the fact that the hon. member for Calgary North was the member whose questions were answered and he was directly affected by the replies, I was quite willing to give way to him. I am now rising on a question of privilege regarding the unsatisfactory nature of the answers we have received.

I think my point of privilege can be dealt with in two parts. The first is that the answers of the Prime Minister are completely unsatisfactory. The questions which were asked on November 24 by the hon. member for Calgary North had nothing to do with whether or not the Prime Minister was aware of the charges contained in the R.C.M.P. report or any of the allegations contained therein. Nor had it anything to do with information regarding the involvement of his parliamentary secretary. Those two questions had been answered the same day but prior to these answers. The three questions which were put in succession by the hon. member for Calgary North, as reported at page 10429 of *Hansard*, had to do with whether the Prime Minister had been informed "about any of the other circumstances". The answer of the Prime Minister was clear and succinct. First of all he said he had been informed only shortly before the justice estimates came before the house. His second reply was:

> —I think I was informed on the day before his estimates were brought before the house.

In view of the statement of the Prime Minister to the effect that when he gave that reply he had forgotten that on September 2 these matters had been revealed to him, it would seem to me that if on November 22, the day before the estimates were brought to the house, the Minister of Justice had informed the Prime Minister that he had the R.C.M.P. report in his possession and that it contained serious allegations regarding certain persons, surely that would have refreshed his memory about the conversation which had

taken place on September 2. Therefore I find it extremely difficult to understand how the Prime Minister on November 24 could make the categorical assertion that he knew nothing about any of the other circumstances regarding the Rivard case until the day before the estimates were introduced in the house.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this is completely at variance with the statement filed by the Prime Minister with Chief Justice Dorion. This statement is attached to a letter which, if I may quote in part, says:

> I had hoped that before now I would have been able to make a short statement on this aspect of the matter to the House of Commons, but the procedural situation made that impossible.
>
> I hope that very shortly the procedural difficulties will be removed, but meanwhile I am attaching to this letter a copy of what I had hoped to say before now, as I think you may wish to have it before the inquiry opens tomorrow.
>
> Yours sincerely,
> L. B. Pearson.

The memorandum which is attached is dated December 14 and is entitled "Statement by the Prime Minister". It is in the following terms:

> This is my first opportunity to report to the house on the judicial inquiry which, as I mentioned three weeks ago on November 24, would investigate allegations that had been made concerning possible bribery and improper pressures in relation to the extradition case involving one Lucien Rivard.

The relevant paragraphs, Mr. Speaker, are these:

> The member for Calgary North then asked me whether I was informed and, if so, when, of any of the other circumstances of this case prior to these matters being brought to the attention of the house on November 23.
>
> My answer on this point should be clarified. I made it clear that I first learned of the contents of the R.C.M.P. report shortly before the justice estimates were introduced on November 23. However, the Minister of Justice had informed me earlier, on September 2, that there were allegations of bribery involving the executive assistant to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration; that these allegations were denied by the official in question; that they were being investigated by the R.C.M.P. upon the instructions of the Minister of Justice, and with the knowledge, of course, of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration; and that the person in question had been sent on leave while the investigation was taking place.

My first point, Mr. Speaker, is that if the statement which the Prime Minister filed with Chief Justice Dorion is correct, then the statements made by him on November 24 as reported at page 10429 of *Hansard* are incorrect, and the house was consequently misled by the Prime Minister regarding the statements he made at that time.

My second point of privilege is that the Prime Minister has had over three weeks in which to refresh his memory and make a correction in the House of Commons. It is not correct, as he says in his letter to the chief justice, that the procedural situation made that impossible or that there were procedural difficulties which he hoped would be removed. Mr. Speaker, there were no procedural difficulties, because any member at any time can rise in his place on a question of privilege. As a matter of fact, during the past two weeks several members at various times have risen on questions of privilege. There was nothing to prevent the Prime Minister from correcting this matter and correcting his statements of November 24. If he found that his memory had been defective with respect to the replies he made to the hon. member for Calgary North he could at any time after his return from his trip west have risen in his place and told the house that he had been in error, and set the matter right.

We take a very serious view of the fact that the Prime Minister made no such statement in the house, and for a period of over three weeks made no attempt whatsoever to correct what was obviously a misstatement of fact. Instead, the Prime Minister sent a statement to the chief justice, which he said he hoped to make in the house when the procedural difficulties were removed. It is only today, when a question of privilege has been raised, that the Prime Minister has seen fit to make an explanation to the effect that his memory had failed him when he was replying to the questions asked by the hon. member for Calgary North.

Therefore I think the members of this party cannot accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Calgary North that this be referred to Your Honour. With all due deference, sir, I feel that this matter must be referred to the house and to the proper committee appointed by the house for that purpose. This is a matter which the house must determine. If the house feels, as I do, that it was misled by the Prime Minister in answers which he gave on November 24 to the hon. member for Calgary North, the house must determine that and the house must say so. If on the other hand the house is satisfied with the explanation which the Prime Minister has given or by any further elaboration which he may care to make to the committee on privileges and elections, then at that time the house can make a determination as to whether or not

the house was misled by the Prime Minister, and decide if that was due to either an unwitting or an intentional action on the part of the Prime Minister.

I move, therefore, seconded by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher):

That the statements made in the House of Commons by the Prime Minister on November 24, 1964, concerning his knowledge of the matters referred to in order in council P.C. 1964-1819, as amended by order in council P.C. 1964-1820, be referred to the standing committee on privileges and elections for consideration in the light of statements made by the Prime Minister in his letter of December 14, 1964, to the commissioner appointed under the terms of the said order in council and in the statement enclosed with the said letter.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Before accepting the motion, Mr. Speaker, you must first of all determine whether there is a prima facie case of privilege. If you do accept the argument that there is a prima facie case of privilege, then of course the substantive motion which has been made is in order. In so far as we in this party are concerned, we believe that the suggestion made by the hon. member for Calgary North is a good one, that is that you take this matter under advisement.

If, in your determination, you are able to satisfy yourself that there is a prima facie case of privilege, then of course you can allow the motion that has been moved by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam. It appears to us at this stage that there is a prima facie case of privilege. We believe the house will determine this matter eventually, but that it ought to go to a committee so we can have the facts all assembled.

We know this whole matter is now under investigation by a judicial inquiry set up by the government, known as the Dorion commission. I believe the determination of whether or not the house has been misled can be brought out by cross checking the evidence that will come out in this judicial inquiry against the dates and the statements that have been made in this house. Then the committee will be able to decide whether there has been a misstatement of the facts in this house or whether there has been an honest lack of memory.

So far as we are concerned, Mr. Speaker, we would support the suggestion that this matter be referred to a standing committee of the house, and I believe the Prime Minister has already accepted this procedure.

Mr. Pearson: There is a motion before the house now, and perhaps I can say a word about it. As I understand the rules, if any member of this house makes a charge that a member of this house has deliberately deceived the house, that is a matter which must be investigated and the hon. member making the charge takes the responsibility for asking for the investigation before a committee. If a charge is made it must be investigated, and the hon. member making the charge takes the responsibility for that. Under the circumstances now, I do not know whether the hon. member is making such a charge. It must be a charge that I deliberately deceived this house. If that is the charge it certainly should be investigated.

The hon. member has said two other things. He said that two or three weeks ago I should have made the kind of statement I have now made as a question of privilege. The hon. member obviously does not give much credence to my statement that I believed the right way to do this was not as a question of privilege, which if I had raised it would have been tantamount to admitting that I had deceived the house, but by making a statement on motions which could be replied to by hon. members of the house. This is what I intended to do at the first opportunity, notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman has said.

Another point the hon. gentleman made was that I discussed the matter with the Minister of Justice on the morning of November 24 and he must have informed me of the earlier talks. He does not accept my word when I say I was not informed by him of any of the antecedents of this matter. He does not have to accept my word, but I repeat that is the truth, absolutely.

Mr. Douglas: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I cannot allow the Prime Minister to put words into my mouth. What I said was that when the Minister of Justice, according to the Prime Minister's own statement, informed him on November 22, the day before the estimates were brought into the house, that he had in his possession a report from the R.C.M.P. alleging certain wrongdoing on the part of certain persons, surely that must have refreshed the Prime Minister's memory that he had discussed this matter with the Minister of Justice on September 2. It is therefore difficult to understand why on November 24 he could not remember this previous conversation.

Mr. Pearson: The hon. member may find it difficult to understand, but I am telling him the facts. When the Minister of Justice spoke to me, it was to the effect that a report had been received, and what it contained. I had

no thought of the earlier discussion at all. He can accept that statement or not, but I am making it as a statement which is true. I would remind the hon. member that, as I said in my first statement, this was a conversation on an airplane coming back from a constitutional conference, the kind of statement which could easily be put in the back of a prime minister's mind when he had other things in his mind during that week, and especially when it was a matter that was now in the hands of the minister and the R.C.M.P. I was informed I would be given the results of the investigation when the minister felt they were complete. This is the story, and it is the absolute and complete truth.

I might have made an error in not getting up on a question of privilege, but I thought it would be better to make a statement under motions. I apologize if that error was made. If the hon. member wishes to charge me with deceiving the house deliberately, he should do so and certainly the matter should go to a committee.

Mr. Speaker: I have to decide whether there is a question of privilege. Dealing first with the argument of the hon. member for Calgary North, I should like to cite Beauchesne, citation 104, subsection (2), which reads:

> It has often been laid down that the Speaker's function in ruling on a claim of breach of privilege does not extend to deciding the question of substance whether a breach of privilege has in fact been committed—a question which can only be decided by the house itself.

It seems to me, therefore, that it is not part of my function, as was suggested, to take all this into consideration, and I do not propose to do so. Furthermore, the hon. member did not finish up with a motion either to refer this to a committee or asking for some penalty, and without some specific motion it seems to me it was a general statement and not necessarily a question of privilege. Then we had a long explanation from the right hon. Prime Minister, and up to that stage it seems to me it was more in the nature of a grievance than a question of privilege. Then the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam rose and moved the motion which I have before me.

In that connection I should like to call to the attention of the house a ruling by Mr. Speaker Michener which is very much in point. The ruling appears in the *Journals* of the House of Commons of June 17, 1959 and I referred to it in the house on October 30, 1964. I do not propose to read the whole ruling but just to cite one key sentence. These are the words of Speaker Michener:

> In my view, simple justice requires that no honourable member should have to submit to investigation of his conduct by the house or a committee until he has been charged with an offence.

On reading and studying the motion moved by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam it seems to me there is no specific charge set out in it. The words are too vague. If the hon. member wishes to make a specific charge there is a proper way to do it, to stand and bring a specific charge.

Here we are dealing with a misstatement, not a question of privilege. There must be a real accusation made against, in this case, the right hon. Prime Minister, and there must be something in the charge which shows the misstatement, if it was a misstatement, was made with intent, with purpose. There is no specific charge, and in view of the ruling of Speaker Michener and of what I have said, in my opinion there is not a prima facie case and therefore no question of privilege.

Mr. Douglas: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the ruling you have given misses the entire point of the motion which I placed before Your Honour and the house, namely that two statements are now before the house, one a series of answers made by the Prime Minister to questions on November 24, and the other the memorandum sent by the Prime Minister to Chief Justice Dorion, and that they are completely at variance.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may not like the ruling, but the ruling has been made in the best possible faith. I repeat once more there is nothing to prevent the hon. member bringing a charge, properly drafted, but in my opinion this is not properly drafted. There is no specific charge, and until there is I cannot accept it.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, believing that the house and the house only has the right to make a decision on this matter, I would therefore regretfully appeal your ruling.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether it is proper to say anything at this time. I do not want to, but I feel a very serious situation has arisen and I am sure the Prime Minister would be most anxious to have this sent to a committee.

There are the two divergent statements. I recognize that one can forget—fail to remember—as a prime minister carrying all the information that a prime minister does, but surely he would want the committee to

look into this question that he should have forgotten a matter so important as this. I make that appeal to him, that he accept the suggestion and not rely on the question of charge or counter-charge.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the matter is in your hands. You have made a ruling, and I believe it has been appealed.

Mr. Speaker: That is exactly what I was going to say to the house, that a decision of the Chair has been given. The decision has been appealed.

The house has heard the decision of the Chair, from which the hon. member has appealed to the house. All those in favour of sustaining the Speaker's ruling will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: Those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

And the members having been called in:

Mr. Speaker put the question as follows:

The question is an appeal to the house from a ruling of the Chair which is as follows:

"The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) as a question of privilege proposed to move that the statements made in the House of Commons by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) on November 24, 1964, concerning his knowledge of the matters referred to in order in council P.C. 1964"—

Some hon. Members: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Shall I dispense?

Some hon. Members: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker:

The Chair decided that in the absence of a specific charge in the wording of the proposed motion he could not find the basis of a prima facie case of privilege.

Whereupon the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam appealed to the house from the decision of the Chair.

The house divided on the question: Shall the Speaker's decision be sustained? And the decision of the Chair was sustained on the following division:

Division

YEAS

Messrs:

Addison
Armstrong
Asselin (Notre Dame de Grâce)
Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)
Badanai
Basford
Batten
Béchard
Beer
Benidickson
Benson
Berger
Blouin
Boulanger
Brown
Byrne
Cadieux (Terrebonne)
Cameron (High Park)
Cantin
Cardin
Carter
Cashin
Choquette
Chrétien
Côté (Chicoutimi)
Côté (Longueuil)
Cowan
Crossman
Cyr
Davis
Deachman
Deschatelets
Drouin
Drury
Dubé
Dupuis
Émard
Eudes
Favreau
Forest
Francis
Frenette
Gelber
Gendron
Godin
Gordon
Granger
Gray
Greene
Groos
Guay
Hahn
Haidasz
Harley
Hays
Honey
Jewett, Miss
Kelly
Klein
Konantz, Mrs.
Lachance
Laing
LaMarsh, Miss
Lamontagne
Lamoureux
Laniel
Laverdière
Leblanc
Leboe
Leduc
Legault
Lessard (Lake St. John)
Lessard (St. Henry)
Lloyd
Loiselle
Macaluso
MacEachen
Mackasey
MacNaught
McIlraith
McLean (Charlotte)
McMillan
McWilliam
Marcoux
Matheson
Matte
Mitchell
Moreau
Morison
Mullally
Munro
Nicholson
O'Keefe
Olson
Otto
Patterson
Pennell
Pepin
Pickersgill
Pilon
Prud'homme
Regan
Richard
Rideout, Mrs.
Rinfret
Robichaud
Rochon
Rock
Rouleau
Roxburgh
Ryan
Sauvé
Stewart
Tardif
Teillet
Temple
Tremblay
Tucker
Turner
Walker
Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Whelan—122.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alkenbrack
Balcer
Barnett
Beaulé
Bélanger
Bell
Bigg
Boutin
Brewin
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Cantelon
Caouette
Cardiff
Chatterton
Churchill
Clancy
Coates

Division

Crouse	Millar
Danforth	Monteith
Diefenbaker	Moore
Dinsdale	More
Dionne	Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Doucett	Muir (Lisgar)
Douglas	Nasserden
Enns	Nesbitt
Fairweather	Nielsen
Fane	Nowlan
Fisher	Nugent
Flemming (Victoria-Carleton)	Ormiston
Forbes	Ouellet
Gauthier	Pascoe
Girouard	Paul
Grafftey	Perron
Grégoire	Peters
Gundlock	Pigeon
Hales	Plourde
Hamilton	Prittie
Herridge	Pugh
Horner (The Battlefords)	Rapp
Howard	Rhéaume
Howe (Hamilton South)	Ricard
Jones, Mrs.	Rondeau
Jorgenson	Rynard
Kennedy	Saltsman
Kindt	Scott
Knowles	Simpson
Lambert	Southam
Langlois	Starr
Latulippe	Stefanson
Loney	Stenson
MacEwan	Thomas
MacInnis	Wadds, Mrs.
MacLean (Queens)	Watson (Assiniboia)
Macquarrie	Webb
MacRae	Webster
McBain	Weichel
McIntosh	Willoughby
Madill	Winch
Mandziuk	Winkler
Martineau	Woolliams—105.
Mather	

Mr. Speaker: I declare the decision sustained.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer). Had I voted I would have voted against sustaining your ruling.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Wahn). Had I voted I would have voted against sustaining your ruling.

Mr. Cardiff: Mr. Speaker, I was paired too, but I forgot about it.

PENSIONS

SECOND REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON CANADA PLAN

Mr. A. J. P. Cameron (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the second report of the special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on the Canada pension plan, in English and in French. By unanimous consent I intend to move concurrence in this report later this day.

[*Later:*]

CONCURRENCE IN SECOND REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON CANADA PLAN

Mr. A. J. P. Cameron (High Park) moved that the second report of the special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on the Canada pension plan presented this day be now concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Does the house give unanimous consent for the Chair to put this motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN COMMONWEALTH FLAG

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SEVENTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The house resumed, from Wednesday, December 16, consideration of the motion of Mr. Batten that the seventh and final report of the special committee on a Canadian flag, presented to the house on Thursday, October 29, 1964, be now concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, when the house adjourned yesterday at six o'clock I was saying that we, in this corner of the house, have or would have no objection to the seventh report of the flag committee being considered again so as to suggest to the government to propose the union jack as the commonwealth flag to all member countries of the British commonwealth of nations.

Several members mentioned yesterday that the Canadian parliament could adopt this flag, since Canada is a member of the British empire or of the British commonwealth of nations.

Now, that flag is not recognized at all as the flag of the empire or of the British commonwealth of nations, but rather as the flag of a country, namely England.

I wish to repeat that we hold nothing against the traditions represented by the union jack or the red ensign. We have nothing against what either of these two flags represent, far from it. On the other hand, the people of Canada wonder why our country

should have two flags. Ours will be the only country in the world, in similar circumstances, to have two flags; a Canadian national flag and another to prove its membership in the commonwealth of nations.

Mr. Speaker, surely we need no flag other than our own Canadian flag to indicate our co-operation with the other members of the British empire. We would have no objection either should any province decide to adopt the red ensign as its provincial flag, if it wishes to do so. We would have no objection to that, but Quebec does have a provincial flag, and it is not trying and never tried to impose it on the federal parliament or any of the other Canadian provinces. We would not attempt either to impose to anybody our provincial flag which symbolizes our origins and our traditions which are essentially Canadian, because everybody knows that Canada was first discovered in 1534 by Jacques Cartier. Therefore, at that time our allegiance was to France. But today we would not impose or try to impose French symbols on the Canadian people as a whole.

We have seen other provinces besides Quebec adopt a provincial flag. For instance, British Columbia and Nova Scotia adopted a provincial flag, and Saskatchewan adopted one yesterday. If Alberta decided to adopt a flag similar to the red ensign or the union jack, we would have the greatest respect for such a decision.

Unfortunately, such is not the case: Attempts are made to force a second Canadian flag on us. And we are sorry to say that this project of the Prime Minister or of the government to adopt a second flag for Canada is bringing about unfortunate reactions in certain parts of Canada.

Reading in the press yesterday and this morning that hon. members from Ontario and other provinces were threatened because they voted for a distinctive national flag, we wonder what has become of our truly Canadian civilization, what has become of that civilization we wish to set as an example for several nations in the world, when things get to the point where hon. members are threatened because they vote for a true Canadian symbol.

Mr. Speaker, we deeply regret the doings of these people who make threats against hon. members, be it against members of the Liberal, Conservative, New Democratic, Social Credit or Ralliement Créditiste parties. I think the Canadian people have reached such a degree of maturity that our country, Canada, can be held up as an example to other countries, and even to certain countries which are members of the British commonwealth of nations at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment moved by the Conservatives and included in the second part of the resolution, to the effect of changing the union jack for the red ensign, faces us with a choice, to use the words of some hon. members.

Now, we of the Ralliement Créditiste have said loud and clear, not only in the province of Quebec but also in Ontario, and I even said so in western Canada, that we would support the adoption of a distinctive national flag, but not two Canadian flags. That statement met with the approval of English speaking and French speaking people as well, and today the Conservative amendment does not imply a choice to the effect of changing the union jack for the red ensign.

Let me tell you how we will vote on this amendment and on the main motion. We have the greatest respect for what the union jack and the red ensign represent, but we still stick to the ideas set forth several months ago to the effect that Canada must have one flag and not two flags, and that it can belong to the British commonwealth of nations with its distinctive Canadian flag and nothing else.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal for the adoption of the red ensign forces us to make a choice, and the stand we have taken is evident. We are in favour of one flag and against any plan for the adoption of a second flag. The Conservatives would like to give us the red ensign as a second flag and the Liberals want to give us the union jack as a flag indicating our allegiance to the crown and our membership in the British commonwealth of nations.

Mr. Speaker, we agree neither to the amendment of the Conservatives, nor to the main motion, and we will be against any plan and any amendment or subamendment which would force upon us a second flag, whatever it may be.

We want to remain authentic Canadians from coast to coast and I think that England and all other countries of the British commonwealth of nations will respect us even more if we appear before them with a Canadian symbol representing Canada in this British commonwealth of nations.

Mr. Speaker, those are the few remarks I wanted to make on the amendment now before us as well as on the main motion that we will probably discuss this afternoon.

Our stand is clear and I will sum it up this way.

The distinctive national flag is adopted. We have voted for that flag not because we had something against one or the other, but because we have voted as real Canadians, not as French Canadians.

We shall vote against the Conservative amendment and against the main motion.

[*Text*]

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to speak in support of the amendment now before the house. I recall very well that during the 33 days of discussion on the important matter of the flag more than one member of this house asked all members to exercise self discipline, not to be repetitive and not to repeat arguments that had already been made. I must have taken that request to heart, Mr. Speaker, because this is the first time I have risen to speak to the flag motions.

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Winch: One hon. member says "Shame". Sir, my position was known to all the members of this House of Commons; my position, I believe, was known to the people of Canada because of the symbolic gesture which I made to indicate that no flag should be raised on parliament hill that was not the flag of Canada since it had not been approved by the House of Commons. My position being known to all the members and all the people of Canada, and some 270 speeches having been made, what more was required to be said on either side of the question? When I had the opportunity of expressing my hope, I voted for the red ensign as the distinctive flag of Canada. When that motion was defeated, we then had to face the vote on the recommendation of the special committee of the House of Commons, a special committee representative of all parties, and having lost what I really wanted, then as a democratic member of a democratic House of Commons I accepted the majority democratic position of all parties in this House of Commons and voted for the new flag. I make no apologies for that.

Now, sir, we have a further question in front of us, and that is what you may call a second flag, a flag introduced on the basis of the fact that, in addition to a national flag, we should have one that will demonstrate the relationship of Canada within the commonwealth, as a part of the commonwealth and of our allegiance to the peoples and countries that were the founders of our country.

I disagree completely with the recommendation of the committee. I cannot understand how the committee reached their conclusion. It is to be a flag that demonstrates our relationship with the commonwealth. How you demonstrate your relationship with the commonwealth by a flag which is wholly and solely outside of Canada, I cannot understand.

The amendment is reasonable; the amendment is understandable. The amendment is the only position that the members of the House of Commons can take in support of the committee if they want a second flag which demonstrates Canada's position within the commonwealth. This flag is, should be, and must be the red ensign. This morning I made once again a special study of the facts to insure that my information was correct, and I think it is.

Let us take the union jack, strictly as the union jack, and we find that is not a flag which demonstrates the relationship between Canada and the commonwealth. It is the flag of the United Kingdom. However, I should like to put this to the members: Take the red ensign, and what is it? It is a combination of the union jack and the Canadian shield. Why is it, sir, that no matter what constituency or province one comes from, there are so many in this house who ignore the Canadian shield. We have the union jack on the red ensign. We have the union jack which we, in Canada, share with other commonwealth countries in what is sometimes termed the staff side of the flag or the jack side of the flag or, if you want to be particular, the canton No. 1. So, on the staff side, the jack side, the canton No. 1, is the union jack, which represents not only the United Kingdom but the commonwealth because it is common to all the commonwealth countries. On the red ensign also, Mr. Speaker, you have the Canadian shield.

Now, sir, a few weeks ago this was explained in heraldic terminology. I am afraid too many have forgotten the heraldic terminology of the Canadian shield. On the red ensign, the Canadian shield is symbolic of Canada. This shield has maple leaves on it, which everyone agrees are symbolic of Canada. It also has emblems that go back to ancient times, ancient times of the peoples and countries who have founded and built this country. You have the couchant lion or, if the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) were here, he would refer to it as the heraldic leopard. We know that it came over from France and was the emblem on the flag of

William of Normandy. Ever since, from 1066, it has been incorporated in the heraldry of Great Britain and of the British kings. On the shield of Canada you have the red lion rampant on a golden field, which was the emblem of the Scottish kings and came to Scotland from ancient Ireland. Then, you have the harp, an emblem on our Canadian shield which is equally ancient and was taken into Ireland many centuries ago. You have the fleur-de-lis on the Canadian shield, which is well known as the lily of France and held a proud place in the arms of British kings proclaiming the French ancestry of the sovereigns from, to put it politely, the distaff side of the house. About the time the fleur-de-lis was removed from the royal arms of the United Kingdom it began to appear in the heraldry of Canada and it has been there ever since.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these emblems on the Canadian shield represent the early pioneers who were instrumental in laying the foundation of our country, Canada. We must remember that the emblems on the Canadian shield, with all their heraldic meaning and early history, were incorporated officially in 1921 because the Canadian government requested King George V to prepare a new coat of arms for Canada. It was in response to the request of Canada in 1921 that the royal college of heralds laid down what we now know as the coat of arms or the shield of Canada.

In view of all the foregoing, in view of the fact that the House of Commons has established what is termed a national, distinctive flag, I say it seems only suitable that the second flag which demonstrates our understanding of the past, recognizes the ethnic groups that founded Canada, demonstrates our history of the past, our allegiance to the past, our recognition of the pioneers who came from many countries and made Canada great, our recognition of our membership in the commonwealth, should be one on which you have the union jack on the staff and the coat of arms on the fly. On that one flag we have Canada with its history and origins, and with its membership in the commonwealth of nations.

Sir, how can anyone argue against the red ensign in such a matter? How can anyone say, with our understanding of the commonwealth, that the second flag shall be the flag of a country outside Canada? The real living proof of our membership in the commonwealth and the real living proof of our knowledge of history and ancestry demand that we have both together on the flag of the commonwealth, the shield of Canada and the flag of the mother country, with tribute to the pioneers who founded our country. It is as simple as that. I have nothing to say against the union jack, but having made a decision the other night on a distinctive national flag I say our second flag should be the red ensign, which is the proof of our history and our pride within the commonwealth.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Girouard (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, I only wish to make a few short remarks.

We will soon be asked to substitute the red ensign for the union jack as a second flag for Canada. I believe, like most of my constituents and a great majority of the Canadian people, that one flag is sufficient to represent Canada.

Whatever the outcome of this vote, whether the red ensign or the union jack is chosen as the second flag, I intend to vote against both, when the vote is taken on the main motion.

Since my constituents and myself are not interested in the vote which will be taken, I will abstain from voting when we will be called upon to choose between the red ensign and the union jack, and, as I said, I shall vote against both when the main motion comes up.

An hon. Member: Question.

[*Text*]

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton)) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken	Forbes
Alkenbrack	Grafftey
Barnett	Gundlock
Bell	Hales
Bigg	Hamilton
Brewin	Herridge
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)	Horner (The Battlefords)
Cantelon	Howard
Chatterton	Jones, Mrs.
Churchill	Jorgenson
Clancy	Kennedy
Coates	Kindt
Cowan	Knowles
Crouse	Lambert
Danforth	Leboe
Dinsdale	Loney
Doucett	MacEwan
Douglas	MacInnis
Enns	MacLean (Queens)
Fairweather	Macquarrie
Fane	MacRae
Fisher	McBain
Flemming (Victoria-Carleton)	Madill
	Mandziuk

Division

Martineau
Mather
Millar
Monteith
Moore
More
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nasserden
Nesbitt
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nugent
Olson
Ormiston
Pascoe
Patterson
Peters
Prittie
Pugh
Rapp
Rhéaume
Rynard
Saltsman
Scott
Simpson
Southam
Starr
Stefanson
Stenson
Thomas
Wadds, Mrs.
Watson (Assiniboia)
Webb
Webster
Weichel
Willoughby
Winch
Winkler
Woolliams—87.

NAYS

Messrs:

Addison
Armstrong
Asselin (Norte Dame de Grâce)
Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)
Badanai
Basford
Batten
Beaulé
Béchard
Bélanger
Benidickson
Benson
Berger
Blouin
Boulanger
Boutin
Brown
Byrne
Cadieux (Terrebonne)
Cameron (High Park)
Cantin
Caouette
Cardin
Carter
Cashin
Chapdelaine
Choquette
Chrétien
Côté (Chicoutimi)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Cyr
Davis
Deachman
Deschatelets
Dionne
Drury
Dubé
Dupuis
Émard
Eudes
Favreau
Forest
Francis
Frenette
Gauthier
Gelber
Gendron
Godin
Gordon
Granger
Gray
Greene
Grégoire
Groos
Guay
Hahn
Haidasz
Harley
Hays
Honey
Jewett, Miss
Kelly
Klein
Konantz, Mrs.
Lachance
Laing
LaMarsh, Miss
Lamontagne
Lamoureux
Langlois
Laniel
Latulippe
Laverdière
Leblanc
Leduc
Legault
Lessard (Lake St. John)
Lessard (St. Henry)
Lloyd
Loiselle
Macaluso
MacEachen
Mackasey
MacNaught
McIlraith
McLean (Charlotte)
McMillan
McWilliam
Marcoux
Matheson
Matte
Mitchell
Moreau
Morison
Mullally
Munro
Nicholson
O'Keefe
Otto
Pearson
Pennell
Pepin
Perron
Pickersgill
Pilon
Plourde
Prud'homme
Regan
Richard
Rideout, Mrs.
Rinfret
Robichaud
Rochon
Rock
Rondeau
Rouleau
Roxburgh
Ryan
Sauvé
Stewart
Tardif
Teillet
Temple
Tremblay
Tucker
Turner
Walker
Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Whelan—130.

[Mr. Girouard.]

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. Beer: Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robert Beaulé (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to prolong unduly this debate on the seventh report of the flag committee.

Inasmuch as we voted only a few days ago to select a flag, I fail to see the importance of giving Canada a second flag as a symbol of our allegiance to the crown and our membership in the commonwealth.

Canada was without a flag for 97 years. But today we are offered two flags. Now, there are some who claim that we are not going to have two. Why then should there be two resolutions asking us to adopt two flags.

Mr. Speaker, if in 1931, when Canada gained its independence under the Statute of Westminster, our country had been given a distinctive flag, we would not be faced today with this thorny problem. Why did the politicians of those days not give Canada a flag? It is up to you to answer.

Mr. Speaker, last November I was privileged to participate in the 10th conference of the commonwealth parliamentary association in Jamaica. What I appreciated about that country is the fact that, in 1962, when it obtained its independence, it immediately flew its distinctive flag, and sang its distinctive national anthem. During that commonwealth conference I did not hear "God save the Queen" sung once, and the union jack was

not in a more prominent place than other national flags.

Mr. Speaker, why should we have two flags while all other countries, such as the United States, France and the U.S.S.R. only have one flag? Why should we act differently?

Why do we have to ask permission or to pass an act in order to fly a foreign flag? If I want to hoist the stars and stripes on the fourth of July, the United States' national day, I have no permission to ask of anyone, any more than if I want to fly the UN flag on United Nations' day.

Canada did not pass an act to recognize the United Nations flag and permit Canadians to fly it. The UN flag was adopted by representatives of the United Nations member countries.

In the seventh report now before us, we are asked to adopt the union jack as the symbol of our allegiance to the crown and of our membership in the British commonwealth of nations.

Why the union jack? It is the flag of Great Britain and we would be lacking in courtesy and tact if we took it over without the permission of Great Britain. It does not belong to Canada to decide what flag to fly to indicate its association with the British commonwealth of nations. In fact, our membership in the commonwealth would not be shown by the adoption of the union jack, because that flag is not the commonwealth's but Great Britain's, and even if it were the commonwealth's flag, we do not need a law to fly it. We just fly it.

To indicate our membership in the commonwealth, a commonwealth flag would be needed, and in that regard the member countries of the commonwealth should decide what flag they will adopt as a symbol of that commonwealth. And thus, all the member countries will be proud of it, because a symbol will have been chosen not by one country but by all member countries.

Mr. Speaker, why has the government brought forward two resolutions? We Canadians wanted a resolution for the selection of a single distinctive flag; that is all. Why try to make us believe that only one flag is involved? Why this seventh report, then? Why do we have to vote on this second flag?

We have often heard during the flag debate that many Canadians fought under the union jack or the red ensign. It is quite proper to recall such memories. There is a tendency here, in this house, to speak about veterans in and out of season, and even to use them for political purposes; but when the time comes to help them, there is not quite that display of courage to face up to their problems, yet many of them are in urgent need of assistance, particularly war amputees and widows whose husbands were killed on the battlefield. It might be better not to mention them at every occasion but pay them more attention and provide them with what they need to face their obligations in life, in short, to provide them with the strict minimum.

Mr. Speaker, we are in favour of a distinctive flag and we have proved it recently by voting solidly for the maple leaf. But we do object to adopting a symbol, in this case the union jack, to show our membership in the commonwealth and our allegiance to the British crown. We cannot concur in this report because it is not up to Canada to decide what should be the symbol of the commonwealth. Why should we, Canadians, legislate in an area involving 18 other countries? This would be a lack of tact and courtesy on our part.

How can a compromise or a solution be reached in this house when five members of the committee abstained from voting, and, consequently, only ten out of a total of 15 members voted. Under these circumstances, and since the decision to fly a flag as a symbol of membership in the commonwealth of nations lies with all member countries, I move:

—That the seventh report of the special committee on a Canadian flag be not now adopted but that it be referred back to the committee with instructions to suggest to the Prime Minister that he should propose the recognition of a flag of the commonwealth of free nations at the next meeting of the prime ministers of the countries comprising the membership of such a commonwealth.

If democratic principles are to be respected, once the different views have been expressed on the matter, let the motion be voted upon, and the result of this vote be respected.

Mr. Speaker, once the debate has come to an end I am sure the Canadian people will remain true to all that has made our nation great. Whether we fly the maple leaf, the union jack or any other flag as a symbol of our allegiance to the crown, we shall nevertheless continue to respect all that has been dear to Canada. And I would not like to see us spurn a past which has given us our freedom. If we are mature people, let us stop our divisions, let us not tear one another to pieces any more; let us endeavour to make Canada a great country to live in.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps this amendment appears to be somewhat in the nature of an

expanded negative. Having expressed this doubt, I must say it is not an open and shut case and I feel it my duty to submit it to the house for decision.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Quebec East, seconded by the hon. member for Charlevoix, moves:

That the seventh report of the special committee on a Canadian flag be not now adopted but that it be referred back to the committee with instructions to suggest to the Prime Minister that he should propose the recognition of a flag of the commonwealth of free nations at the next meeting of the prime ministers of the countries comprising the membership of such a commonwealth.

And that the committee for such purposes be revived.

Mr. L. P. Antoine Bélanger (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of the amendment and against the recommendation of the seventh report of the special flag committee, and, for several reasons, all of which I shall not put forward because I intend to be brief, very brief.

At the outset I wish to congratulate the government for having had the courage to bring the flag matter before this house and to hold out against the pressures exerted on them to have the matter postponed.

I suppose that the fact they knew they had the support of our group, the Ralliement Créditiste, helped in giving them that courage which resulted in giving our country, Canada, a distinctive national flag.

Unfortunately, things were too good to last, because today we of the Ralliement Créditiste must withdraw our support, and for the same reasons we had to give them support when they proposed a distinctive national flag.

Today we are asked to give official recognition to the emblem of another country. I think it is a mistake which destroys the good impression made by the government because of the adoption of a new flag.

I think I would be justified to turn against the hon. member for Beauharnois-Salaberry (Mr. Laniel) the charges he made against us, as can be seen on page 11237 of *Hansard*, concerning the position that our members adopted in the house on the flag issue. He said that our conduct was dictated by political interest.

As far as I am concerned, I can see no reasons other than electoral which have prompted the government to introduce this motion for a second flag. It seems that after having succeeded with its project of a distinctive flag, it feels it may have caused dissatisfaction among a certain group, and this second flag is to satisfy them. That is why I am forced to oppose this second flag as earnestly as I had supported the first one.

In fact, I think the best way to explain our opposition to a second flag would be to ask why a country needs a flag. A flag is an emblem representing the nation; it helps us to love our country and to make it known.

The flag must be a national focus and the emblem around which all citizens are proud to gather. Therefore, we should not have two official flags; the flag should not, moreover, bring back to an important group of citizens memories which they prefer to consign to oblivion.

We applauded when the government introduced the motion for a distinctive flag which, even though it is not very representative, has at least the essential quality of not including in its design reminders of bondage, of colonialism, or of a conquering nation. I fail to see why the government should ask us now to approve a second flag which, in our opinion, expresses precisely all these things.

During the previous debates the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) and several of his members blamed us for trying to break with the past and refusing to recognize the great bounties England brought to Canada.

Besides having a bad influence on the relations among Canadians, this action is futile, not to say childish, because we never passed any resolution to recognize the flag of the United Nations, and yet it is flown when required by circumstances, and the same applies also to all foreign flags.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I must interrupt the hon. member, because it is now five o'clock.

[*Text*]

It being five o'clock the house will now proceed to a consideration of private members' business.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I have spoken with the leaders of the other groups in the house, and I believe it is agreeable to all hon. members that we waive the private members' hour today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is that agreeable?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bélanger: The new distinctive flag means harmony and peace among the ethnic groups of this country, but this second flag will mean discord and disunity. Once more, let us not forget that if Great Britain gave this country many good things, it also gave us, French Canadians, things which we would rather forget, and we would prefer looking toward the future of Canada.

If we recognize officially a second flag under certain circumstances—which are not mentioned—we will afford certain groups, which I will not name, a valid reason for flying the second flag more often than the first one.

We are told that this second flag will denote our membership in the commonwealth of nations. Then, why use the British flag for that purpose? That flag is not recognized by all the countries of the commonwealth. Therefore, why and under what authority should we impose it upon the commonwealth nations who do not want it? Why should we carry our dispute concerning a flag to the meetings of the commonwealth of nations?

It is also claimed that this second flag will show our loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. We have never had any such flag since the conquest, but none the less French Canadians have proved themselves quite respectful and loyal subjects from the conquest to this day.

We shall recognize and respect our Queen, as long as the province of Quebec does not choose freely and without compulsion to become an independent state like Ghana, for instance. But let us not give weight to the present separatists tendency by forcing upon its supporters obligations which they are now carrying out freely.

To impose such coercion would give them arguments that they could make the most of for their own purposes. I am against separatism in Quebec and I shall be against it as long as I can keep the hope that Quebec will be able to assert its rights in this house.

During the flag debate we had clear evidence that the interests of Quebec will never be well safeguarded by the two old parties, because we saw the Conservative party go to pieces and its Quebec members break with the group and vote against it. On the other hand, on the occasion of the adoption of a second flag, we see Quebec members of the Liberal party voting against their own opinions in order to return the courtesy that they received from their colleagues of the other provinces. That is why this flag debate has convinced me of one thing, and it is that if we want to keep Quebec in confederation it is an urgent necessity for all Quebec members who are conscious of their responsibilities and who really want to protect Quebec's rights and stand for them within confederation, to unite and form a Quebec party in Ottawa. That would be the only way to show that Quebec is not like the other provinces and deserves a treatment different from the treatment it got in the past.

You will find further evidence of what I am saying in the perfect unity which prevailed and still prevails in our party on racial matters like the one now before us. It was very easy for our group to remain united because we are all of the same origin. I think that Quebec and also confederation would be better off if we had in this house a Quebec party strong and united.

In concluding my remarks I ask all Quebec members in this house, whatever their political party, to unite with us so as to prevent the passing of this resolution for the creation of a second official flag. As regards the other members, I say this: You have everything to gain if you do not permit this factor of dissension, the adoption of a second flag, to come between you and the Quebec representatives.

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, if at this time I take this opportunity to address the House of Commons, it is mainly because I am convinced that we are now discussing an extremely important subject, a most important principle for our country.

I sincerely hope that we will really have a free vote soon.

I will state immediately that I give my unqualified support to the amendment moved by the Créditistes. Indirectly, perhaps it will not be in agreement with the first remarks I wish to make, but I will state that, at this time, I am very proud of the fact that we now have a distinctive national flag.

If we must have a flag for the commonwealth, I wonder why we should not also have a distinctive flag as a symbol of our agreement with the commonwealth.

[*Text*]

Very briefly, sir, in rising to support this amendment responsibly put forward by the Créditiste party at this late hour, I am only doing so because I sincerely feel in my heart of hearts we are dealing with a most important principle. I am proud to say that at this moment Canada, certainly by a vote of

this house, has a distinctive national flag. If we have a distinctive national flag, then I ask myself, why should we not have a distinctive commonwealth flag? I know that, directly or indirectly, we cannot talk about votes that have been taken. However, when I voted a few minutes ago for the red ensign as our commonwealth flag, I did all in my power to make sure that if we had a commonwealth flag it would be distinctive. I did all in my power to assure that we would minimize the chance of this whole consideration being taken by the country as a two flag resolution. It is for this reason I rise at this moment.

Most of the technicalities advanced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) in his argument are correct, as I said during the debate on the amendment. While I do not agree with all the technicalities presented by the Prime Minister in relation to the flag of England or the royal standard, he knows as well as I do that, while the royal union flag is greatly respected in many corners of this country, it is greatly respected as the national flag of one of our great allies, Great Britain. I say that if hon. members opposite were really forthright, were going to vote in a free vote, they would advise the Prime Minister that there is going to be confusion on this issue in the province of Quebec. I do not like continually to make references to the province of Quebec, but surely the members of the Quebec caucus of the government party have explained to the leadership of their party that in many parts of Quebec this is going to confuse the issue. If this is truly not a political proposition, can members opposite not accept this fact? Do hon. members opposite not realize that by rushing a vote on the union jack at this late hour, they are going to maximize the possibility, certainly in my constituency, of this whole issue being considered as a two flag resolution?

I ask hon. members opposite, do they not agree with the responsible utterances of members of the Créditiste party and with our attitude at the moment, to the effect that no matter what technical explanation you make you cannot explain the technicalities from the Atlantic to the Pacific on an emotionally charged issue such as the flag? Hon. members know in their heart of hearts that in many parts of the country, not only in Quebec, the union jack is considered to be the flag of England? Why rush into this matter?

An hon. Member: The flag of the United Kingdom.

[Mr. Grafftey.]

Mr. Grafftey: The flag of the United Kingdom; excuse me, I have made a technical error myself. Hon. members sit opposite and shout, "Carried". Surely they can see the sincerity with which I am speaking. Surely many members, not only those from Quebec but from other provinces, must agree with me at this moment. This is going to create much unnecessary confusion. Do you think for one minute, gentlemen, that I am rising to my feet at this late hour, after the flag debate has dragged on for such a long time, just to say something in which I do not believe? I believe this sincerely.

I know I have often been partisan. There have been speeches in this House of Commons on occasion when we have regretted a few of the things we have said. I have often said the Liberal party has said one thing in Quebec and another thing outside of Quebec, and that by proposing this type of resolution, by forcing us at the end of a long, long session to rush into this kind of vote, they are only asking the people to emphasize the fact that they have said one thing in Quebec and another thing in the rest of Canada. Surely the members of the Quebec caucus must know that if they believe in all sincerity that national unity is a really important thing, they are going to support the Creditiste amendment to minimize the chance of confusion. Hon. members opposite from Quebec look across at me and smile. I know that in their heart of hearts they realize their electors have told them that so far as they are concerned the union jack is the distinctive flag of the United Kingdom. But the same cannot be said of the red ensign or any other kind of flag. However, the vote on the red ensign has been taken and it was defeated.

Speaking as a public man I know that in my own constituency sometimes we have done a bad job explaining to the electors the real significance of our commonwealth ties. This is true in the province of Quebec. Sometimes we have done a bad job explaining the significance of the presence of the crown in Canada, but why confuse things and make it harder to explain this important issue by rushing into this kind of vote?

Maybe I sound partisan now but I must say this. During a past debate hon. members opposite said to me, "You don't dare vote against a distinctive flag." For a totally different reason, during this debate hon. members opposite have said to me "You don't dare vote against the union jack as our

commonwealth symbol." That is political stuff. That is partisan. I am not going into the details of why they said that, but anyone with any imagination knows why they said it.

This is a last appeal I make to hon. members opposite. One of them laughs. Does he not admit that voting for the union jack is going to create confusion in his own area?

Mr. Ryan: Definitely not.

Mr. Grafftey: I am sure many of his electors will tell him about it at the next election.

Mr. Ryan: I know what my electors have told me.

Mr. Grafftey: If it is not a political consideration then I ask why the whip of the government party told us this was a free vote, yet when we in a spirit of good will try to do—hon. members opposite laugh. How cynical that you laugh. When we get on our feet you sneer and laugh. When we tell you what is in our heart of hearts, what is the best thing in the interests of this country, your whip cracks down and you just cower like a bunch of sheep.

Mr. Deschatelets: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I remind the hon. member that he should address the Chair.

Mr. Grafftey: I am sure that the hon. member who has just made that remark does not wish that I address him, because he does not like the sound of these remarks.

The other day when I voted with the government for a distinctive flag I voted in the name of the French speaking and English speaking electors of Brome-Missisquoi for one distinctive flag, for one united Canada. I did not speak on that issue because my people knew where I stood, and I did not think it necessary to take up the time of the house. But I shall take up the time of the house now and do all in my human power to minimize the chance that what we are doing now will make the whole issue a two flag proposition. If hon. members are sincere about the fact that they do not say one thing in Quebec and another outside it, they should stand up to their whip and support this amendment, because it makes good sense.

Mr. Rinfret: On a question of privilege, I wish the whip of your party would talk to you so that you would quit making an hysterical speech in the house.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, that was a false point of privilege. I would have thought the assistant whip of the government party would know more about the rules, but obviously he does not have that position on the basis of his knowing too much about them.

Mr. Rinfret: On a question of privilege—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. I must advise the hon. member that his first alleged question of privilege was not even close to being one. I hope his second will be a little more legitimate.

Mr. Rinfret: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has been speaking about the whips of this party, and I happen to be one. He has no right insinuating what are the attitudes of the whips and members of this party about the question of the flag. He should get down to brass tacks and quit using hysterical words. This is an historical moment, not an hysterical one.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, there is only one reason I am on my feet now and it is because I am convinced beyond doubt that if we are rushed into a vote at this late hour on this important question confusion will be created, certainly in my riding. Can we not have a commonwealth flag that in a real sense shows the French fact on it? I do not believe we are a melting-pot society in Canada and I cannot understand why we cannot have the French fact represented on our commonwealth flag.

No other country in the commonwealth of nations has adopted a commonwealth flag in this manner. Cannot hon. members opposite show their good faith and accept at least one amendment during these two debates? Months ago we were told this was going to be a non-political question, that we were going to have a non-political flag or flags. Cannot hon. members opposite, in the face of a patently sensible amendment, show their good faith and non-political consideration by accepting it? I am sure all members from the province of Quebec must consider that this is going to create confusion at a time when needless confusion should not be created.

[*Translation*]

When the Prime Minister explained his point of view I agreed with him, but when he explained in detail the question of a flag to symbolize our allegiance to the commonwealth, everybody knows, as well as every Liberal member, that the union jack is also the flag of the United Kingdom.

[*Text*]

Since the French fact has not been signified on our national flag, can we not consider that it should be on our commonwealth flag? Why are hon. members opposite in such a hurry? Can we not consider the possibility of postponing this issue and letting the government decide, with its other commonwealth partners, what would be a suitable commonwealth flag? Is not this a patently sensible amendment? Surely hon. members opposite realize it is.

I make a last appeal. Let me repeat for the third, the fourth, the fifth time that for the good of the country, from Atlantic to Pacific, we should minimize the possibility of this being taken as a two flag resolution. If you plunge hastily into this matter this evening many Canadians in many parts of Canada will unfortunately think that what the Liberal party is playing with is a two flag resolution. Has the hon. member opposite something to say? For heaven's sake let him make a speech on it.

Mr. Ryan: I would like to know what you want.

Mr. Grafftey: I think the hon. member must realize that that interjection was not worthy of him. I want a united Canada and I am sure he does too. If he has a modicum of common sense he could easily follow the principles I am speaking about.

At a time when the Liberal party is flirting with the associate state idea, at a time when we have Liberalism reigning in Quebec and Ottawa, at a time when people in many parts of Canada think they are fostering a two-Canadian theory, for heaven's sake be sensible and accept this amendment, thus minimizing the possibility of having two flags.

When my party voted on the sixth report of the flag committee I was allowed a free vote. I did not agree with the bulk of my party on that report, but to a man the Conservative party stood for one flag for one united Canada. I am sure hon. members opposite feel that way too. If they do they will support this amendment and minimize the chance of making it look like a two flag resolution.

After these brief remarks of mine I hope it is obvious why I have considered it important to rise at this time and make this plea that the government should support the amendment put forward by the Créditiste party. I am about to take my seat, and members opposite know that on the first report I was with them all the way. Do they think I am on my feet just to be sneered at and yelled at by them? Members from Quebec yelled at me and said I did not dare vote against the first report. Now they think that because of the population make-up of the county of Brome I am bound to vote in favour of this report. Mr. Speaker, I believe that in my district I have in pilot form the problem which faces the whole country. Why do not members opposite reflect for a few minutes instead of yelling and sneering at members who try to put propositions forward in the best interests of this country?

I have done everything in my power not to let the flag issue become a political football. If I was not acting that way, why did I support hon. members opposite on the first committee report?

An hon. Member: You had no alternative.

Mr. Grafftey: Who said "You had no alternative"? What did he mean by that? What a cynical remark. Did you hear that—"You had no alternative." What a cynical, political remark. It is unworthy of the hon. member who made it. I will not name his constituency, although I know it. I do not think the constituency would want to be associated with such a remark. This represents the type of cynicism we have always faced in Quebec. A two flag resolution—one for Brome and one for Missisquoi? Never. That is why I left the Liberal party and that is why I am on my feet today pleading with the government to unite this country by supporting the Créditiste amendment.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Grafftey: Yes.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Are you in favour of, or against, a commonwealth flag?

Mr. Grafftey: If the hon. member had been in the house during the last division he would have seen me voting for the red ensign as a commonwealth flag. I did that because I thought it was distinctive and because I thought its adoption would minimize the chance of this whole flag issue looking like a two flag proposition.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Grafftey: May I be given a chance to answer? Now I am on my feet pleading with the house not to adopt the flag of England as a commonwealth flag, because this will confuse the issue and make it a two flag

proposition. Is that clear? Does the hon. member understand? Thank you.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, the amendment now before the house proposes to refer back to the committee, for further study, the matter of a symbol for our membership in the commonwealth. Still, this amendment recognizes the principle of a symbol or a second flag.

As for the Conservatives, they have proposed the red ensign. It is their right, and I respect their opinions.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I wish to define briefly the attitude I shall take when we vote in a few minutes, I hope.

I believe in the evolution, along parallel lines, of our country toward its present independence and of the symbolism of our sovereignty. On several occasions I expressed opinions which, to some people, seemed extremist, to others, hasty, and to others still, objective.

These opinions, Mr. Speaker, I have voiced most sincerely and probably with the enthusiasm of the younger generation to which I belong. I shall express them by the negative vote I shall cast, not only on the amendment moved by the Créditistes, but also on the main resolution for the adoption of a symbol of our membership in the commonwealth and our allegiance to the crown.

Mr. Gérard Chapdelaine (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, like the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey), I admit that the amendment moved by the Ralliement Créditiste makes a lot of sense. I would find it hard to vote against it, but I would do so for the following reasons.

When the house spent several days debating the first resolution proposing the adoption of a distinctive national flag for Canada as well as the union jack as a symbol of our allegiance to the crown, there came a time when the Liberal government agreed, at the request of the opposition, to refer the matter to a committee which studied it attentively for six weeks. The report submitted to the house would have us vote for the adoption of a distinctive national flag with one maple leaf, which has been done already, and also for the adoption of the union jack as a symbol of our allegiance to the crown.

Mr. Speaker, I am ready to agree to the suggestion of the committee which studied that matter thoroughly, looking at it from all angles. But other reasons lead me to favour the adoption of that report. Apart from the fact that it is the committee's report, there are reasons of the heart and mind which I want to explain.

This afternoon, during the vote on the Conservative amendment to substitute the red ensign for the union jack as a symbol of our allegiance to the crown, I saw, on the other side of the house, quite a few English speaking Liberal members who had to tear their hearts out in order to vote against that amendment, because the red ensign means more to them than the union jack.

What made those English speaking people from all parts of the country take such a stand? There could be many reasons, but I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that it was surely not because they wanted to be successful at the next election. I have personal friends in the Liberal party and they have assured me that because of the position they took in this case, they run the risk of being defeated at the next federal election.

There must certainly be a more logical reason to their attitude than party unity. In my opinion, this is a positive action so that in a more or less distant future we may actually fly a single maple leaf flag throughout the country as the one and only Canadian flag. Since most Canadians are less fond of the union jack than the red ensign, it would be a less dangerous rival for the single maple leaf flag and, in a few years, the single maple leaf flag will be increasingly displayed instead of the union jack.

In my opinion, this is the reason why the Prime Minister proposed that second flag rather than the red ensign as a symbol of our allegiance to the commonwealth. I believe also that the fact we have the union jack in the flag resolution will make easier and less confused the intermediate stage toward the national and full recognition of our single maple leaf flag.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I do not see any objection to voting for the union jack as a symbol of our allegiance to the commonwealth, because first in my opinion it does not mean much and, second, it will provide an intermediate stage, as I said, that will permit our distinctive national flag to be accepted more rapidly and with less confusion.

Mr. Henri Latulippe (Compton-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I feel I must say a few words about the amendment we have moved. I am in favour of this amendment, first of all, because it is logical; second, because it is patriotic; third, because it is sensible and

uniting and, fourth, because it is Canadian and protects our sovereignty.

As I have already said in this house, Canada is a sovereign country, and I keep this in mind. Since we are a sovereign country, we do not need any other flag. It is useless to accept another symbol. It would be detrimental to Canadians and carry separatism to extremes to accept another symbol.

We barely managed to adopt a flag. We now have one and it is under it that we must live and die.

Mr. Speaker, we now have a flag. It was forced upon us, we know, but it is still the Canadian flag, the flag around which we must rally and unite. We must salute it proudly.

That noble flag, Mr. Speaker, might see some rough days, but we must love it, fly it, defend it and even die for it, if need be, if we are true Canadians.

To show its sovereignty, our flag had to be distinctive. Now that we have it, let us rejoice. That hard-won flag is the symbol of our aspirations, our ambitions, our legitimate pride, our unity, our loyalty, our Canadian nationality. It fulfils at last the legitimate wishes of Canadian men and women in this land.

This noble and beautiful flag will grow with the Canadian people, as long as we all remain Canadians, just plain Canadians.

This flag will be respected as long as the Canadians it represents will be able to live decently on Canadian soil, enjoying freedom, security and a decent standard of living, as long as every Canadian will be respected and recognized right across Canada, from one ocean to the other, from the north pole to the parallel separating us from the United States.

That is the meaning of our flag, the Canadian flag. A Canadian flag does not mean two flags. It does not mean the union jack or the red ensign.

With the greatest difficulties we have finally succeeded in giving our country a distinctive national flag. Let us not offend our Canadian people by imposing upon them an official flag of foreign origin, even though we recognize its greatness and its merits in its own country.

Mr. Speaker, when we study the background and origin of flags, we find that the union jack remains the emblem of Great Britain, under a royal proclamation of January 1, 1801 and that the red ensign, authorized in England by Queen Ann in 1707 and by Queen Victoria in 1864 is, in accordance with section 72 of the merchant and shipping act, 1894, the national flag of all the ships and crafts owned by British citizens.

[Mr. Latulippe.]

If the Canadian people truly wish to express their newly acquired truly Canadian citizenship, which has been theirs since January 1, 1947, and if they want to show a truly distinctive patriotism, those two foreign flags cannot fulfil their national and legitimate hopes.

I see absolutely no point in having two flags in the statutes of Canada. We have approved one flag, we have expressed ourselves clearly on the final choice: a flag free from all signs of race, colour or religion, free from prejudice, a truly Canadian flag. We should leave it at that.

If the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) lacked sincerity or diplomacy in requesting two flags for our country, let him suffer the consequences and turn back, because the people of Canada, like the people of all other countries, are quite content with their Canadian flag, a single national and distinctive flag, among all the other countries of the world.

Instead of wrangling over two flags—and I am speaking to all members of the house —we should unite in order to obtain a national anthem and a national day; we should not be fighting for political purposes.

We do not resent any nation flying its flag for the purposes of its national life, but we believe that our national flag is sufficient to express our own Canadian and national life. If some Canadians do not like our flag, let them go and live under another flag; in my opinion, true Canadians will be proud to live under an exclusively Canadian flag, a distinctive flag belonging to the Canadian nation.

We approved the closure motion concerning this flag issue on condition that there would be no further debate on the flag, but that it would be saluted, loved and respected, and that it would not be disowned immediately by imposing, within our own walls, an arrogant and outmoded competitor on this American soil.

Does the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) imagine that closure is like an election promise? If he was unable to have closure observed, he should not have imposed it. Now that closure has been imposed, we must abide by it. Let us respect our flag and continue to administer our country, Canada, for the good of all its citizens, for the good of all its 19,400,000 Canadians who have vested in us the administration of their right to life, freedom and personal security.

There is a limit to filibustering in the case of a flag, but not for two. There are other problems to be solved in Canada, apart from

the problem of a second flag. There was certainly a lack of sincerity and diplomacy on the part of the Prime Minister, perhaps not by himself, but by his wrong attitude in the present circumstances experienced by Canada.

People who lack bread have enough of one flag.

A second flag would be an uncalled for luxury. Let us think about giving the people the daily necessities of life, before we think of the luxury of a second flag.

Let us put an end to the discussions on the flag. Let us manage the country, which has enough of one Canadian flag, for all of the 19,400,000 citizens who want to live united in the eyes of God and under the only emblem of one Canadian flag.

We are of those who want to go ahead. There is a limit to filibustering, to the conspiracy of silence, to blindness in the face of real and serious problems, merely to defend political myths, Grit or Tory. The people want a flag, but not to the prejudice of their bread, their lives and their security. Not a single hour can be found to study the problems of unemployment, poverty and indigence among hard working and peaceful people, the personal, family and social problems which are facing us now and require an immediate solution.

There is much uncertainty among Canadians. The number of poverty-stricken and discontented people is increasing. With your nonsense, you are preparing the plague which will punish your political follies.

Because of the inertia of the two old parties, the public debt is increasing, interest is increasing, taxes are rising, the taxpayers' pockets are empty and people have to deny themselves everything.

Because of the two old parties' inertia, we see our businesses and industries going bankrupt, and the farmers are in a new depression. Sabotage is a criminal destruction, and the saboteur is a destructive criminal.

The saboteur is a parasite who leads a life of luxury, makes his profit on sweat labour and does not mind the plight of those who, because of him, have to tramp the streets in search of work.

After a life of labour, endurance and continuous fortitude, the human nest has become the prey of parasites. The land, worked at great pains, is mortgaged to the hilt, and nobody finds the time to discuss and find a solution to the serious economic problems which, in this century of progress and science, condemn and abuse our fellow men.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, we have considered the amendment brought forward by the Créditistes and, frankly, I find its logic quite wrong.

Even, if, on the whole, I support the feelings of my colleague for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey) concerning this matter and the futility of two flags, on the other hand, I am unable to support this amendment.

[*Text*]

Now, Mr. Speaker, this amendment seeks to recommit the seventh report to the committee so as to recommend to the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) that he defer any action on a second flag until one is chosen by the commonwealth prime ministers at their next meeting. This suggestion might have some merit for acceptance if the proposed second flag were to be singly or uniquely a symbol of our membership in the commonwealth. I intend to speak on the main motion so I will therefore limit my remarks at this point, but I say that this is a sop to those people who feel that there is a division in or a cutting off of our ties with Great Britain and the crown as a result of the flag that has been chosen.

If we examine the composition of the commonwealth we find it is composed of a number of self-governing dominions and a number who pay no allegiance to the crown and Queen. In this country she forms one of the elements of our parliament. However, there are many members of the commonwealth which are republics wherein the Queen figures not one iota. Within the concept of the commonwealth these countries are prepared to accept the Queen as the symbolic figure of head of the commonwealth. Theirs is merely a political adherence to the commonwealth, whereas ours goes much further than that. I say that this would be a complete denial of the government's proposal for a second flag as outlined in this resolution, namely that there must be some symbol of loyalty and affection to Her Majesty by the adoption of this second flag. Right away we can see that if this matter were referred for decision to a commonwealth prime ministers' meeting those countries which have no connection with the crown would immediately say they refuse to have any element in that flag which would tie them to the crown or to the Queen of Great Britain and the Queen of Canada. The flag which they would propose would have removed or eliminated from it any symbol of loyalty and affection to the Queen. Therefore we would

have a national flag, and/or a second commonwealth flag.

For this reason I feel that the amendment to this motion is illogical, even though I dislike intensely the report itself, as I shall outline at the next stage of this debate. I do not think that the acceptance of this amendment would mean anything other than limiting any second flag to being the symbol which represents the commonwealth, because it could not in any way represent any symbol of loyalty and affection to Her Majesty. If that is what this group wish to be the aim of a second flag then that is fine, but they have not said so. One day they pay lip service to Her Majesty as Queen of this country, and the next day they say we should remove any suggestion or symbol from any flag of Canada of loyalty and affection for Her Majesty.

The proposal for a second flag must assume as a basic premise that the first one is a limp one, because it apparently does not contain any symbol of loyalty or affection for Her Majesty. In the form of government we have, Her Majesty is as integral a part of parliament as is this chamber. That fact is accepted by the vast majority of the people of this country.

For those reasons I believe we have clearly indicated that on these flag questions, including the motion and amendment now before us, all hon. members on this side have a freedom of choice. Certainly I am not in favour of this amendment and when the time comes to vote I shall vote against it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief. I already expressed my opinion on the flag yesterday. As I said then in this house, we have had enough difficulty giving our country a truly national flag and we should not, with an illogical resolution, make a mess of everything that was done thanks to the last vote taken after closure.

If we were able to accuse the Conservative party of deliberately wasting the time of the house on the matter of a distinctive national flag, we can now accuse the Liberals of deliberately wasting more time by trying to have a second national flag approved by the house. We will be the only country in the world to have, by virtue of a government act, two flags which will compete with one another according to the whims of the people in each province. The second flag, we are told, will serve to show our allegiance to the crown, but if the English provinces decide—and they would have the right to do so—to show their allegiance to the crown 365 days a year, who can stop them? Could that be the way out used by the Prime Minister to have the single leaf flag accepted by certain English reactionary elements? Everything is possible with this government which lacks determination.

As I said in my last speech, the government cannot give as a reason our membership in the commonwealth of nations. In this connection, I support wholeheartedly this motion introduced by our group to the effect that it is up to the commonwealth association, that is all the prime ministers as a group, to decide on the flag of that organization known as the commonwealth of nations and to discuss at such a meeting the matter of a distinctive emblem for that community.

This government suggests that the union jack has always been considered as the emblem of the commonwealth. Perhaps it was at the time of the British commonwealth, in the sense that the British commonwealth or England directed everything and it had borrowed this expression to have the years of its colonialism forgotten.

Today it is a dictatorial act, while England is our equal partner, and this is the reason why we say the "commonwealth of nations", because even the countries which have completely rejected royalty are members of this association.

Do you really believe that this suggestion of the Canadian government concerning the union jack would be agreed to by these countries which have repudiated royalty? They would agree even less to a country enacting the recognition of the union jack as the emblem of the commonwealth of nations, as this would be an unprecedented attack against all these free countries from a member country.

At most, we could agree to refer the matter to a committee of the house, and suggest—I do not say order, but suggest—to the Prime Minister at the next meeting of all the representatives of the other member countries of the association, to propose this matter of an emblem representing the commonwealth of nations. We do not say that it is necessary to wait for this meeting, to wait for a decision of the people responsible for the commonwealth to adopt it; no we simply say "suggest to the Prime Minister, at the meeting, the selection of an emblem to represent the commonwealth of nations among the member countries".

This is the only course that can be legally taken by parliament in this field.

The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) said a moment ago that we are, in fact, accepting a second flag. Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say at this point that there is the word "necessarily", if the association decides on a flag that will represent the commonwealth of nations.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I must interrupt the hon. member—

[*Text*]

It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, to resume my remarks which were interrupted at six o'clock I was saying that the hon. member for Lotbinière claimed in his speech that we were accepting a second flag in principle. Quite the contrary. We would accept the emblem to be chosen by the whole commonwealth of nations, if ever the prime ministers concerned were so to decide, just as we accept the use of NATO emblems and those of other organizations. Still, we do so in principle only, and not under a federal act, for the day we decide to withdraw from NATO, from the commonwealth or any other international group, we no longer have any use for those emblems.

This does not mean that we recognize two Canadian flags, one for week days and the other for Sundays. We want one flag and one flag only.

The hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) said that our amendment is illogical. I wonder in what books he learned his definition of logic.

If it is illogical to let the real authorities of the commonwealth select the emblem which should represent that association, I do not understand anything about logic.

Everybody will agree that what we are asking for in our amendment is merely common sense. Therefore, I urge all members of each party to support the amendment proposed by this group.

Thus, we would not encroach on anybody's authority. We would not bring about any conflict, any misunderstanding and above all, any unfortunate complication. We would not dictate anything to anybody and we would leave full and complete freedom of action to all member countries. We are only expressing one of our dearest wishes, that is to obtain eventually an emblem for the commonwealth, just like there is one for the United Nations and NATO, an emblem which we could fly during meetings of the commonwealth of nations.

Mr. Speaker, I made those remarks so that the purpose of our amendment may be understood, and I hope that every member will make it his duty to support it.

Mr. Rémi Paul (Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière): Mr. Speaker, as I did not have the opportunity to take part in the debate following the presentation of the sixth report, I now want to congratulate all those members who, for six weeks, studied the matter of choosing a distinctive national flag, which was adopted last Monday evening.

The committee also submitted a report which has been discussed in this house since last Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that there is increasing unity on the distinctive national flag chosen by the majority in the house last Monday, and we must now, in accordance with the recommendation of the seventh report of the committee, choose a second flag.

I listened with great interest to the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming), who declared after studying the seventh report of the committee, that nine members had voted for its adoption while five members had voted against.

And, by chance, it so happens that the five members who seemed to take a logical course in the work to be done by this committee were Conservative members who, oppose, just like their party, the adoption of a second flag.

It is alleged as a pretext in the committee report that we have to adopt a second flag as a sign of our membership in the commonwealth of united nations and of our allegiance to the British crown. It is permissible to wonder whether, since Canada adhered to the commonwealth, that is since 1945, it has expressed its allegiance to the British crown, because we did not have the union jack to proclaim, as suggested in the report, our membership in the commonwealth of nations and our allegiance to the British crown.

We wonder where "Joe" is in this seventh report. And speaking of "Joe", we might ask whether it is not the premier of Newfoundland who influenced the federal members of

his province, because this premier said that he would never tolerate any flag other than the union jack or the red ensign to be flown on government buildings in his province.

Why two flags, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Grafftey: Why two?

Mr. Paul: Why two? And I was very interested in the remarks, or the explanation, which the right hon. Prime Minister tried to give when supporting the report of the committee chairman. He has not brought forward any arguments, he has only provided pretexts.

Is there a country in the world with two flags?

We have had to wait 97 years to have a distinctive national flag and now, within three or four days, we are going to have two flags to offer to the Canadian people and to the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest also to some hon. members of my own province who have risen in support of the second proposed flag, the union jack; no doubt, I shall have the pleasure of seeing them in my riding, during the next election, with the two flags.

Mr. Grafftey: Never, only one.

Mr. Paul: Mr. Speaker, the seventh report of the committee is going to be put to a vote. Let us hope it will be tonight. Now, I want to take this opportunity to tell my colleagues, the members of the province of Quebec: "Be completely at ease to rise and vote against the adoption of the second flag." The right hon. Prime Minister has told us that it was going to be a free vote. We, in the Conservative party, are absolutely free to vote as we please on matters dealt with in this report and I hope the Liberal members are also free to do so.

I have no doubt—

Mr. Deschatelets: You were not free, a while ago, in caucus.

Mr. Paul: I hear the hon. member for Maisonneuve-Rosemont (Mr. Deschatelets), my good friend the Minister of Public Works. How enthusiastically the voters will salute you when you offer them these two flags. You could say: My dear constituents, we are the only government in the world to give two flags to its citizens.

I hope to have the opportunity to see the flag for special occasions flying in front of the house of the Minister of Public Works and the second flag behind his residence or vice-versa. What a sight, Mr. Speaker, two flags being bestowed on Canada.

I see the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette), my good friend. I would like him to name a republic in the world which has two flags.

Mr. Choquette: Nigeria.

Mr. Paul: Perhaps the republic of Lotbinière will have two flags.

Mr. Choquette: Name me a party with two leaders who disagree.

Mr. Paul: Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that I should be unable to reply to the one who has just spoken as he does not speak from his seat, which he does quite often.

Mr. Grégoire: He does not know the standing orders.

Mr. Pigeon: And the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan)?

Mr. Paul: Why, Mr. Speaker, does the government bring forward this second flag which we do not need?

I was listening with great admiration and emotion to the right hon. Prime Minister when, on the nights of Monday and Tuesday, he made a plea for unity around a distinctive national flag to be chosen by the House of Commons. Why give the opportunity to the people of Canada to divide around two flags? Only one flag can represent the most legitimate aspirations of all the citizens of Canada to make our country progress; only one flag is sufficient to proclaim to the whole world that, finally, under the banner of this new flag, there are no longer different races or languages, but, on the contrary, that the rights of the minorities are respected, because all the people are willing to co-operate, to walk hand in hand toward progress and prosperity for Canada?

But no, it is an occasion for division, as has always practised the Liberal party which preaches different policies in the English speaking provinces and in the province of Quebec.

We are sincere, we want the tremendous sacrifice we made last Monday to sanction our choice not to be in vain. We do not want this flag to be an occasion for dispute, but it will be, Mr. Speaker, if the government persists in its plan and tries, as it has always done in other fields, to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds.

Mr. Speaker, we will not vote for a second flag. Personally, I will also vote against the

subamendment moved by the Créditistes and I will tell you why: I have listened to the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) 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. Grégoire: 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. Grégoire: 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 Créditiste 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 Créditiste—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.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grafftey: He is referring to the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker).

Mr. Paul: Ask John. I would say: "Ask Réal."

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, in order to become final this royal proclamation must bear the signature of the Governor General. Has the latter the right to give our country a flag which is already that of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II?

A problem of constitutional and international law arises. Can the Governor General, without consulting Her Majesty the Queen, allow Canada to have a second flag, the union jack, which has already been chosen by our ruler, Her Majesty the Queen?

Unless the Minister of Transport had the opportunity to discuss the matter when he was in London last summer, the problem has remained unanswered. If at that time, the Minister of Transport consulted Her Majesty the Queen, it might be interesting to know what answer he obtained. If he did not consult Her Majesty the Queen, let us by all means do so, for I fear the Governor General might be faced with a dilemma which, from the point of view of international law, would prevent the implementation of the order in council adopted by the government, provided of course a second flag is adopted by the house, not to unify Canada but to divide it.

We have had the opportunity of selecting a first flag. I have no doubt that the hon. members on the other side, specially those from the province of Quebec, will set aside all partisan considerations and vote—

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): You have no right to mention my name in this house.

Mr. Paul: Does the hon. member for Longueuil have a question to ask me?

Mr. Côté: You said "l'esprit de parti de côté." I made the remark because you mentioned my name, and it is forbidden to mention a member by name in the house.

Mr. Paul: I have no doubt that the hon. members will be allowed to have a free vote against the subamendment which is even more illogical than the main motion, and Canada will have only one flag after 97 years of existence.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against the main motion and against the subamendment.

[Mr. Caouette.]

Mr. Lucien Plourde (Quebec West): Mr. Speaker, after listening to the hon. member for Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière (Mr. Paul), one is reminded of a proverb which could very well be applied to him, namely: There are none so deaf as those who do not want to hear. I think that is literally true in the case of the hon. member. If he had listened to the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier), he would have known exactly where we stood and would not have talked through his hat. It seems that he wants to get the population as confused as the members of his own party. That is why I will not waste my time disproving what he tried to say, because he simply got everything mixed up. I will therefore proceed with my speech.

I will try to be brief because I feel the marathon has gone on long enough in this house.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with the seventh report of the special flag committee and I strongly support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Beaulé).

I believe that for the good of Canada the said flag committee should be reconvened, with instructions to suggest to the Prime Minister that he propose the adoption of a British commonwealth flag at the next meeting of the prime ministers of the member countries of the commonwealth. This does not mean that we accept a second flag, but on the contrary that we do not want a second flag adopted by the Canadian parliament. This is up to the commonwealth and let the commonwealth find some emblem. It is not our problem, and that is what it means.

I think it is not our responsibility, as members of parliament, to accept or impose a symbol of Canada's membership in the commonwealth and of our allegiance to the crown.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that it was our responsibility to give the country a truly distinctive flag. And that is what we were happy to do. But when it comes to accepting a second flag for this country, we beg to disagree. If there is only one Canada, there should be only one flag. At first, the government showed great courage when introducing in the house a motion to endow this country with a flag of its own. But what a mistake was made when, a little later, Mr. Speaker, Canada was to receive a second flag.

We have waited 97 years, sir, to have a flag, and I think we might be ready to wait another 97 years before discussing this sec-

ond flag the government wants to impose on us. Those two flags have brought about all the confusion we are now witnessing in this country.

The government, in its desire to please both ethnic groups in our country, did just the opposite, that is it managed to set both factions one against the other with speeches such as those we have heard from the Conservatives.

If two flags and two national anthems are imposed, do we want parliament to accept, without knowing it, that from then on, our country will consist of two associate states? If such is the case, we should know about it so that, in the next parliament, we could see here representatives of each of those different states, and we should consider at once an amendment to our Canadian constitution and an acknowledgement of the respective rights of each of those two states.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members will accept our amendment and that we will not hear anything more about this second flag if, really, it is not in the government's mind to recognize, by that very fact, two associate states in Canada.

Now, if parliament votes against this amendment, it will mean that it advocates, in this country, two associate states, and the responsible people will actually be those who are now in office.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on the amendment to the main motion.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Beaulé) which was negatived on the following division:

Division

YEAS

Messrs:

Beaulé
Bélanger
Boutin
Cantelon
Caouette
Dionne
Enns
Fairweather
Frenette
Gauthier
Grafftey
Grégoire
Howard
Langlois
Latulippe
Macquarrie
Perron
Peters
Pigeon
Plourde
Rhéaume
Rondeau—22.

NAYS

Messrs:

Addison
Alkenbrack
Armstrong
Asselin (Notre Dame de Grâce)
Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)
Badanai
Balcer
Barnett
Basford
Batten
Béchard
Bell
Benidickson
Benson
Bigg
Blouin
Boulanger
Brewin
Brown
Byrne
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Cadieux (Terrebonne)
Cameron (High Park)
Cantin
Cardin
Carter
Cashin
Chapdelaine
Chatterton
Choquette
Chrétien
Churchill
Coates
Côté (Chicoutimi)
Côté (Longueuil)
Cowan
Crossman
Crouse
Cyr
Danforth
Davis
Deachman
Deschatelets
Dinsdale
Doucett
Douglas
Drouin
Drury
Dubé
Dupuis
Emard
Ethier
Eudes
Fane
Favreau
Fisher
Flemming (Victoria-Carleton)
Forbes
Forest
Francis
Gelber
Gendron
Girouard
Godin
Gordon
Granger
Gray
Greene
Groos
Guay
Gundlock
Hahn
Haidasz
Hales
Harley
Hays
Herridge
Honey
Horner (The Battlefords)
Howe (Hamilton South)
Jewett, Miss
Jones, Mrs.
Jorgenson
Kennedy
Kindt
Klein
Knowles
Konantz, Mrs.
Lachance
LaMarsh, Miss
Lambert
Lamontagne
Laniel
Laverdière
Leblanc
Leboe
Leduc
Legault
Lessard (Lake St. John)
Lessard (St. Henry)
Lloyd
Loiselle
Loney
Macaluso
Macdonald
MacEachen
MacEwan
MacInnis
Mackasey
MacLean (Queens)
MacNaught
MacRae
McBain
McIlraith
McLean (Charlotte)
McMillan
McWilliam
Madill
Mandziuk
Marcoux
Martineau
Mather
Matheson
Matte
Millar
Mitchell
Monteith
Moore
More
Moreau
Morison
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Muir (Lisgar)
Mullally
Munro
Nesbitt
Nicholson
Nielsen
Nugent
O'Keefe

Olson
Ormiston
Otto
Pascoe
Patterson
Paul
Pearson
Pennell
Pepin
Pickersgill
Pilon
Prittie
Prud'homme
Pugh
Rapp
Regan
Ricard
Richard
Rideout, Mrs.
Rinfret
Robichaud
Rochon
Rock
Rouleau
Roxburgh
Ryan
Saltsman
Sauvé
Scott
Simpson
Southam
Starr
Stefanson
Stewart
Tardif
Teillet
Temple
Thomas
Thompson
Tremblay
Tucker
Turner
Wadds, Mrs.
Walker
Watson (Assiniboia)
Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Webb
Webster
Weichel
Whelan
Willoughby
Winch
Winkler
Woolliams—194.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Beer: I was paired; had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. Clancy: Mr. Speaker, I abstained from voting, and I cannot see why anybody—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Clancy:—in this house has to support something that they voted against nine times.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, other than for the few remarks I made this afternoon on the amendment which has just been voted upon, I have not spoken in the debate on this motion for concurrence in the committee's report. I have just a few remarks I should like to make in this debate.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lambert: I wish hon. members opposite had the courtesy to listen.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. In fairness to the hon. member who has the floor may we have a little quiet in the chamber.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, I must comment on the noise that comes across from some members sitting on the opposite side as though they had gas on the stomach and were relieving themselves. I feel that this house is entitled to hear the opinions of all members. We are quite prepared to listen to hon. members, even hon. members opposite when the occasion arises and they do not behave like trained seals. In particular we would like to hear from some of the members from the province of Quebec.

[*Translation*]

And I should like to know what will be the attitude of the members of the province of Quebec who voted against the red ensign, because it was a foreign symbol and who now intend to support the government's proposal so that Canada may be given a second flag that is even more foreign than the first, if it was. Then, we should like to know which arguments they will use to adopt the union jack as a second flag for Canada, and it is indeed a second flag.

Mr. Caouette: That is correct.

Mr. Lambert: Of course, the union jack is a nice flag, but it is the flag of Great Britain. It is not the Canadian flag. I am proud of my affection for Great Britain, because after all I married a girl from over there and I studied in England, but I can tell you that, in my view, the union jack is not a flag for Canada.

[*Text*]

Any way you want to cut it, Mr. Speaker, this is the same loaf of bread we had last June when the government introduced its resolution which the Chair divided into two parts, one dealing with the national flag and the other with the second flag. Shortly after that resolution was introduced I was in Europe and may I say that Canadians abroad, and our friends abroad were absolutely astounded at what they considered was the completely illogical position taken by the government.

We can, of course, advance all sorts of reasons why this was done. A charge has been made in the press and elsewhere that this was a sop or pacifier to certain sectors of the country.

An hon. Member: Where?

Mr. Lambert: Well, first of all, I know one provincial premier at the eastern extremity of the country who said, "I don't care what flag they adopt in Ottawa so long as it is the union jack or the red ensign, because the union jack is what is going to fly in this province." I am sure there were many government backbenchers who were also astounded when they saw the form of the resolutions calling for two flags. Everybody had talked about a distinctive national flag, not two flags; yet this is what was produced.

In view of the appeal the red ensign had throughout the country, and in view of its general popular support, if we were to have

a second flag showing our devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty, one would have thought we would adopt the red ensign. But no, the government refuses and we are to take the flag of another country, the royal union flag. It is certainly a royal flag in the United Kingdom, but I ask what is the government afraid of? Is it afraid that if the red ensign were put alongside the one maple leaf flag it would still be the popular flag?

Further, if the red ensign was so unpopular in the province of Quebec—and we had scores and scores of members saying it should not fly in this country—how much more chance is there of the union jack flying in that area? I would say considerably less, and with justification because it is not the flag of Canada. I find it a little difficult to see why, by vote of this house we should take the flag of another country and make it our own. What right have we to do this?

Mr. Woolliams: It takes some doing.

Mr. Grafftey: It certainly does.

Mr. Pickersgill: Which way will you vote?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: May we have order in the house, and may I bring to the attention of the hon. member who has the floor that this time the noise is coming from his side of the house.

Mr. Lambert: It is a good exchange. I am competing against a lot, Mr. Speaker, but, as I was saying, what right have we to take over the flag of another country?

I think hon. members opposite should read the comments that appeared in part of the British press, in regard to this whole flag question. They were not very complimentary to Canada.

In résumé, Mr. Speaker, I say that if the government had real faith in its original flag proposal there would not have been any need for this second resolution which, after all, was brought in only after the flag committee had reversed itself. At the very beginning in the committee there was a unanimous resolution that the committee would discuss one flag and one flag only, but the time came when it swung around on this because someone had to deal with the second portion of the original resolution which had been divided by the Chair.

This is not our flag to take, although it is a very respectable, and I would say beautiful flag. But it will have no greater attraction, in fact even less attraction than the red ensign in many parts of the country. How can one distinguish between public occasions so as to decide an occasion on which not to show loyalty and devotion to Her Majesty? On all public occasions, then, we will have the two flags flying. I was talking to a man who controls a large building on which there are two flagpoles. He said to me: Which flag am I to put at the front and which am I to put at the back; which is to have precedence, and when?

If the government had shown faith in its flag proposal it would have asked the house to adopt one flag; it would have left the other off. The second portion of the flag proposal is an admission of weakness in the premise for the first. I am sure that Her Majesty and all others concerned would have more respect for us had we said: All right, we will have one flag; we may have disagreed as to the nature of that one flag, but the disagreement has been resolved or is in the process of being resolved, and we will stick by it. I have just as close a connection with the United Kingdom and just as much devotion for Her Majesty as anyone in this house, but I think I show greater respect when I say we should not take over for our own use a flag which is the flag of Great Britain. I would hope that the flag of Canada would itself show devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty. We do not have to go about wearing that like a badge on our sleeves. This is something which flows from our actions, from our support and recognition of the crown as part of the parliament of Canada. In my opinion it was unnecessary to bring this second flag forward.

Those are the observations I wish to make on this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Marcoux (Quebec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, to begin with I should like to state that I am not one of those who speak for hours on many occasions, and who, then, turns around and accuses others of making lengthy remarks. In fact I controlled myself for a while, but I found out that it was not to much avail.

We had before us the sixth report of the committee which was passed a few days ago.

We are considering now the seventh report about which, in my opinion, the members expressed their views in a rather substantial manner, especially since they had made them well known during the consideration of the sixth report. I believe that the best way to make one's opinion known, with regard to a committee report, is through a vote.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) stated a while ago that he was anxious to know what the Que-

bec members would do. He should let us vote, and then he will find out.

Several amendments were moved, and at this stage I must point out to the house that when the Conservatives were accused of obstruction, at least in the meantime we could work in our offices, the ministers could attend to their work and the committees could sit. But when an amendment was moved, the committees could not sit and the ministers could not perform their work, because everyone had to be called back to the house in order to vote on a question the result of which was known beforehand.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that if it can be said that some overstepped the mark in their speeches, others did the same through the amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not express any other opinion this evening for, as early as on the 18th of August, I recommended that closure be imposed by the government, as I felt that it had given all members opportunity to express their views. If only the members had had new opinions, new interpretations or new solutions to proffer: but back came the same old speeches.

I had even declared that if, as a private member, it had been in my power to apply closure, I should have been pleased to do so. But I realized that it was impossible for me to do it, as only a minister could move closure.

Before moving a motion myself and notwithstanding the respect I have for the committee, I wish to express my personal views and those of my constituents.

There are in my riding about 85,000 voters, and none of them asked me to vote for a second flag. In fact, in the few letters which were sent to me, I was told to vote for a distinctive flag but, for goodness' sake, for one only. That means that I will vote against the adoption of a new flag to mark our allegiance to the crown. I wonder also why others voted against one flag and wanted to propose another one? I am against any flag to show our membership in the commonwealth. We should use our national flag in the meetings of the commonwealth nations as elsewhere.

Moreover, I wonder whether those who said they would vote against the union jack, because it is the flag of another country, will not be the first to stand up and sing "God Save the Queen" which is also the national anthem of another country.

Personally, I already stated that I was against; I am against another flag. I am against the adoption as ours of another country's flag.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the debate should certainly be allowed to continue in the house, since hon. members are free to speak, but there should be no other amendment.

Therefore, in order to have no more amendments to discuss, and basing my suggestion on standing order 51 which says:

> The previous question...shall be in the following words, "That the question be now put"—

And, further on, citation 216, paragraph 2 of Beauchesne, fourth edition:

> The previous question prevents an amendment to the main question and thus forces a direct vote on the main question.

I move, seconded by the hon. member for Portneuf:

> That the vote be now taken on this question.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt this motion?

Is the hon. member for Skeena addressing the house on the motion?

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I hope to, if I get the floor. I really do not think the motion which is before you should be put at this time. All it does is attempt to choke off the birth of debate on this particular question which is before us. It is a lefthanded way of introducing closure, especially in view of the fact that a great number of members in all parties have, as I understand, reached a general understanding about the time at which the debate should end in any event. There is a certain hazard involved in rising to speak about this question and about the question of the flag itself; that is, that one may become guilty by association of something of which he is not guilty. For instance, my own view with respect to the whole number of motions which have been before us in respect of the two flags for Canada could, on the one hand, make me an associate of les Québecois members in the house and I would thus be sort of tainted with that; or, on the other hand—and this applies to other members also—I might become guilty by association with the Liberal party. God forbid. I do not know which would be the worst of the two, really. Even taking another course could make one guilty by association with the Conservative party.

Mr. Grafftey: No, no, no, no.

Mr. Howard: Those are aspects of this question that one has to consider. The hon. mem-

ber for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey) says, "No, no, no, no", and I agree with him. I know he objects to my association with him as much as the reverse applies.

Mr. Grafftey: Politically.

Mr. Howard: Yes; not with him personally, but with the party. So, Mr. Speaker, the views I want to express and make clear are my own and I am sure each hon. member has approached this question in the same way. I start off in that way because I intend to take a particular course with respect to the report of the committee.

Mr. Woolliams: Don't you think we should vote on it tonight?

Mr. Howard: That was an inane question from the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams), who asked, "Don't you think we should vote on it tonight?" He, of all people, is attempting to rush to a conclusion a debate of this sort. It may be that he has worn out his filibustering techniques; I do not know. However, I think we should look at the report of the committee from the point of view of its original birthplace, which was in the devious mind of the member who was then the member for Bonavista-Twillingate (Mr. Pickersgill) when he sat on this side of the house in opposition and when the Liberal party were groping desperately for all sorts of appealing ideas to place before anybody who would listen to them, in the hope of gaining some political support in the country and getting back into the seats of government, which they obviously accomplished. At that time the then member for Bonavista-Twillingate came up with the nightmarish idea that we should not have a distinctive national flag but that we should have two flags. This two flag policy was quickly dubbed the two-faced policy, which I think was the more appropriate designation for it then and is now, because the basis of it was not particularly to develop some sort of symbolic banner for Canada as much as it was to appeal to different sections of the nation, to different ethnic groups within the nation. I think we have to look at it in that light. This was the birthplace of the so-called distinctive national flag, namely the appeal that flag would have within the borders of only one of the provinces, the province of Quebec.

On the other hand, the other half of this two-faced flag policy, namely the part relating to the union jack, was designed, again, to cater to and appeal to one particular province initially, and latterly to other people who are pro-British in extraction. The province I am talking about is the province of Newfoundland. The only ethnic group of people who were not considered by the government—perhaps I should put it more strongly and say the only ethnic group of people in Canada that was completely disregarded by the government in their preparation of these flag designs was the group to which we should be paying the greatest amount of attention in regard to anything symbolic, namely the people who were here a long, long time before the Europeans came over.

Mr. Matheson: It's a red flag for the red man.

Mr. Howard: I refer to our native Indian people. Some smart character on the other side said something about a red flag for the red man. That indicates to me the degree of ignorance he has or his degree of disdain for the native Indian people, to classify them in the vernacular of Hollywood movie-makers.

Mr. Grafftey: A typical Liberal approach.

Mr. Howard: In any event, Mr. Speaker, with all that as a background I cannot for the life of me see the logic of this parliament embarking upon a course of adopting a flag that belongs to another country. Stretching this idea a little further, one might ask the government to bring in a motion indicating that we should fly the stars and stripes, old glory, because of our association with NORAD. What is the difference in that? Would they think of such a course? Would they think of proposing that idea because we happen to be associates on the North American continent? It is just the same. They sell wheat, following the example set by the Tories, to the People's Republic of China. Why not fly their flag, commemorating the fact that China has bailed us out of our difficult position in regard to our balance of international payments? That is equally logical. We belong to the United Nations, and I think that if we are going to fly any other flag commemorating our association with other countries of the world it should be the United Nations flag above all else. Why don't we approach it on that basis? In any event, Mr. Speaker, with that as an introduction I would say that I have no intention of voting to endorse the union jack being flown in this nation for any purpose, because it is a flag that belongs to another country

and we have no business whatever appropriating it.

Some hon. Members: Question.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Girouard (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, a few words only in order to explain my stand in connection with the votes that will take place in a moment.

We are requested to vote on the final report of the flag committee, a report suggesting the adoption of the union jack as a symbol of our membership in the commonwealth.

When I refer to the motion that had been made in the house to set up that committee, I note that in the French as well as the English text, it is written:

> That is it established to study the question of the flag.

I really wonder why this committee had to submit a seventh report suggesting that a second flag be voted on here in this house. It had been requested to study the flag question, flag, not the question of flags.

I, therefore, strongly question the fact that the committee is suggesting a vote this evening.

I would more readily believe that the government is using a roundabout way to make believe there was unanimity among the parties in order to have us adopt a second flag in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly will not go over all the reasons which have been given here, why we should vote for a second flag in this country. I would simply appeal to my Liberal colleagues of the province of Quebec before it is too late.

Not very long ago, and on several occasions, my Liberal colleagues from the province of Quebec applauded loudly the courage and daring of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer). They even allowed themselves, on several occasions, to applaud your humble servant who rose to vote against his own party.

I would remind them, Mr. Speaker, that you have to be courageous and bold to do it, and that is hard. I should like to remind them particularly that you have to be most conscientious to vote against your own party, knowing that, for once, the interest of the voters lies on the other side.

Tonight I should like them to recall the courage, the boldness and the fortitude shown by the hon. member for Three Rivers who, on three or four occasions, voted against his own party in order to properly represent the voters of his riding and his province.

I do not see the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette), but I do see the hon. member for St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville (Mr. Dupuis). Those gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, speak loudly on the hustings and I would like to ask them tonight to speak just as loudly in order to voice the views of their voters who insist—and I challenge them to say the contrary—that they vote against the union jack as a second Canadian flag.

Mr. Speaker, this appeal is a simple one. The right hon. Prime Minister made it himself when he stated:

> The members of my party are free to vote according to their conscience.

I challenge my Liberal colleagues from the province of Quebec to vote according to their conscience tonight. If they vote for the union jack, I challenge them to explain their attitude to the people of Quebec immediately. I challenge them to vote against the union jack.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, it was easy to applaud the hon. member for Three Rivers, as well as those other members who followed him. It was said that they had voted against their own party. They were not voting against their party, Mr. Speaker, they were voting according to the wishes of their electors, they were voting according to their conscience, because the leader of their party had left them free to do so.

I am making the same appeal to them and I challenge them.

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker—

[*Text*]

An hon. Member: Filibuster.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: How interesting it is to hear a Conservative member talk about filibuster, although for six months those same Conservatives have been filibustering against the adoption of a distinctive national flag.

Mr. Speaker, the first and main reason why the government and the opposition are asking for the recognition of the union jack is because during the 1914-18 and the 1939-45 wars, many Canadians served for and on behalf of the union jack or the red ensign.

Mr. Speaker, under such circumstances it would have been preferable for the government not to give a flag to veterans, but rather to introduce legislation giving them pensions and the right to lead a decent life

in their country, Canada, for which they fought.

Mr. Speaker, there are also the widows of veterans. Hundreds of them write to us in this House of Commons asking that their pensions be increased and imploring the passing of legislation which would enable them to lead a decent life in their country, Canada.

Mr. Speaker, instead of offering them decent pensions, instead of coming to grips with this problem, the lot of our veterans, those people who served Canada under various flags, the union jack or the red ensign, instead of passing legislation enabling them to live, we are arguing in this House of Commons whether we should give them a flag called the red ensign or the union jack.

The colour of the flag matters little to a veteran, to a 65 or a 70 year old man, to a 50 or 55 year old man, to a veteran of world war I or II if they are starving in Canada.

We have seen ministers under the Mackenzie King government deliver speeches in Europe to our young people and tell them: "Young Canadians, fight with bravery and courage and when you return to your country you will never experience a depression or unemployment and you will never be considered outcasts."

Mr. Speaker, I feel that veterans or their widows are now treated like outcasts or second class citizens in the country for which they fought on two occasions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I am sorry, but I have to interrupt the hon. member, because it seems to me that his remarks are not relevant to the subject matter, which is concurrence in the seventh and last report of the special committee of the Canadian flag.

In my opinion, the study of the economic situation in some sectors of our population is not directly connected with this question and I ask the hon. member to make sure his remarks are relevant.

Mr. Caouette: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for calling me to order.

However, I would like to submit most humbly that since the discussion on the seventh report on a second flag for Canada, Liberals and Conservatives in turn have told us this was a national emblem which would respect and represent those who served Canada on the occasion of both world wars.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I believe sincerely that my remarks are quite within the ambit of the question of a second flag which the government wants us to adopt.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not say more on this point, because all the hon. members who served during any of the world wars are well aware of the problem we raise at this time about the veterans of any of those two wars, their widows and their families.

Mr. Speaker, during the flag debate we heard the Liberals say that we needed a distinctive national flag and later the Conservatives repeated that we needed only one distinctive national flag. The representatives of both old line parties contradicted themselves within a few weeks. We heard the Liberals, not only from Quebec but from elsewhere, tell us that one distinctive national flag was enough. I hope that there will be a vote shortly, because this will indicate clearly, not only to the people in the province of Quebec but also to those in the rest of the country, how much sincerity or honesty the Liberals and the Conservatives have toward the Canadian voters.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard Conservative members, including the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer) and the hon. member for Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière (Mr. Paul) oppose the adoption of a second flag for Canada. I congratulate them. They represent a sector of the Canadian people that must be taken into consideration and is entitled to its opinion.

The hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Marcoux) a while ago moved that the house revert to the previous question, under standing order 51, to cut down the discussion on the adoption of a second flag. He went about it the wrong way, because we shall have to vote on the previous question motion and then on the main motion, that is, on resolution 44(B), in order to decide whether or not the union jack should be adopted as Canada's second flag to show our allegiance to the British commonwealth of nations.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the way to cut the debate short. It is rather a good way to extend it. Surely the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency was wrong when he moved his motion on the previous question according to standing order 51. We shall vote against the previous question motion and then against the main motion intended to give Canada a second flag, whereas we had enough of one, that is the distinctive national flag we adopted just two days ago.

[*Text*]

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak for very long during this debate, but I do wish to ask for some consideration about something in which I think that hon. members of this house should exercise justice.

In the next few minutes we are going to be asked to vote for the establishment of a second flag for Canada. I am much like many of those French Canadian members who are so very proud of their heritage and because they have been here for such a long time. I think I have been generous in allowing them to express their opinions. I have been very interested in listening to their opinions and their statements regarding their positions about the establishment of a new flag for Canada. This flag will give them the right to be proud of the development of Canada. It is a flag which they feel has no ties with any other country or with the past.

It is true that they look at our past in a little different way than I do, but it is safe for me to say that I too as an English speaking Canadian am interested in the establishment of only one flag for Canada. I honestly believe that that is the feeling of every member of this house.

The plea made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) in this house not long ago was made with some passion. I cannot agree with the position taken by the Prime Minister in introducing his plea, but I think he was sincere in that regard and I have no reason to doubt that sincerity.

Perhaps the French speaking members of this house will be fair with me as an English speaking Canadian. I have had difficulties in my riding over this flag issue as a result of the fact that a number of people who have come from the British Isles live in that riding. I am sure those difficulties have been experienced by other members who represent predominantly English speaking provinces or ridings. If we are to have two flags, one with some heritage attached to it and a new one without any historical significance, there will continue to be a conflict in many areas, particularly having adopted the red ensign a number of years ago. I think we should make sure that all Canadians have a flag that can be considered by everyone as the flag of Canada.

Surely there is no one French Canadian member in this house who would voluntarily fly the union jack, and if I am wrong in that feeling those members should have stood in their places and given some indication of that feeling. At least 25 or 30 per cent of the people living in my riding are French speaking and I have not yet heard any of them express a desire to fly the union jack. I plead with the French Canadian members of this house at this time to refrain from confusing me as an English speaking Canadian about this problem which I have faced for many years. If we adopt a second flag for Canada the English speaking Canadians will in effect have two flags, while the French speaking Canadians will only have one, and we will not have solved the problem which I hope will be solved by the adoption of the one flag which I believe will provide all Canadians with a flag of which they can be proud.

I know there is a hardship in this regard as far as some members are concerned who have made commitments to their political parties, and who are being forced to vote against the wishes of their own constituents. It is important to me as an English speaking Canadian to have one flag which will symbolize our unity. I believe that French Canadians have now been given a flag which they can support, and I hope they will give that same right of support to English speaking Canadians by refraining from adopting a second flag which can only create conflict.

My plea is made with as much sincerity as the Prime Minister's plea of several days ago. Surely we are all in support of the position taken by the Prime Minister when he made a plea in this house that we all support one flag, and that we all get behind it with as much loyalty as possible. I make a similar plea to the members of this house, particularly the French speaking members, to give me as an English speaking Canadian an opportunity to believe in the unity of Canada under one flag, so that we all, English and French speaking can say: This is my flag because I am a Canadian.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether it would be agreeable to not see the clock for a short period of time so that we can have the vote tonight?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, before we agree, perhaps the house leader might set a time limit on this in order that we will not be here until four o'clock in the morning. These open-ended agreements invariably run into difficulty. No one is able to predict the extent of the participation by hon. members of the house in a debate.

Mr. Churchill: Perhaps we could have an indication as to how many more members wish to speak so that we can set some time limit.

Mr. McIlraith: I believe there are one or two members who wish to speak, but it is my information that the speeches will be very short. If they will give some indication as to how much time they require I am agreeable to setting a definite limit.

Mr. Fisher: How about 10.15?

Mr. McIlraith: Would eleven o'clock be agreeable?

Mr. Howard: I think 10.15 would be much more agreeable.

Mr. McIlraith: Perhaps there would not be enough time if we agreed on rising at 10.15. Perhaps 10.30 would be agreeable.

An hon. Member: Sold.

Mr. Winkler: Perhaps we should allow the Minister of Agriculture to run this raffle.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There seems to be agreement on 10.30.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, it seems that the next speakers are being asked to be rather brief, whereas for the past two or three months, or more exactly for the past seven months, we have been asked to adopt flags. In the last minutes of this debate, we are being rushed so that a second distinctive flag might be adopted.

As previous speakers have pointed out, we already have a national flag, and the problem facing us at present is to select a second flag.

I did not have the opportunity, or at least I did not avail myself of the opportunity to speak about the first flag, because I fully endorsed the resolution. When it was time to vote, I showed that I was in favour of a distinctive national flag, like all other members of my group.

But after listening to all the marathon speeches made in this house about those two proposed flags, I feel entitled to make a few remarks tonight.

The other night the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) made a pathetic appeal about our national flag, saying that we should be proud of it, rally around it, that we should be happy to adopt a national flag liable to favour unity.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that if our national flag was a source of unity, as I believed at first, the resolution on the second Canadian flag, which will be put to a vote in a few moments, will be as great a source of division as the single leaf flag can be.

At this stage I ought to thank the Speaker who, when the resolution was introduced, was kind and gracious enough to separate it into two parts so that we may vote according to our conscience and more freely.

I wish to congratulate the English speaking Canadians who took part in this discussion this afternoon, and among others, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) who, with several of his colleagues, approved the single leaf flag and now favour but one distinctive national flag with a view to promoting Canadian unity.

Mr. Speaker, like many other members, I am now asking the Liberal members of the province of Quebec to rally around the single maple leaf flag, because they are the ones who will now give us a second flag, which, in future, will divide this country, because the second flag which we will adopt tonight will give rise to more separatism in the province of Quebec and in other provinces. In fact, this flag will cause disunity.

As the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) so aptly said: Which of the two flags will have precedence? The single leaf flag in the province of Quebec, and the union jack in Newfoundland? Why? Because the hon. premier of Newfoundland stated that whatever distinctive flag was chosen, only one flag would be recognized, or flown, in Newfoundland: The union jack.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we are living at this time a very significant moment in the last minutes of this long debate, perhaps the longest since confederation, on a most important matter.

Our distinctive national flag is an instrument of unity, of mutual understanding. As to the second flag on which you will vote tonight—and the Liberals will be held responsible for it—it may well favour and spread separatism in the province of Quebec and in the rest of this country.

As for me, like my colleagues, I shall vote against a second flag.

And once again I must congratulate the English speaking members who have rallied around the maple leaf flag and who do not want to recognize a second flag.

To them, I say that I look upon them as patriots. But to the Liberal members who were asking us to rally around the maple leaf flag and who may, in a few moments, vote for a second flag indicating our allegiance

to the crown, I say this: You will be voting for a second flag which is not ours, a flag which belongs to England. I also tell them that I am anxious to know their names, because in the province of Quebec they are not looked upon as patriots but as flag-wavers who, unfortunately, say a lot and do not have any principles when it is time to vote.

Mr. Speaker, we respect the union jack and what it stands for. We have already said so in this house; but the union jack is not our flag. Why a second resolution, if they were so keen on a distinctive flag? It is a two-faced "gimmick", and I think the Liberal government, under the circumstances, tried to please everyone.

The government should have remembered the words of the famous French fabulist who said it was impossible to please everyone and one's father. In these circumstances an attempt was made to satisfy not only everyone and one's father, but also one's mother-in-law.

That is why I say the Liberals, under the circumstances, not only did not please everyone, but they displeased everyone, for they failed to assume their responsibilities with regard to the problem at hand, namely that of adopting only one distinctive flag.

Under such circumstances, perhaps we will not be in a better situation in six months than we were before losing so much time in adopting a flag, because what we are doing tonight will probably be a cause for disunion, disagreement and even quarrels throughout Canada, because it is not known which of the two flags will be the official emblem.

Which of the two flags will we fly on certain occasions? We are told that that will be left to everybody's discretion.

I suggest that when you leave such an important matter to the discretion of everyone and anyone, that is likely to create dissension in Canada, and the Liberal party will bear the entire responsibility for it, for I am not ready to accept the union jack as the flag to fly in Canada's ten provinces.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the house ready for the question? Mr. Marcoux moved that the question be now put.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcoux: Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the house, and seeing I have been assured no amendment will be introduced later, I am willing to withdraw my motion.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Has the hon. member the unanimous consent of the house to withdraw his motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, as we had no intention of moving an amendment, we accept the withdrawal just made by the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency.

[*Text*]

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Batten) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Addison
Alkenbrack
Armstrong
Asselin (Notre Dame de Grâce)
Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)
Badanai
Barnett
Basford
Batten
Béchard
Bell
Benidickson
Benson
Bigg
Blouin
Boulanger
Brewin
Brown
Byrne
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Cadieux (Terrebonne)
Cameron (High Park)
Cantin
Cardin
Carter
Cashin
Chapdelaine
Chatterton
Chrétien
Churchill
Clancy
Coates
Côté (Longueuil)
Cowan
Crossman
Crouse
Cyr
Danforth
Davis
Deachman
Deschatelets
Dinsdale
Doucett
Douglas
Drouin
Drury
Dubé
Dupuis
Emard
Enns
Ethier
Eudes
Fairweather
Fane
Favreau
Fisher
Flemming (Victoria-Carleton)
Forbes
Forest
Francis
Gelber
Gendron
Godin
Gordon
Granger
Gray
Greene
Groos
Guay
Gundlock
Hahn
Haidasz
Hales
Harley
Hays
Herridge
Honey
Horner (The Battlefords)
Howe (Hamilton-South)
Jewett, Miss
Kennedy
Kindt
Klein
Knowles
Konantz, Mrs.
Lachance
LaMarsh, Miss
Lamontagne
Lamoureux
Laniel

Laverdière	Patterson
Leblanc	Pearson
Leboe	Pennell
Leduc	Pepin
Legault	Pickersgill
Lessard (Lake St. John)	Pilon
Lessard (St. Henry)	Prittie
Lloyd	Prud'homme
Loiselle	Pugh
Loney	Rapp
Macaluso	Regan
Macdonald	Richard
MacEachen	Rideout, Mrs.
MacEwan	Rinfret
MacInnis	Robichaud
Mackasey	Rochon
MacLean (Queens)	Rock
MacNaught	Rouleau
MacRae	Roxburgh
McBain	Ryan
McIlraith	Saltsman
McLean (Charlotte)	Sauvé
McMillan	Scott
McWilliam	Simpson
Madill	Southam
Mandziuk	Starr
Martineau	Stefanson
Matheson	Stewart
Matte	Tardif
Millar	Teillet
Mitchell	Temple
Monteith	Thompson
Moore	Tremblay
More	Tucker
Moreau	Turner
Morison	Wadds, Mrs.
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)	Walker
	Watson (Assiniboia)
Muir (Lisgar)	Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Mullally	
Munro	Webb
Nasserden	Webster
Nesbitt	Weichel
Nicholson	Whelan
Nielsen	Willoughby
O'Keefe	Winch
Olson	Winkler
Ormiston	Woolliams—185.
Pascoe	

NAYS

Messrs:

Balcer	Langlois
Beaulé	Latulippe
Bélanger	Marcoux
Boutin	Nugent
Caouette	Paul
Choquette	Perron
Côté (Chicoutimi)	Peters
Dionne	Pigeon
Frenette	Plourde
Gauthier	Rhéaume
Girouard	Ricard
Grégoire	Rondeau—25.
Howard	

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Beer: My Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

IMMIGRATION

ONOFRIO MINAUDO AND GIUSEPPE CATALONOTTE—TABLING OF CORRESPONDENCE

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, in order to complete answers to questions Nos. 2,537 and 2,538 given yesterday, I should like to table copies of the correspondence exchanged between the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and any individual, including members of parliament and people writing in their names, about the deportation of Onofrio Minaudo and Giuseppe Catalonotte.

[*Text*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre not intend to ask what tomorrow's business will be? If not, I shall ask it on his behalf.

Mr. Churchill: The hon. member does not need to ask it on my behalf. The leader of the house arranged with me a month ago that he would announce the business of the house without anyone asking him from this side of the house.

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre is quite correct. I am afraid that in my feeling of relief that a rather long debate had come to an end on a good note I overlooked doing what I ought to have done.

Mr. Bell: You are still a good house leader.

Mr. McIlraith: Tomorrow we propose to submit to the house for its consideration the opting out resolution in the name of the Minister of Finance; the labour standards bill; the C.N.R. financing bill; the combines legislation amendment; the Judges Act amendment; the Merchant Seamen Compensation Act amendment; and the resolution and legislation on the Coal Production Assistance Act amendment—

Mr. Bell: I take back what I said.

Mr. McIlraith: —the insurance legislation amendments, the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act amendment; and the resolutions ratifying trade agreements between Canada and Hungary, Canada and the U.S.S.R., and Canada and Bulgaria.

I may add that the items I have mentioned will not necessarily be dealt with in the order I have given.

Mr. Knowles: In view of the last words of the government house leader to the effect that these various items would not necessarily be dealt with in the order given, may I ask whether the second item he mentioned, namely the Canada labour code measure, will be on the list tomorrow, in view of the government's promise to deal with this matter before Christmas?

Mr. McIlraith: The only item to which I can really give priority is the opting out resolution.

An hon. Member: Welching again.

Mr. Thompson: May I ask whether it is the intention of the leader of the house that we should adjourn the session tomorrow night at six o'clock?

Mr. McIlraith: That is our hope.

It being forty five minutes after ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, December 18, 1964

The house met at 11 a.m.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

RECOMMENDATIONS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON RATES OF PAYMENT TO PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to present the recommendations of the joint committee on the library of parliament concerning rates of payment to professional employees of the library.

[*Later:*]

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I move that the report of the joint committee on the library of parliament tabled this day be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Fifth report of special committee on food and drugs—Mr. Harley.

Second report of standing committee on mines, forests and waters—Mr. Godin.

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN FIFTEENTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, acting for the special committee on procedure and organization I move—

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether at this point I could raise a point of order to put something before the house. The hon. member is about to move concurrence in a very important report of the special committee on procedure and organization which was presented to the house on December 14.

Hon. members will have noticed that this is the most important report that has come from the committee; and I say that with all deference to the other reports that have come from the committee. It raises very important matters which are basic to the whole procedure under which we operate in the house. It is the kind of report that is deserving of full debate and discussion in the chamber.

I think all hon. members will agree that there is need for examination of the rules with a view to their improvement, and that this report does deal with some of the basic, needed improvements. I for one, and the government, have not had an opportunity of studying this report thoroughly and in a proper way. We would like to have more opportunity to study it, and indeed have made some preliminary arrangements for doing that during the recess.

In the light of what I have said, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether the hon. member would consider not moving concurrence today. I am led to believe, from conversation with some members of the committee, that the hon. member may feel he is obligated to move concurrence because of some proceeding in the committee, namely that he may have given a commitment that he would move concurrence in this report before the house recessed. But I would appeal to committee members, if any such commitment was given, to release the hon. member from that commitment. I wonder whether it would meet the wishes of the house if we were to let this very important matter stand over, in the hope and expectation that when we reconvene for the latter part of the session we could give it priority for the thorough discussion which it deserves.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the President of the Privy Council has put forward clearly and concisely very cogent arguments in support of the suggestion of the government that this report, revolutionary as it is in certain portions, deserves the fullest consideration. The President of the Privy Council has said that sufficient opportunity has not been available to the government to give that type of consideration to all the implications that are inherent in the report. I think this suggestion is one that deserves the support of the house.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order that has been raised by the President of the Privy Council, I would like to say that I appreciate the remarks he has made, but I also believe that if the members of this house are going to consider this report during the recess and come back to the session some time after the new year, there are at least some

words of explanation due to hon. members respecting the considerations of the committee when compiling this report. I would be agreeable to having the report stand until a later date, but I do think it would be useful to hon. members, particularly to members of the government, if some explanation could be given at this time; then the report could stand and we would not proceed to the point where we had concurrence.

Mr. McIlraith: Do I understand the hon. member's remarks to mean that he would make his speech moving the motion for concurrence in the committee report and then have the debate adjourned at that point in the proceedings? I believe that would be agreeable if that is what he intends to ask for.

Mr. Speaker: I think it is only right that the Chair should declare its personal interest in this matter. It has been moved by the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson), seconded by the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Walker):

> That the fifteenth report of the special committee on procedure and organization presented to the house on December 14, 1964 be now concurred in.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I had a very detailed explanation prepared for the house this morning, but I will be as brief as possible in keeping with the desire to give members of this house at least some explanation of the background to the preparation of this fifteenth report.

I want to say at the outset that concurrence by this house would not necessarily give effect to the recommended changes in standing orders and all the other necessary changes in procedure in this house to the point where all the suggestions which have been made would be effected. It would simply give the blessing of this house to the new committee structure which is proposed by the fifteenth report. I think it is obvious from reading the report, from the language which is used and from the nature of the recommendations which are made that it would require changes in standing orders as well as other changes which could not in fact be made without legislation being passed.

In commencing my remarks may I point out to hon. members that they can find the complete report printed in *Votes and Proceedings* No. 210 for Monday, December 14 last. I also want to express appreciation to the members of the subcommittee who worked for many weeks preparing this report, including the hon. members for York Centre (Mr. Walker), Northumberland (Miss Jewett), Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), Royal (Mr. Fairweather), Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire). I should also like to express appreciation to Mr. Laundy, Mr. Carty and Mr. Kirby, who prepared a number of special studies for the consideration of the committee.

This subcommittee was established on August 26 of this year and its term of reference was simply "Committees". It was authorized to consider all questions and problems relating to the committee structure of this House of Commons. In the opinion of the full committee this subject was of such importance and magnitude as to justify the appointment of a fourth subcommittee with this single area of investigation as its terms of reference.

For your information, Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee held a large number of meetings. They wrote and redrafted the report several times. In addition, it was brought before the whole committee on procedure and organization three times and was appropriately amended after the discussion on each occasion.

When members study this report and give consideration to the effect it would have on the proceedings of this house, I should like them to bear in mind that our major attention was directed toward that duty of the house of dealing with the estimates and expenditures of the federal government. We did a great deal of work in considering what could and should be done by the standing committees of this house in respect of bills and other legislation, but we decided that we could not complete a study and make the necessary recommendations concerning the procedure for consideration of bills in the committees. So when considering this report I hope hon. members will bear in mind that the emphasis was placed on the consideration of estimates.

In *Votes and Proceedings* No. 164 of Wednesday, October 7 there appears a list of 14 special studies that were authorized for and on behalf of the subcommittees. Rather than read the list into the record again perhaps permission could be granted to have this list printed in *Hansard* along with this explanation. All these studies will be available to members so they may consider some of the background the subcommittee used in arriving at the recommendations it has made.

Mr. Speaker: Does the house give consent to the suggestion of the hon. member?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: The list referred to above is as follows:*]

Documents of the Fourth Subcommittee

(a) Some features of interest in the procedures and organization of the British House of Commons (Mr. George Carty).

(b) Some features of interest in the procedures and organization of the French parliament (Mr. George Carty).

(c) The committee structure of the House of Commons at Westminster (Mr. Philip Laundy).

(d) The committee structure of the French national assembly (Mr. Philip Laundy).

(e) Reform of parliamentary committees (Mr. Robert Armstrong).

(f) The committee structure of the congress of the United States (Mr. Michael Kirby).

(g) Classification of committees in the Canadian House of Commons (Mr. Michael Kirby).

(h) Nominal lists of parliamentary and congressional committees in the legislatures of Canada, Great Britain, France, and the United States (Mr. Michael Kirby).

(i) Some features of interest in the procedures and organization in the legislative assembly of the state of Victoria (Mr. C. B. S. Dobson).

(j) Some features of interest in the procedures and organization in the legislative assembly of the state of New South Wales (Mr. C. B. S. Dobson).

(k) Statistical data prepared by the committees and private legislation branch of the House of Commons.

(l) List of suggestions for parliamentary reform made by party leaders and other members of the House of Commons.

(m) Some features of interest in the procedures and organization in the parliaments of Australia and New Zealand (Mr. Robert Thompson).

(n) Summary of Mr. Lambert's impressions of his visit to certain legislatures in western Europe.

Mr. Olson: Essentially the report provides that all the main estimates, when they are tabled in this house by the minister of finance, shall automatically be referred to the appropriate standing committee. In this regard we have set up nine new committees, if you want to call them that, or renamed the committees, with at least one designated to consider each part of the estimates tabled in this house.

Some consideration was given to the physical limitations of the number of committees which would be meeting concurrently or simultaneously. There was also some consideration given by the fourth subcommittee to the suggestion that we adjourn every Wednesday while parliament is in session, setting it aside for the exclusive consideration of estimates by the committees. Consideration was given to a number of other ways by which we could give more and greater attention to the consideration of estimates.

One of the points which required a great deal of consideration by the members related to the designation of committees. We considered names for these new committees very carefully, and I am sure there will be some objection to the names suggested. We even considered simply numbering a large number of standing committees rather than giving them names, because of the connotations which might be placed on particular names. For instance, in the matter of the Department of Labour and the designation of a special committee, there was no disagreement that this was a tremendously important department, of sufficient importance that it warrants a standing committee by itself. That also applies to the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Olson: In relation to the Department of Veterans Affairs, when considering matters which come within that designation we had to bear in mind that many things would have to be sent to the committee when considering the estimates. We felt that at this time the Department of Veterans Affairs is concerned largely with veterans hospitals, pensions and things of that sort. Certainly the same committee which considered the Department of National Health and Welfare estimates would also be concerned with pensions and hospitalization. Therefore we put the Department of Veterans Affairs in with the Department of National Defence. It was moved out once, moved back in and moved out again.

We have included the Department of National Defence and the Department of External Affairs in one of the nine committees. There can be no argument that each of these departments is large enough to warrant a committee, but in the consolidation of the standing committees it was necessary to reduce their number and try to find some common ground or at least some common area of interest in assigning the various departments to the committees. By the way, Mr. Speaker, appendix "B" to the fifteenth report does in fact give the detailed assignment to committees of all the departments and agencies of the government. We do not regard this assignment as perfect, but after a great deal of consideration we thought this was probably the best we could do at the time in grouping those areas where there is some common interest.

In going through the report, Mr. Speaker, you will see that there is an introduction in the first six paragraphs. We say in part by way of introduction that we recognize that

the committees branch of the House of Commons must become the subject matter of a thorough investigation to make sure first of all that they are able to cope with the provision of rooms, staff, and all the other facilities these committees will need. I might say at this point that some members of the subcommittee felt that consideration of the estimates should have been consolidated even more so far as the number of committees is concerned. We are down to nine committees, but some of us felt that the number should be reduced to six because of the physical limitations involved in having six committees meeting simultaneously.

There is the matter of reporters in both English and French, the question of simultaneous translation and all the other facilities these committees will require. Having in mind the overriding consideration that we wanted to have the estimates referred to committees, we had to try to reach some kind of compromise so that in fact the committees could meet and be properly staffed. There is also the problem of having the committee proceedings printed and available to members. Therefore it seems to me we have to recognize that there are physical limitations.

We think that at the present time it would be difficult for more than three or four committees to meet simultaneously, but during those periods when the house would stand adjourned there would be additional staff who would be released from their reporting and translating duties in the House of Commons who would be available to the committees branch. Therefore it would perhaps be possible for four or five committees to meet at the same time and still do all those things that are necessary.

With regard to joint committees, members are well aware that at the present time there are several joint committees with the other place which primarily consider shared services such as the restaurant, library and so on. We believe that one joint committee could deal with all of these shared services. We also recommend, of course, another joint committee on statute law review and consolidation, which is a new departure. I am not going to take the time today to explain that particular committee. I want to go through the report very quickly.

We recommend that the size of committees be reduced substantially. In fact your committee recommends that no standing committee shall consist of less than 15 or more than 30 members. Members will be aware, of course, that at the present time some of the standing committees have as many as 60 members. We recommend that the quorum of all these committees shall be a majority of the membership. In other words, for a committee of 30 members the quorum would be 16, and for a committee with 15 members it would be eight.

We also recommend that at the outset, when the committees are struck and the membership is named, there should be alternate members named so that we would not have to come back to the house repeatedly for the substitution of names. Therefore if any member who is assigned to a committee is unable to attend it would be his responsibility to get in touch with his alternate to see that he should attend.

We also recommend that a chairmen's panel be set up consisting of the Deputy Speaker of the house as chairman and the chairmen of all the other standing committees as members. The purpose of this is so there can be some co-ordination of the activities of all the standing committees. At present there is at times some difficulty within the committees branch in finding accommodation and staff, and we think this could be overcome to a large extent if there were a chairmen's panel which would make the decisions as to when committees would meet or, if that could not be done, at least co-ordinate their thinking so there would not be this difficulty in finding accommodation.

Paragraph 23 of the report sets out that we should adjourn the house for a period of two weeks after three weeks of sitting, and that would come into effect after the main estimates have been tabled in the house. There are nine standing committees on estimates and legislation. We considered this number very carefully, and we believed it would be physically impossible for nine committees to meet concurrently without a lot of confusion developing. Therefore we recommend that half, or about half—that is four of these estimates standing committees—meet during one week of the two week adjournment and that the other four or five, whatever the case may be, meet during the second week of the two week adjournment. We recommend that this be continued throughout the session; that the house shall sit for three weeks and then stand adjourned for two weeks while the legislation and estimates committees would have the exclusive attention of hon. members.

We further recommend that the members be required to attend these meetings of the committees to which they have been ap-

pointed, and that standing order No. 5 be amended by the addition of the words "and its committees" after the word "house" where this occurs. At present members are required to attend the sessions of the house, but when a session stands adjourned their attendance is not obligatory. We think this obligation should be invoked also with regard to attendance at committees.

In paragraph 28 we recommend that the main estimates of expenditure should automatically be referred to the appropriate standing committees when they are tabled in the house.

Paragraph 29 recommends that there be no more than 20 days set aside for debating the main estimates in committee of the whole. We think the details of all the expenditures would be delved into deeply in the committees, and that a maximum of 20 days is sufficient for debating them in the house. This would, of course, prevent interminable repetition of the debate which took place in any committee.

Paragraph 30 contains a very important point that requires some explanation, because it deals with the six supply motions that are required under the present standing orders. At present these six supply motions are required in order to refer estimates to the committee of the whole, but if all the estimates when they are tabled automatically stand referred to the appropriate committees, it would appear there would no longer be any need for these six supply motions.

At the same time we recognize that there ought to be a number of debates during the course of a session on which the opposition would have the right to select the subject matter and move motions of no confidence if they wished to do so. Though we have not provided for what should be done to retain this right of the opposition we do not believe these opportunities should be abolished, even though they would not be required to enter estimates. We recognize that additional study needs to be done to provide for retaining this procedure and at the same time tidying it up so that it will not necessarily be called a supply motion.

There are a number of other suggestions, such as that these supply motions would still be required in order to vote the funds when the report of an estimates committee came back to the house and, as I pointed out, there was no intention on the part of the subcommittee to do away with such opportunities because it is necessary that the opposition select the subject matter of a limited debate. One other consideration which is not contained in the report is that possibly the first two days, the Monday and Tuesday after the house reconvenes following an adjournment period, would be an opportune time for the presenting of motions of no confidence.

Paragraph 31 simply exempts the Speaker's estimates, the Governor General's estimates and the privy council estimates from going to the standing committees, because we think these are of unique importance to members in the chamber and therefore should be considered in committee of the whole.

At present I am not going to go into a lot more detail, but I think members of the house should know these things and the considerations which gave rise to the recommendations.

Taking all the recommendations that are in the fifteenth report and putting them together with the recommendations made in the eleventh report, which dealt with the matter of committees being set up at the beginning of each parliament rather than at the beginning of each session, in our opinion they will make a tremendous improvement in the efficiency and effectiveness of parliament.

I should now like to read excerpts from two or three press reports which appeared since the committee's report was tabled last Monday, in order to indicate that there appears to be almost unanimous support in editorial comment across the country for the recommendations of the committee. For example, the Montreal *Star* on December 16 said:

> Where there has been failure it has often lain in outmoded procedure and rules rather than individuals. These rules have been under scrutiny for many months. An all-party committee of the house has worked with astonishing unanimity to change and streamline procedures.

The Ottawa *Citizen* on December 16 said:

> The best thing about the report is that it proposes a thorough and rational study of government estimates, thus suggesting a more effective check on spending while restoring to the private member his ancient control over the public money. A job that needs to be done would be given to a group of people—the backbenchers of all parties....

The Toronto *Telegram* of December 16 said:

> This week the Commons committee on procedure and organization made some recommendations which give hope for a revival of respect among the people's elected representatives. This is indispensable, for without it the nation's respect for parliament cannot easily be nursed back to health.

It goes on to say:

> The recommendations offer a sensible way to entrust important segments of a mounting work load to keen scrutiny in committee without weakening the basic authority of the Commons as a whole.

There is much more I could read into the record, but I promised to be brief. I make an appeal to members of the house to study this report in detail over the recess period, and to give consideration to giving it their support, at least on a trial basis, so that we can restore, if one wants to put it that way, some order to the tremendous load of business being transacted by the house at present.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Baldwin, seconded by Mr. Knowles, moves that the said debate be now adjourned. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NATO—REPORT ON MINISTERIAL MEETING

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I should like to make a brief statement to the house on the NATO ministerial meeting which the Minister of National Defence and I have just attended in Paris. I should like to table copies in English and in French of the communiqué which was issued at the close of the meeting. As is usual, perhaps this could be made an appendix to today's record.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): This was a useful and encouraging meeting. In fact I think it was the most useful of the four which I have attended, for we discussed matters which are at the heart of the alliance in a spirit of candor and tolerance. As so often happens, the meeting was preceded by reports of crisis, but an alliance which can discuss its difficulties in the spirit I have described is strong and healthy.

That differences exist is of course well known, and this is particularly the case with regard to the nuclear arrangements of the alliance. I went to the meeting with the strong belief that the various proposals that had been made for nuclear arrangements should continue to be discussed in the NATO forum and that no decisions on these important questions should be taken without full consultation in NATO. During the meeting I expressed this belief, which was shared by others, and paragraph 8 of the communiqué reflects this view.

I should like to make quite clear that in urging NATO discussion of these issues, we are not aligning ourselves for or against any other member of the alliance. What we are doing is seeking a way to reinforce the unity of the alliance. It is for this reason that the Canadian government has consistently maintained that any new arrangements must be related to the essential purposes of NATO.

We also discussed Cyprus in a restricted meeting of ministers. We were given a report from the secretary general which covered the conscientious efforts which he and his predecessor, Mr. Stikker, had made under the watching brief entrusted to them to try to bring Greece and Turkey together. Without the intervention of the NATO secretary general the dangers arising from the tension between Greece and Turkey and the threat to the stability of the southeastern flank of NATO might well have increased.

After hearing statements from the foreign ministers of Greece and Turkey, I appealed to the sense of responsibility of the two governments and urged them to do all they could to exert a moderating influence on the two communities in Cyprus. I reiterated the need for renewed efforts to reach agreement on a negotiated settlement. I also urged that restraint on the part of the governments of Greece and Turkey could be an even more influential factor than the activities of the NATO secretary general. It was of course understood that the watching brief of the NATO secretary general which the council reviewed should continue to be in support of the mediatory and peace keeping role of the United Nations. That role is of primary interest to Canada as a contributor to the United Nations peace keeping force in Cyprus.

I may say that the government expects to receive a request from the secretary general of the United Nations today to agree to a renewal of Canadian participation in the United Nations force for a further period of three months, and that the Canadian permanent representative to the United Nations will be authorized to convey the government's agreement to this request.

It has been the Canadian view for some time past that if NATO is to continue as a dynamic alliance, its members must consider carefully the kind of alliance most suited to their national needs and to conditions in the future. The importance of examining the alliance's future was recognized at The Hague meeting, where ministers had their first exchange of views on this subject. At this recent meeting I advanced the view that there should

be a study of the state of the alliance and the commonly accepted purposes and principles of NATO, to be undertaken in the first instance by the permanent council. I am pleased to be able to report that this view finds clear expression in paragraph 4 of the communiqué.

We believe the unity of the alliance is best served by using to the fullest possible extent the machinery of consultation which NATO provides. It was with this aim in view that, as I have just mentioned, we advocated a full and continuous examination of the state of the alliance and of its purposes and objectives.

I cannot recall a more searching discussion at any of these meetings. We did not evade the problems of the alliance, even the United States and British proposals for multilateral defence arrangements. We heard and welcomed in unmistakable terms assurances of mutual confidence and co-operation based on a unanimous recognition of the fact that at least as long as the threat of agression in a divided Europe continues, the need for the alliance remains as compelling as ever.

While NATO has survived successive crises, I hasten to add that I found no state of crisis in the alliance but a healthy recognition of the perplexing problems of the international scene and a desire to come to grips with them.

I had talks with the French foreign minister which were part of a series in the ministerial consultations between Canada and France begun last January at the time the Prime Minister and I visited General de Gaulle and members of the French government. I had an extensive conversation in this connection on December 13 with Mr. Couve de Murville at the Quai d'Orsay. The French foreign minister and I exchanged views on a number of NATO issues and reviewed several subjects of current interest to both our countries, including defence.

Finally, I took the opportunity on December 14 to attend the opening of the new consulate general of Canada at Bordeaux. This marks a further significant stage in the rapidly broadening relations between France and Canada.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): First I want to say to the minister that he has given to the house a general review, but he has not touched on certain matters which I would have thought he would deal with.

When he speaks of the necessity of preserving the NATO alliance, that sentiment would, of course, receive the entire support of the members of this house. The hon. gentleman stated that the NATO alliance showed no sign of weakening. That is not the information which is daily being received through the press, over the radio and through other media of information. Indeed, for the past several months these sources have indicated a loosening of those ties in NATO.

One of the main purposes of the meeting, I would think, would have been to bring about a more general agreement in respect to those things which are essential to the preservation and strengthening of NATO. It has always been the case that an alliance defensive in its nature weakens when the threat of danger lessens. Certainly in the last year, in any event, the communist threat as posed by the U.S.S.R. has, in the public mind, diminished and in consequence those things that hold the nations together in NATO tend to weaken.

The minister had advised the house that Canada will be receiving an invitation today from the secretary general to provide for a further three months of peace keeping in Cyprus, and he has informed the house that the stand of the government will be the acceptance of the request. I would have liked to hear the minister place before the house and the country the representations he made regarding the most unfair responsibility which rests on Canada of providing the entire cost of Canada's contribution to that peace force. Why should Canada be placed in the position of having to bear the entire cost of doing an international work? We have spoken of this on more than one occasion. Apparently, however, the minister did not deal therewith or place before the NATO countries the need of a reasonable degree of equality of sacrifice among the nations in the preservation of the UN force and the maintenance of that peace force.

On the question of the nuclear deterrent we received little or no information from the minister. I can understand his difficulty, because this government in its policy in this regard has followed a course of uncertainty and vacillation. We have seen evidence of that over and over again in the last 19 months, namely that the views expressed by the members of the present government, when they were in opposition, regarding a nuclear deterrent and the like have been forgotten or in any event denuded in the experience of carrying them into effect.

Then there was reported in the press a statement made by the minister regarding

Canada's attitude to France. That was a most unusual statement and one that deserves to be debated in this house. I do not have it before me, but in summary it was that Canada had given its assurance to General de Gaulle that in any course of action that might be taken in NATO, Canada would do nothing that would run contrary to the course being developed by or the attitude of mind of the Republic of France.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, may I just point out to my hon. friend that a correction was made in regard to that report. I saw the report, and the next day I made a correction of it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, these corrections do not seem to catch up with the ebullient declarations of the hon. gentleman. He held a press conference; he expressed himself; he had with him a host of pressmen; and each and every one, press, radio and t.v., reported the statement allegedly made by the minister. It is one that needs to be clarified, for what it amounted to—and it was so interpreted—was that he, on behalf of Canada, had made a declaration that regardless of the attitude of the United States in its contribution to the preservation of the peace of the world through NATO, if France was in disagreement Canada would follow the lead of France.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is something that is not realistic and cannot, as I see it, be accepted by the Canadian people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The minister says he corrected it. Well, Mr. Speaker, the place to correct it and say what he in fact did say is in the House of Commons, so that the misunderstanding that was created, if such indeed took place, would be removed and obliterated. But, as it is, all the pressmen, radio and t.v. reporters took the same view and made the same interpretation of the words used by the minister when in Paris. There was no exception. We in this house have the right to know what is the attitude of the government of Canada in relation to the views being expressed by General de Gaulle, and above all France, which so often do not coincide with the views of the other members of this great alliance.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, in commenting on the statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs I would like to confine myself to three brief points. The first is that, as is usual, the communiqué from the NATO council is vague and reassuring in its terms; it papers over the very real problems and difficulties that exist. I regret that we are not able to hear from the minister a clearer statement of where Canada stands on the problem of the control of nuclear weapons and the further dissemination of nuclear weapons.

The second point I would like to make is this. We regret that there appears to be nothing in the statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs to indicate that Canada has now initiated the renegotiation of her role in the area of tactical nuclear weapons, which was promised by the government before the election; I believe by the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs. We regret there is no indication that this point was raised by Canada, and that this renegotiation of Canada's role—long overdue, in our opinion—has now begun.

Third, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that we do welcome the indication in the statement made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs that Canada will accept the invitation of the secretary general of the United Nations to continue her peace keeping role in Cyprus. We believe that Canada should do this, notwithstanding the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition that it is perhaps an unfair financial burden to put upon Canada. We think that financial burden is small compared with the tremendous constructive value of Canada's contribution to the peace keeping force in Cyprus, and we hope that notwithstanding any difficulties and feelings—and they are natural—such as the Leader of the Opposition has expressed, Canada will continue to accept this very important responsibility.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, in attempting to be as brief as possible I would say that we welcome the summary report given to us by the Secretary of State for External Affairs on the recent NATO conference in Paris. I believe we all agree that the record of NATO has been tremendous; it has accomplished far more than was originally expected. I believe that, in spite of the difficulties which are being faced today, there is a very urgent need and a very definite role for NATO in world affairs.

It is obvious that the most important work at this conference was done not so much in the formal meetings that were held but in the discussions and direct contacts among

various representatives of the different nations. From what we have read and from what has been said this morning, I would think Canada's delegation played a very important role in this regard.

Obviously there is some satisfaction to be taken from what was accomplished in spite of the fact that there is a great deal of insecurity and certainly indefiniteness about just what is going to be the future role of NATO. I think no single matter is more important than the question of whether there is going to be a nuclear deterrent in the hands of NATO. I am sure the decision of the British parliament yesterday, namely to support the government's recognition of an Atlantic nuclear force in place of what has been suggested by the United States, is of extreme importance, and I would have appreciated it if the minister had said more about that matter. Obviously there is a great deal yet to be done in relation to what action is going to be taken through NATO as it relates to the nuclear deterrent in Europe.

We welcome the statement which has been made about Cyprus. I think it is important that Canada continue her peace keeping role there, and I would hope that in this apparent lull in active hostilities some definite plan is being worked out for that island in the unfortunate situation in which it finds itself at the present time. Certainly a peace force such as there is now, is essential, but this arrangement cannot go on indefinitely, and I trust that everything is being done which can be done toward bringing the situation to some sort of satisfactory settlement.

There is one point on which I should have liked to hear more from the minister, and it is this. I realize it does not relate directly to NATO and its sphere of influence, but it has a definite relationship to world peace. This concerns Portugal and its role in Africa. The charge is constantly made that NATO equipment is being used directly or indirectly to support a very dictatorial colonial regime in two major parts of Africa, Angola and Mozambique, and that unless this situation is settled we will never have peace in Africa. Certainly NATO does have some direct responsibility here, particularly if it is true that the assistance which is being given to a NATO member country is being used for other purposes than originally intended.

This brings up the point, Mr. Speaker, that the role of NATO is definitely changing in the changing world in which we find ourselves today. Certainly the metamorphosis and development required to meet changing conditions will result in some very definite changes in NATO. I hope when we reconvene we may have an opportunity for a full scale debate on these matters which centre around NATO, because certainly it is not only vital to the world situation but it is most important as far as Canada's role in that situation is concerned.

We note with interest the fact that another consulate general has been opened in Bordeaux, which brings up the point made by the Leader of the Opposition that Canada's developing role with France is likewise something which should be debated in this house because it concerns a very important policy regarding Canada's foreign relations.

While we realize there are many problems still facing NATO, NATO is nevertheless bigger and more important than these problems, and I think it has a very important future which will remain as important as it has in the past.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words to congratulate the minister for the report of his meetings at NATO and the discussions in which he took part, because they certainly helped the cause of peace.

I think that NATO is the right organization for trying to gather all the nations which want to unite, first of all for peace and, more particularly, for standing up to communism.

During my last journey, I had the opportunity of seeing for myself the work accomplished by those 15 countries, an experience which made me very happy indeed, because I could see that those nations who want peace, and more particularly to work for peace are able to do a great deal, even if their population is not very large, as in the case of Canada.

Yes, Canada can accomplish a great deal by joining with those war giants. What strikes us in all those discussions is to always see the mighty prevail against us. It is all very well to say that in order to protect ourselves we must get arms, but what scares me most is that all those NATO discussions aim to provide everybody with weapons, while giving bullets to only one. This is dangerous, but I know that in his speeches, the minister has surely helped to relieve this tension and this threat by emphasizing that all countries, including France, should contribute to this peace-minded organization. I wish to congratulate especially the minister for his good work.

There is only one point about which I wondered, and it is the matter of Cyprus. We are asked to leave our occupation forces in Cyprus for another three months. I understand that Canada should be asked to make further sacrifices but it seems that it is the only country that is paying all the expenses of its troops in Cyprus. Therefore, I wonder why the Canadian government does not take the necessary steps to see that our army is on an equal footing with the other troops regarding its expenses.

People overseas think that Canada is a rich country but if they came to live here they would change their minds.

I always wondered why we accepted to spend millions of dollars to pay all expenses of our armed forces in Cyprus when the other UN forces which are in that country to protect it—the same as the Canadian troops—do not have to pay their expenses.

Now, I would like to ask the minister to tell us the exact costs of our Canadian troops in Cyprus.

We should help, of course, to the keeping of peace, but we should also bear in mind that there are 15 countries in NATO and that the burden should be born equally by those 15 countries.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister to communicate with the countries concerned and discuss this matter with them in order to put an end to all these expenses being paid by Canada while these other countries are only contributing a very small share.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that the communiqué referred to by the Secretary of State for External Affairs be printed as an appendix to today's *Hansard*?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: For communiqué referred to above, see appendix.*]

PENSIONS

PROPOSED PROCEDURE FOLLOWING PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION RESPECTING PRIVATE PLANS

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a short statement on the procedure which the government proposes to follow as a result of the present and proposed provincial legislation relating to the portability and solvency of private pension plans.

[Mr. Gauthier.]

Legislation relating to the portability and solvency of private pension plans, applicable to employment under provincial jurisdiction, has already come into force in the province of Ontario and is currently being considered by other provinces. An interprovincial conference on uniform pension legislation, to which federal government observers were invited, was held in Toronto on October 16 of this year. It was then agreed that every effort should be made to prepare a model act for consideration by the end of this month, with the hope that it could be approved by provincial authorities in time for presentation to the various provincial legislatures at their 1965 sessions.

The government has decided that as soon as there is a wide measure of agreement as to the approach to be taken by the provinces to this problem as it applies to employment under provincial jurisdiction, the government will, as a measure of co-operation with the provinces, introduce similar legislation applicable to employment in works, undertakings and businesses under the jurisdiction of parliament. Before any such legislation is introduced, however, the government will be having further discussions with the provincial authorities. In addition, the pension plans of federal government employees and employees of federal crown corporations will be amended to include similar provisions for portability.

I should like to make it clear that since both the provincial legislation and the proposed federal legislation on this subject will relate to private pension plans, there will be no conflict between it and the Canada pension plan.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

CONDUCT OF CERTAIN MINISTERS—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 26

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I should like leave to move the adjournment of this house in accordance with standing order No. 26 in order to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely the grave doubts and uncertainties which have arisen in connection with the standard of conduct and public morality of those in authority in public affairs, in particular the public admissions made by the Secretary of State (Mr. Lamontagne) and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Tremblay) concerning the relationships between those ministers and the Sefkind brothers of Montreal and companies associated with them.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacEwan: Perhaps if hon. members, particularly the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Robichaud), will wait for a moment, I will indicate the actions of those ministers which I believe to be inconsistent with the proper conduct of ministers of the crown.

Before I move the motion, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I will be allowed to mention briefly the importance and urgency of this matter. As you will recall, on December 1 the hon. member for Cape Breton South placed the following question on the order paper:

> Arising out of the investigation into bankruptcy frauds now in progress in Montreal, has the government secured any information showing that the records and documents connected with bankruptcy proceedings by Max and Adolph Sefkind and/or their companies disclose contributions for campaign purposes to any cabinet ministers or other members of parliament, and, if so, to whom and in what amounts?

Without going into the details, Mr. Speaker, on December 8 the Secretary of State was reported in the press as having revealed that he had dealings in the amount of some $6,800 in relation to the purchase of furniture from the now bankrupt United Upholsterers Limited. He said he had received this furniture in 1961 and in 1963, not having made a down payment or arrangements for payment, and began to make payments after receiving a demand from the trustees in bankruptcy in January, 1964.

On December 9 the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration was reported in the press as having volunteered similar information to news representatives. In this case the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration stated that deliveries of some $3,341 worth of furniture had been made to him between November 15, 1963, and January 10, 1964. He stated that he had received it under similar conditions, and that he made a final payment upon the demand of the same Bank of Montreal.

On December 9 the Prime Minister was reported in the press as having made the following statement:

> I make no statement until I have all the facts, in contrast to allegations and innuendos. When I have all the facts, I'll make any statement that is appropriate.

We do not know what further facts the Prime Minister might be waiting for, but information about this matter which is so important to parliament should be brought before parliament at this time.

As to the importance of this matter, without reading any of the many reports which have been made throughout the country, as is known to Your Honour for some time there has been a great deal of speculation and an extraordinary amount of questioning in the press and over other media, t.v. and radio, having a bearing upon the propriety of the actions of the two ministers.

As to the urgency of the matter, if Your Honour will allow me, and in view of the fact that it is the last day before we adjourn for—

Mr. Pearson: That is what you think.

Mr. MacEwan: That is what the house leader stated last night. Perhaps the Prime Minister will check with his house leader.

Mr. Pearson: He said he hoped, but that hope is now gone.

Mr. MacEwan: All right; we hope that to be the case, and this is a good time of the year to have hope. This is the time when this matter should be brought forward. I have set forth the matters of importance, as set out in the motion which I should like to move. No statements have been made in this House of Commons by the ministers concerned, which could have been made on questions of privilege. They have made voluntary statements to the press, and I suggest that is to their credit; but I believe in regard to matters of such importance, dealing with cabinet ministers in this country, the House of Commons and parliament are entitled to an explanation. Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin):

> That the house do now adjourn in accordance with standing order No. 26 to discuss a matter of urgent public importance.

I have already set out that matter, Mr. Speaker, and I will not repeat it now.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, are you going to allow discussion on this matter? On the question of urgency and the public importance of this question, Mr. Speaker, I would say first that nothing is more important than that the actions and activities of ministers of the crown shall, like Caesar's wife, be free from any suggestion of impropriety. The only explanation that has been made has consisted of statements by the two ministers, made outside the House of Commons, which, for want of a better expression, I would say had all the appearances of political upholstery of a situation that demands an explanation.

An hon. Member: Furnish us with the facts.

Mr. Diefenbaker: No opportunity has been given up to the present time to ask any questions on this matter. As the hon. member for

Pictou has stated, the first question asked, the one as a result of which the ministers suddenly developed memories of what had taken place, was a written question by the hon. member for Cape Breton South which was answered on December 16. That question was as follows:

> Arising out of the investigation into bankruptcy frauds now in progress in Montreal, has the government secured any information showing that the records and documents connected with bankruptcy proceedings by Max and Adolph Sefkind and/or their companies disclose contributions for campaign purposes to any cabinet ministers or other members of parliament and, if so, to whom and in what amount?

This was the answer given by the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Justice:

> The government does not have, on its own files—

I emphasize the word "own".

> —nor has it secured, arising out of investigation into bankruptcy frauds now in progress in Montreal, any information showing that the records and documents connected with bankruptcy proceedings by Max and Adolph Sefkind and/or their companies disclose contributions for campaign purposes to any cabinet ministers or other members of parliament.

How important this is, sir, is shown by the fact that the Prime Minister issued what might be called the Prime Minister's "political primer" indicating the proprieties that must be maintained. Indeed, as an aside may I say that document was a colossal indictment of his colleagues, and it would be interesting to know the reaction of the ministers and the replies they gave thereto. We have had no explanation by either of these ministers as to what took place other than a general statement which, to say the least, has not brought about the dissipation of the veil of speculation surrounding these unusual, "un-Household Finance" transactions which might be described as "Beneficial Finance" transactions.

There are questions to be asked; there are questions to be answered. One would think the ministers would immediately agree that this opportunity should be given. Certainly we should find out, and the country has a right to know, whether the R.C.M.P. has made any investigations following the revelations that are taking place in connection with the bankruptcy commission instituted by the government of the province of Quebec. Has the R.C.M.P. produced any report in connection with this matter? If so, what action does the Department of Justice intend to take in connection with it? The records are available but we are unable to get them from the trustee in bankruptcy, the accounting firm of McDonald Currie, because the trustee has no power to make information public on these questions.

What about the accounts receivable that appear on the records of the Sefkind firms? Could we be told what records the Bank of Montreal has in connection with this matter? Certainly the answer that was given on December 16 is simply a brush-off answer, and brush-off answers will not meet the serious question of ministerial ethics. So there is urgency, as has been made very clear by the hon. member for Pictou.

The President of the Privy Council said last evening that he hoped the session would end today. A few minutes ago the Prime Minister emphasized the word "hope". Whether it ends today or Monday or Tuesday or whenever it ends, there will be no other opportunity for parliament to consider this matter, a matter of urgency and even more urgent having regard to the serious view that the Prime Minister took in writing a letter to his cabinet associates. Indeed, that letter is one that ought to be attached as an appendix to *Hansard* so that all who run may read. It sets out the Prime Minister's view very clearly in these words:

> It has been said that the elementary qualification demanded of a minister is honesty and incorruptibility. But it is not enough for us to have those qualities. Our attitudes and conduct must be such as to reflect them.

Sir, I am in no way casting aspersions.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have not said a word that casts an aspersion. The ministers sit in this house with their lips sealed. They had an opportunity today to rise in their places and make the explanation which I would have expected them to make under all the circumstances. They sat silent when they had an opportunity. Yesterday the Prime Minister stated he did not raise a question of privilege because he did not have the opportunity procedurally to explain the situation. That was not according to the facts.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, a decision was taken on this matter yesterday, and perhaps the right hon. gentleman will observe ministerial ethics in dealing with it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I said that the Prime Minister yesterday made a statement that he knew was not in accordance with the facts—

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I ask you to rule on the point I have raised.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —when he said—wait until I finish the sentence—that he had no procedural opportunity to make an explanation until yesterday.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Kindt: This howling down of people has got to stop.

Mr. Speaker: Order. It is difficult enough for the Chair without extraneous assistance. I am interested in these remarks, but I am sure the right hon. Leader of the Opposition will confine himself to the matter under discussion today.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I was pointing out that what the Prime Minister learned yesterday was that procedurally he could have done that and made his explanation at any time; and certainly having learned that yesterday I am surprised the two ministers would not rise and give the house the facts.

They did not do it. Mr. Speaker, they cannot sit this out. They have got to explain what took place and, not having done so, I say to you that no matter is more important than that this be thoroughly discussed; because editorial comment across Canada has been unanimous, I believe—I know of no exception—that an explanation must be made, that this must be cleared up because the circumstances reveal a surprising lack of appreciation for those things that must be maintained not only by ministers but by members.

I say, sir, that under all the circumstances there is urgency. It is a most important matter. The integrity of parliament is the most important matter with which we can deal. These ministers had the opportunity today to explain, but they kept their mouths sealed. We want to know the facts now and there is only one way in which we can find them out; this is through the motion in question.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman dealt not, of course, with the urgency of the matter but with the substance of it, and I assume I will be given the same opportunity.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Absolutely.

Mr. Pearson: He also dealt with it within the context of what he called ministerial ethics. It might help the Leader of the Opposition in coming to a reasonable conclusion on questions of ministerial ethics if he could recall some of the difficulties when he was prime minister which concerned the ministerial discharge of affairs and the action, or lack of action, which he took at that time in the discharge of his responsibilities.

Mr. Diefenbaker: When?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, may I read this—

Mr. Diefenbaker: No innuendos. Go ahead and reveal what you had in mind.

Mr. Pearson: I am reading from *Hansard* of 1959:

> We shall not permit, we shall not allow, in our country that something to occur which brought about devastating effects on a responsible government in another country whereby individuals were tried by television, whereby evidence was introduced by innuendo and hearsay.
>
> I say this, that it ill becomes anyone in the house to bring forward a shadow of a motion that in no way offers any proof and behind which the mover does not stand. I will do my utmost to protect the rights of parliament. It is one of the glories of the Canadian parliament that there are few cases in our history where there has been wrongdoing, but where there is wrongdoing it is the responsibility of the Prime Minister and all members of the house to do their part to see that it is punished.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: I say stand up and make a charge of wrongdoing and stand behind it. I continue the quotation:

> Here we have but a piece of paper containing a motion ingeniously contrived in order to sow suspicion.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Who was the mover of the motion?

Mr. Pearson:

> The hon. gentleman moving the motion will not take his stand behind the truth of the allegations ... I say this. I hope I shall never allow any hon. member to be struck in his honour and integrity by a motion such as this, a motion of suspicion fortified only by questions, with the mover holding the high and responsible position of Leader of the Opposition refusing to accept his personal responsibility to make a charge on the basis of his opinion and belief with respect to the alleged findings of wrongdoing...

These observations, Mr. Speaker, were made by the right hon. gentleman—

Mr. Diefenbaker: And I stand behind them today.

Mr. Pearson: —on June 17, 1959. Let him get up now and make a charge.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: He won't do that, Mr. Speaker, any more than the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) will do it when he goes on television and talks about lack of integrity in high places.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: I heard that broadcast, Mr. Speaker, and I asked the hon. gentleman's office for the text and could not get it. But I got the transcript of it, and I have written to him and asked him to produce the evidence on which he charges members of the government with lack of integrity, and of course I have not heard from him.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Prime Minister's comment, I answered his letter three days ago.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: He may have answered but it is still in the office.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Dinsdale: On a question of privilege—

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Prime Minister forgot for three months.

Mr. Pearson: Let me quote the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton), speaking in this house, as recorded at page 6368 of *Hansard* of this year when he said—

Mr. Dinsdale: On a question of privilege—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is a question of privilege.

Mr. Dinsdale: The Prime Minister has suggested that letter is still in my office. I will be very happy to supply him with a copy of that letter, which left my office three days ago.

Mr. Pearson: I have not received it. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle had this to say when a certain question was raised in the house concerning the propriety of the conduct of a member of the house, and I do not think the hon. member for Qu'Appelle has seconded this motion today:

> He picks out a little section out of context—a little something which he hopes will be of some advantage to his mind, that lives in a sewer.

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle was referring to an hon. member on this side of the house. Then he went on:

> I would simply point out to hon. members on the government side that if they ever try to stir up any thoughts which are not based on the facts, they destroy themselves.

These are very good words to apply to hon. members who make this kind of motion in this context, and I would say to my right hon. friend, who is a great authority on quotations, perhaps he will recall a quotation from Confucius—

Mr. Coates: Stop the smokescreen and give us the facts.

Mr. Pearson: —perhaps he will recall the quotation from Confucius, "He who digs dirt loses ground."

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am also reminded that the same Confucius said "He who hides wrongdoing is a wrongdoer himself."

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the right hon. gentleman is he charging wrongdoing?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to Your Honour that the Prime Minister by his very argument has confirmed that we do need a debate on this particular matter. As a matter of fact we have been having it, and I think there is no clearer justification of the urgency than that instead of speaking to the urgency of the matter he immediately engaged in a debate.

We are bothered from the point of view that we consider other matters to be very urgent, but we also feel that there is some merit in the point of view that the house has not been taken into account so far as these explanations are concerned. I think all of us have been reading the public print on the matter and I think we recognize, or at least assume, that the Prime Minister has been carrying on some investigations into this matter.

Therefore we assume that the government and the Prime Minister would welcome the opportunity for a brief debate so the ministers and the Prime Minister could indicate very clearly the details of the matter to us in our forum, rather than in a press conference where you get a different coverage and quite often an incomplete coverage. I hoped that the Prime Minister in speaking to the urgency of this question would have indicated that the government was willing to accept the motion so as to clear up these details. I certainly feel that the question of a charge is a subterfuge on the part of this government—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Fisher: Well, look at what happened yesterday. I do not believe in rehashing things, but if hon. members want this on the

record I still believe that no matter what the decision of the house was, the Prime Minister misled the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, since that news appeared in the newspapers at a time when the house was concerned with a flag debate which forbade the members to raise that question and since the opposition was unable at any time to put questions to the ministers in that respect, it seems to me that, even if today is supposed to be our last sitting day before the adjournment, it would be appropriate to allow a debate on this issue, so that the members and the ministers involved may make the necessary clarifications, since innuendos appeared in the newspapers.

This matter being of some significance, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it would be in order for the Chair to let us discuss it, at this time, with the hope that it will not take us the rest of the day and that we shall proceed with the orders of the day.

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, when I hear in 1964 the present Prime Minister quote what the prime minister of 1959 said, I am convinced that the two old parties are alike: When they are in office, they say one thing, and when they are in the opposition, they say the opposite. When they change sides, they say the same things as their predecessors. This confirms my opinion: both are alike. They wish to hide the truth when they are in power and when some things pop up, and they would like to raise scandals when they are in the opposition.

Since the substance of the matter was dealt with, Mr. Speaker, I must state that I have no doubt about the honesty of the minister concerned, but it seems that one point should be clarified.

I refer to the fact that in all these things which have cropped up of late, whether it be the matter presently under judicial inquiry, or furniture, or Hal Banks, there always seems to be a tie with the electoral coffers of the Liberal party. That, Mr. Speaker, far more than the honesty of the ministers, is what brings questions to my mind.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question we are discussing is whether the house should adjourn under standing order 26 to discuss a matter of urgent national importance; not political speeches or things affecting political parties. Two people have been mentioned. That is the subject before the house.

Mr. Howard: We have got two rules again.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, on taking the floor a while ago the Prime Minister said that he agreed that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition should have some latitude to speak on the substance of the matter. I should like to have the same latitude, but when I attempt to speak, I am called to order. Why?

I am not accusing anyone, but I wish to point out that every time there is a scandal, the matter of the electoral coffers of the Liberal party crops up. We would like a discussion of this matter and an inquiry into it.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. There is a proper way to make a charge, as the hon. member knows. The question before us is the urgency and the importance of the matter under discussion. We are not concerned with various allegations which have appeared in the papers. We are concerned with the particular question the Chair has to consider at this moment and I would ask the hon. member to restrict himself to the matter under discussion. I am not here to make rules; I am here to apply the rules given to me.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I again refer to the importance of the matter. I think discussion is important for the ministers involved because, if they are not guilty, it would give them the opportunity to clear themselves publicly and before the members of the House of Commons. That is why I think it is important.

As far as the urgency of debate is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask you when we would have an opportunity to discuss this matter if we cannot do it today, since the session might very well end today.

Mr. Speaker, I think the matter should be open to debate. We will support the motion, because we think we should have more information concerning the public affairs of this government, especially regarding electoral funds, because it affects everybody.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another point I should like to discuss. Must a specific charge be made by a member of the House of Commons before something can be discussed or referred to the committee on privileges and elections? I do not think so, Mr. Speaker, because since 1962, that is since the day I entered parlia-

ment, on various occasions matters were referred to the committee on privileges and elections, and that was never done following specific charges concerning the responsibility of an hon. member.

After all, we are not asking that a charge be laid but that explanations be given on certain points. A charge may be laid later if necessary—and I repeat "if necessary"—and if the investigation should reveal certain irregularities.

But for the time being our purpose is to get some explanations and not to lay charges, because I do not question the integrity of the ministers involved.

[*Text*]

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Speaker, because of the things which have already been said on the substance of this so-called issue I hope you will allow me as a matter of privilege to make a very brief statement.

Mr. Speaker: May I suggest we try to reach a decision on the question before me. Then if the minister has any question of privilege to raise, he can raise it.

Mr. Lamontagne: A lot of things have been allowed to be said on the substance of this matter, and since I am directly involved I think I should be allowed to make a very brief statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Chair does not wish to prevent, and will not prevent, the minister making a statement at the right time; he can always rise on a question of privilege and make his statement. But I have a specific matter to deal with, and I should like to deal with it first. Then if the minister wishes to make a statement I cannot see any particular harm in his doing so.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): The difficulty as I see it is that the Leader of the Opposition rose and made extensive remarks after the hon. member for Pictou had proposed his motion. In the course of those remarks he dealt in a somewhat extensive way with the whole subject matter.

Mr. Diefenbaker: No.

Mr. McIlraith: Well, that is a matter of record. What was said is recorded in *Hansard,* so let us not get into a controversy here about it. However, having been permitted to make those extensive remarks—

Mr. Grégoire: I was not permitted.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. member for Lapointe was not permitted to make the same kind of extensive remarks. Surely the minister directly involved should, in the circumstances, be permitted to make the same extended remarks as the right hon. gentleman, and he should be allowed to make them as a right, not as a privilege or by a concession of the house. He should be allowed as a right to make remarks exactly in the same context and at the same point in our proceedings. We cannot have a situation where one set of interpretation is permitted for one hon. member and another for another. Surely, since he is directly involved, the minister is entitled to be heard on this point with exactly the same interpretation placed on the latitude for his remarks as was placed on those of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order that has been raised by the Secretary of State, I agree that the minister should be heard; he should be allowed to make a full statement. But I point out to Your Honour that the substance of the matter has already been dealt with both by the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, and the only way the minister can make a statement is for Your Honour to allow the motion.

Mr. Pickersgill: Not at all.

Mr. Douglas: It seems to me that having allowed two speakers, if Your Honour allows the minister to make a statement on the substance of the matter Your Honour will have in effect allowed the motion. In my view, to have the minister make a statement and then for Your Honour to rule that the motion is not relevant and deny anyone else the opportunity of making a statement would be most improper. It seems to me that having allowed the debate to go this far, Your Honour has really no alternative but to allow the motion and let the debate proceed.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, in relation to the point of order raised by my colleague and spoken to by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, I wonder whether I could suggest that a factual statement by the two ministers concerned is absolutely essential at this point in order that Your Honour may have the opportunity to determine whether there is any urgency of debate.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: May I also suggest, sir—and I hope I will be listened to as the right hon. gentleman was listened to, and not howled down—that hon. members opposite, having made a motion about these two ministers, having made a number of statements about them which they culled from the newspapers and so on, ordinary, elementary justice demands that the two ministers be allowed to make a factual statement of their own position; and that you, sir, cannot properly decide whether this is an urgent matter until we have heard those two hon. gentlemen.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, this is the most amazing suggestion I have ever heard.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: The Minister of Transport is suggesting that under the guise of debating urgency two ministers be allowed to make statements which they cannot properly make unless the motion is allowed. I agree that in justice both these ministers should be allowed to make statements. I would go further. In view of the fact that they have both made statements outside this house, they should be required to make statements in the house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: The only way they can properly make those statements is not under the guise of arguing urgency, but for Your Honour to allow the motion, allow them to make their statements and allow the contribution any other hon. member wants to make in the course of the debate.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I think the argument that has just been made by the Minister of Transport makes it abundantly clear that there is urgency of debate. I think the request made by one of the persons named in the motion, namely the Secretary of State, that he should be given an opportunity to make an explanation is in itself an indication that there is urgency of debate.

The Prime Minister argued that there is a need for someone to make a charge. I agreed with him yesterday that when a motion is moved on a question of privilege the member concerned is then—if there is a question of privilege or a prima facie case established—obliged to follow up with a substantive motion containing a charge. The motion yesterday of course did not have a charge in it, but it is a completely different matter to move the adjournment of the house under standing order 26, which is the proposition that is before us this afternoon.

Therefore I think the fact that the Secretary of State and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration apparently feel they ought to make statements and ought to make explanations in this house because of certain latitude of discussion that has already taken place is sufficient argument to allow the debate to take place.

Mr. Speaker: I think I can say without hesitation that the matter is not without a certain amount of difficulty; but as Speaker I am bound by form, precedent and also, I hope, a sense of fairness and justice. Before giving this ruling I would say that I do think it is in the interests of the house that a short explanation be given by the two ministers concerned, particularly in view of the wide latitude given this morning to the right hon. Prime Minister, the right hon. Leader of the Opposition and even, if I may say so, the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam and others. Therefore I think it is in the interests of fair play and justice that not necessarily a statement but certainly an explanation be given by the two ministers concerned.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: One o'clock.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, in view of the hope that I expressed last night, I wonder if we could agree to sit through the lunch hour—

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. McIlraith: —for the purpose of carrying out that hope.

Some hon. Members: One o'clock.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, it would be much better if we sat at the dinner table instead of sitting through this muck-raking.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, we would prefer that you call it one o'clock, because this will enable us to consider the ruling you have just made, for, in my opinion, your decision is one which we will appeal.

[*Text*]

Some hon. Members: One o'clock.

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Speaker, may I call it one o'clock?

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, before Your Honour leaves the chair may I ask a question.

Am I to understand from Your Honour's ruling that the two ministers in question may make statements on the matter of urgency, and will Your Honour also allow other members of the house to make statements following the ministers' statements?

Mr. Churchill: That will have to be allowed, if it is under privilege.

Mr. Speaker: I do think the hon. member is asking for quite a bit. It is the wish of the Chair to have an explanation this morning from the two ministers concerned and not to continue with a long debate unless it be necessary. My particular problem is to reach a decision on whether the house should be adjourned under standing order 26. In view of the latitude given this morning and in fairness to the two persons charged—informally, if you wish—they should at least have the opportunity of making short statements. I think those statements should be made before rendering a decision as to whether standing order 26 is to be applied. If the house would give consent for those statements to be made now it would be of material assistance to the Chair; but I am in the hands of the house, of course. Does the house give consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: One o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Does the house give consent?

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, the minister himself called it one o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: It being one o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: This morning when the house recessed for lunch we had certain matters under discussion, and I think it might be useful if I gave my view at this moment not on the principal question whether or not the house should adjourn but on the question whether or not hon. members are entitled to make remarks for the benefit of the Chair. I do not necessarily mean statements; I mean remarks to assist the Chair in arriving at a conclusion.

This morning reference was made to standing order 26 to which a revision has been made this session as a result of a suggestion by the committee on procedure and organization, and I think it might be useful to refer to it at this moment. Standing order 26 (3) reads:

> He then hands a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to Mr. Speaker. If Mr. Speaker questions the urgency of debate with respect to the proposed matter, he may invite members to speak on the question of such urgency.

It then goes on to refer to other matters, but the point is that the Speaker "may" invite members—which is only right, of course—to assist him in trying to arrive at a proper conclusion.

In virtue of that, this morning several members gave the Chair the benefit of their views, which were in fact quite extensive. The matter under discussion should have related to urgency and in some cases it went far beyond that and related to the substance; but no matter, several hon. members did have the opportunity of assisting the Chair. So it seems to me that the Chair should extend the same privilege to other members, within reason. The privilege should not be abused, but the Chair is entitled, within reason, to call upon other members of the house for their views—again I stress the point; not statements, but views—as to the urgency of the matter.

Therefore I propose to extend the same privilege to the Secretary of State (Mr. Lamontagne), not for the purpose of having him make a formal statement, but for the purpose of allowing him to present his views for the assistance of the Chair. I think it is only a matter of common right and justice that he should, within reason, have the same latitude which was extended to other hon. members this morning.

Mr. Bert Leboe (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, I am in a little difficulty here on several counts. First of all, the Secretary of State (Mr. Lamontagne) did rise and say he wanted to speak on a question of privilege. He also said he had a prepared statement, which you, Mr. Speaker, could not have known about. It seems to me that if the hon. gentleman wants to rise on a question of privilege and so state, then you, Mr. Speaker, must hear that question of privilege before you decide it, and by that time it will be on the record. This has been going on in the house for years.

I find difficulty in allowing this type of statement to be made when we are under the impression, and I think rightly so, that the minister had a prepared statement when he came into the house. Under the circumstances, I believe that if he wants to make a statement

on a question of privilege, then let him make it on a question of privilege. Then, after hearing it, if Your Honour says there is no question of privilege involved, that is up to you. But I think that is the way we should proceed; and I too am only trying to help the Chair.

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I had no prepared statement this morning. I have one now and I think I should be allowed to make that statement because of what has been said this morning.

Mr. Speaker: We are playing with words. I am sure the Secretary of State (Mr. Lamontagne) wishes to present his views to the Chair, and the use of the word "statement" is a difficulty between French and English, if I understand him properly.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Speaker, a few years ago when my Ottawa home burnt down, several pieces of furniture were destroyed. The cost of damage was high, since my insurance had expired without my knowledge, due to the death of my insurance agent. At that time, I had to refurnish my home in part on a temporary basis.

In the spring of 1962, before my daughter's wedding, I decided that I could no longer delay buying new furniture. I then bought furniture on credit from the Futurama store, a well known Montreal firm. There was never any question of a gift. I received statements of account and, besides, my account was normally transferred by the company, like all other outstanding accounts, to the Bank of Montreal in early January 1964.

I must also point out that at the time, I was a private citizen and not yet a member of parliament, and that my salary was $12,000, rather than $27,000, as suggested by a journalist.

After my election, I certainly would have been able to settle this account, but early in May 1963, a member of my family had to retire from active life for reasons of ill health and asked me to lend him $3,000 to help build a small home. I felt unable to refuse him this service, but this meant that I would have to postpone starting to pay my debt.

In December 1963, I made a second purchase of furniture for the apartment I have in my riding, and I intended to pay for it without delay at the time. However, I did not have this opportunity, as I received the first statement about January 21, when all the company's accounts had already been taken over by the Bank of Montreal. The bank got in touch with me at the time. I proposed an arrangement which was immediately accepted, and I now have repaid about half my liability.

I wish to add that I did not take part directly or indirectly in any fraudulent activities. Moreover, the Sefkind brothers and their companies did not get any favour from the government through my intervention. More particularly, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Deschatelets) informs me that an investigation has revealed that his department did not get any offer for sale, by tender or otherwise, and that it did not buy anything from the Sefkind brothers or their companies since April 1963.

I do not intend at this stage to comment on the false rumours and slanderous comments that can be heard in the halls of parliament or read in the newspapers about that incident. Before resuming my seat, I would like to give some advice to all hon. members of the house.

Should you want to buy furniture, pay cash. Should you buy on terms and should your supplier go bankrupt later on, you and your family would go through very unpleasant moments, especially if you feel you have made some sacrifices to remain in public life.

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity afforded me to lay before the house the facts about the furniture I bought from the Futurama Company Inc., Montreal, in order that you may rule on the merits of the motion for adjournment.

In order to complete the furnishing of my new house, in the summer of 1963, I went to Montreal with my wife to the show room of the Futurama Company, a firm which is known for the high quality of its furniture, which had been in business for more than 20 years and where many prominent people from Quebec city and Montreal went regularly to make their purchases.

The first delivery of furniture was made on November 15, 1963, the second, on November 28, 1963, the third, on December 19, 1963 and the fourth on January 10, 1964.

After the above deliveries, there were still a few more pieces of furniture to come.

It was on February 19 that the manager of the Bank of Montreal advised me of the bankruptcy of the Futurama Company and of my account, as of that date, with that company.

Six days later, on February 25, 1964, I sent to the manager of the Bank of Montreal a cheque in the amount of $3,341.69, and on

March 2, 1964, I sent him a second cheque in the amount of $240.41, after adjustments, since some furniture items had not been received by then.

Thus, I was waiting for my last furniture delivery before making the final payment to Futurama, which did not take place before the bankruptcy.

I am still dealing with Fraser Brothers, the company which bought out Futurama and which gave me the assurance that they could complete the order and exchange some lamps, delivered to me by mistake, which did not match the selected design.

That business transaction with the Futurama company was conducted in the most normal way, and at no time did I have the impression of benefiting unduly from that company.

Any insinuation to that effect is malicious, and those who are guilty of such insinuations are assuming a heavy responsibility indeed before this house and the country as a whole.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: I must now decide whether or not the motion now before the house to adjourn the house under standing order No. 26 should be received.

This morning we had a wide discussion as to the urgency of this matter, and it seems to me that we got into the substance of the matter to a much greater degree than necessary. I must take some responsibility in that regard.

However, we are here dealing primarily, it seems to me, with the conduct of ministers. According to paragraph 3 of the motion submitted to me in these words:

> These public admissions indicate action totally inconsistent with proper conduct of ministers of the crown.

In this connection I must—I tried to do this this morning without success—refer to Bourinot's fourth edition, page 300 where the following is stated:

> Certain matters cannot be debated save upon a substantive motion which can be dealt with by amendment or by distinct vote of the house, such as, the conduct of the Governor General, the Speaker or Deputy Speaker, members of either house of parliament—

This has frequently been interpreted in this country to include ministers of the crown.

Later on in the same paragraph it is stated:

> For the same reason, no charges of a personal character can be raised save upon a distinct and substantive motion to that effect.

[Mr. Tremblay.]

This seems to be borne out by Beauchesne's fourth edition, citation 127 (2) which reads:

> Unless discussion is based upon a substantive motion drawn in proper terms, reflections must not be cast in debate upon the conduct of the sovereign, the heir to the throne or members of the Royal Family, the Governor General of a dominion, the Speaker, the chairman of ways and means, members of either house of parliament—

Again in my opinion this includes the personal conduct of ministers of the crown, and I do not see any other way of interpreting that particular subsection.

Citation 100(2) of Beauchesne's fourth edition states:

> Matters arising out of the debates of the same session, or the term of a bill before the House of Lords, matters of privilege or order, or matters debatable only upon a substantive motion, cannot be submitted to the house under this standing order.

There is then a reference to standing order No. 26.

In the circumstances I regret that I cannot receive the motion which is presented for debate at this time.

COMPANIES ACT

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State) moved the first reading of Bill No. S-22 (from the Senate), to amend the Companies Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

SEFKIND BANKRUPTCY—REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS IN TRANSACTIONS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question, in connection with the matter to which you have just referred, to the Minister of Justice, asking him whether or not there has been an investigation by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police into the bankruptcy of the Sefkind Brothers or the companies which they operated. Has he as Minister of Justice anyone present at the investigation by the government of the province of Quebec into fraudulent bankruptcies? Will he, in order to clear up the matter respecting the question put on the order paper by the hon. member for Cape Breton South, communicate with the trustee, Peter Christie of the firm of McDonald Currie, and empower that official to make available the documents in his possession with regard to the transactions on the part of these people or those connected with them?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of the question of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition, I must say that as soon as I noted on the order paper the question on the possible advance of contributions and electoral funds, I asked the R.C.M.P. to conduct an investigation. At the same time, I advised the ministers concerned that I was asking for such an investigation to be undertaken, and they approved of my decision.

It is the result of this investigation, as far as the R.C.M.P. could make it, that is reflected in the answer given to question 2,423 on the order paper.

As far as the second part of the question put a moment ago by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition is concerned, he will understand that under the rules of the house I must take it as notice, but I can assure him that I will immediately take steps to obtain the required information.

[*Text*]

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask the Minister of Justice if he has received from the R.C.M.P. a full report on the Sefkind bankruptcy proceedings and if this report is now in his possession?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I made it quite clear a while ago that at the risk of asking the R.C.M.P. to somewhat override the limits of their jurisdiction, I requested that an investigation be made so that I could answer the question put on the order paper.

As regards the matter of bankruptcies and any investigation in bankruptcy frauds, it is clear that from the strict point of view of federal jurisdiction, any information that could be obtained is restricted to what the superintendent of bankruptcy has in his possession because of his official function. Bankruptcy frauds as such being criminal offences come under the attorney general of the province and the investigation made in the case of the companies in which people were or are involved, as I understand, was made and is being carried out probably in the name and at the instance of the attorney general of the province.

Under such circumstances, I am not so sure that it comes under my jurisdiction to order an investigation. However, what I have tried to do up to now and what I will try to do, is obtain the most complete body of information from those authorities that have jurisdiction, taking into consideration the respective powers of the Minister of Justice and of the attorney general of the province of Quebec.

[*Text*]

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister of Justice inform the house whether any report at all has been made to the superintendent of bankruptcy in his department in connection with this matter?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Favreau: I shall take this question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

THE MINISTRY—CODE OF ETHICS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Prime Minister if he is in a position to give us an explanation of the situation that led him to issue the so-called code of ethics. I should also like to ask him if he would be kind enough to table it in the house so it can become part of the permanent records of the house?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to table it. The letter speaks for itself.

Mr. Fisher: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the Prime Minister, in any follow-up to the letter which he sent to his ministers, carried on any investigation or set up any investigation on his own into the situation that was involved in the whole question of ethics?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I would have thought the hon. gentleman had been in the house long enough to know that ministerial discussions and ministerial exchanges are not made public in the House of Commons.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why was the document produced then?

DORION COMMISSION—LETTER OF CLARIFICATION BY PRIME MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gene Rhéaume (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister. Can the Prime Minister tell the house whether, immediately prior to the writing of the letter of clarification of the Dorion

inquiry, he or any of his staff received any threat of any kind from any member of the press gallery that the matter would be made public unless that letter was written immediately? Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious question I am asking.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious question and a very impertinent question. I do not act on instructions from the press gallery in these matters.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we do not intend to take lessons on impertinence from the Prime Minister.

Mr. McIlraith: You are an expert on that.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I ask him this question. Having made this codex ministrensis—I suppose that is the proper Latin expression—available to the press, thus making it a public document, did the Prime Minister receive any letters from any of his ministers? It is no longer a question of ministerial confidentiality, the Prime Minister having made this extraordinary document available to the people of Canada.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I did not make the document available to the press, and the right hon. gentleman, who was once the head of a government, should know and I am sure does know that exchanges between ministers are not made public in the house unless they are tabled.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why then did the Prime Minister make this document available which cast aspersions on every member of his cabinet by the very fact that he sent it?

Mr. Pearson: This document cast no aspersions upon any member of the cabinet. It lays down a code of conduct and ethics which has been followed by members of the cabinet, a code of conduct and ethics that might well have been laid down by my right hon. friend when he was prime minister. One of the reasons for this exchange with my cabinet ministers was to warn them about the kind of innuendo and insinuation they might leave themselves open to if they were not extremely careful in these things.

An hon. Member: In other words, cover it up.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Prime Minister whether he has worked out any method by which the code of ethics can be made retroactive?

[Mr. Rhéaume.]

Mr. Pearson: Yes; Mr. Speaker, I think it should be made retroactive to 1867, and also to provincial governments.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, since the Prime Minister does not believe in innuendoes and smears I wonder would he like to be more specific because I for one—

Some hon. Members: Lay a charge.

Mr. Douglas: —would be very glad to see the Prime Minister make a definite statement and lay a charge.

Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman made a definite statement. He asked me if this document could be made retroactive. I said yes, and to 1867, and to provincial governments. Surely that is a very reasonable reply.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask the Prime Minister, since it was sent to his cabinet, how does he feel this would be applicable to provincial governments? Surely it was sent to his cabinet because it was felt his cabinet needed it.

Mr. Pearson: I presume provincial ministers have the same sense of responsibility as federal ministers, even in the province of Saskatchewan.

POSSIBLE ACTION RESPECTING ONTARIO SUPREME COURT JUDGE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Some time ago the Minister of Justice promised to make a statement to the house on the position of Mr. Justice Landreville. He said, later, that he would postpone making that statement for reasons he did not explain. Is the minister now in a position to make the statement he undertook to give us?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): I am not now in a position to make a statement on the matter.

THEFTS FROM DORVAL AIRPORT—POLICE INVESTIGATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice, and I have broken it down into several parts. Can the minister report to the house on the theft of $100,000

in bullion and other specie from Dorval airport on Monday last, the second such theft at Montreal airport, as I understand it, in approximately six months?

Is an investigation being carried out by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police; and what precautionary measures are being taken to prevent recurrence which would be damaging to Canada's reputation and security?

What investigation is being made of the statement by local police that this was an "inside job"?

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

Mr. John N. Turner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question having to do with Dorval airport.

Mr. McIntosh: Well, I have not had an answer yet. I wonder whether the minister would give an answer?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): You should give notice.

Mr. Turner: Mr. Speaker, this is quite an urgent matter.

Mr. Speaker: I suggest this question be put on the order paper.

Mr. Diefenbaker: With great deference, Mr. Speaker, this is the last day and the matter is of great importance. We are trying to expedite the business of the house, but this is a matter on which information should certainly be available.

Mr. McIntosh: I did not quite get the statement of the minister. He asked, why did I not—what?

Mr. Favreau: Give notice.

Mr. McIntosh: I should like an answer, if I may have it.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that no minister, as I am sure the hon. gentleman would agree, can carry in his head figures and facts which concern the aspects of a very vast department. I am sure that had I received notice of this question either yesterday or this morning I would have inquired about it and would probably have been in a position to answer today. All I can do now is take this question as notice. However, I can say this. If in the meantime, at a time when the hon. gentleman is available, I obtain the information, I will be pleased to give it to him personally. I will, of course, report to the house at the first opportune time.

Inquiries of the Ministry

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

INQUIRY AS TO NUMBER OF DEATHS BY SUICIDE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should also like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. With respect to the inordinately high rate of suicides in the R.C.M.P. he replied some days ago that he would undertake to look into the matter to see if he could ascertain the explanation. Is he now in a position to give that information to the house?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I have obtained some information on this matter. However, I think the best way to answer the question would be to prepare a short statement that I could read to the house at the first opportunity.

What I can say is that impressions created in the press were obviously caused by misinterpretations. But, in order to give the house accurate information, I feel I should give more than just a verbal report. That is why I should like to table figures and show, with each group of figures, the causes or reasons which led to the suicides, to the extent that they could be determined by the investigations in each case.

[*Text*]

DISMISSALS FOR MISAPPROPRIATION OF FUNDS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Justice and ask is he now in a position to inform the house whether reports are correct that the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. recommended the dismissal and firing of two high ranking officers for misappropriation of funds, and that that decision of the commissioner was changed by himself or by the cabinet, for retirement purposes and pension, in order that they be gagged?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the decision of the R.C.M.P. commissioner was changed neither by myself nor by cabinet. At one stage of the proceedings cabinet had to take a responsibility upon my recommendation, and the cabinet took its responsibility in a sense which in my opinion was totally consistent with a sense of fair play and justice.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Winch: As a supplementary question, I ask the Minister of Justice whether or not the commissioner of the R.C.M.P. recommended the dismissal of the two men concerned?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, if this is an allowable question would you ask that it be put on the order paper?

Mr. Winch: What have you got to hide, Mr. Minister?

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would think the minister would want to answer that question. Of course he had a discretion to exercise. I am frank to admit that, but whatever discretion is to be exercised by the cabinet is certainly something the house should know about. That does not imply any criticism to ask that question, but what was the order of the cabinet in that regard?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I think it is a matter of principle that the question should be ordered to be put on the order paper. It will be fully answered. There is, of course, nothing to hide, but it seems to be the type of practice and procedure followed by these hon. gentlemen across the way always to insinuate that, because we do not want to break the rules, we have something to hide.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I rise immediately on a question of privilege. I make it perfectly clear there was a discretion to be exercised by the minister and the cabinet. This is a matter of an appeal to them but strangely enough this government, with all the codes of decency and responsibility—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —strangely will not carry them out.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice concerning the R.C.M.P. officers. Since the decision of cabinet would have to be reflected, I assume on the basis of an order in council, would he be willing to table that order in council in order to clarify the matter?

Mr. Favreau: It is not always with pleasure I answer the questions of the hon. member for Yukon but this time I will say yes with pleasure.

[Mr. Favreau.]

PRIVILEGE

RECEIPT OF LETTER FROM MEMBER FOR BRANDON-SOURIS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a question of privilege. This morning I indicated—and I rise now because the hon. gentleman is in his seat—that I had written a letter to the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) on December 14 and at the time of speaking I had not received a reply. I have checked into this and I find that when the house opened this morning no reply of any kind had been delivered to my box. Since that time, Mr. Speaker, two replies have been delivered. One was delivered to my office by hand and the other to my mailroom in the east block, stamped on December 18, 1964, 1.40 p.m.

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, on the same question of privilege and in view of the Prime Minister's distaste for innuendo I would like to reiterate once again that that letter left my office on December 15, on Tuesday last. If there is such confusion in the Prime Minister's office that he did not discover it, then it is not my fault.

[*Later:*]

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, during the last two or three minutes suggestions have been thrown across the floor of this chamber that there has been delay on the part of post office officials. Delays in postal services are to be expected at this time of year, but I think the house should know, especially the hon. gentlemen casting aspersions, that the post office in this building is the responsibility of the Speaker of the house, not the Postmaster General.

Mr. Speaker: In further explanation I would like to say the Speaker is overworked.

[*Later:*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): The Prime Minister referred to a statement concerning a letter he has received from the hon. member for Brandon-Souris. Since there is a considerable aura of mystery surrounding this letter I wonder whether the right hon. gentleman would mind tabling it or giving the house a summary of its contents.

Mr. Pearson: I would be very glad to table the letter and my reply.

CANADIAN COASTGUARD

ALLEGED INABILITY TO RENDER ASSISTANCE TO SHIPS IN DISTRESS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the inability of the Canadian coastguard to provide assistance to Nova Scotia fishermen during a recent storm, which resulted in the loss of two lives, will the minister give consideration to constructing adequate ships for the coastguard service, with authority granted to the captains to rescue crews and tow disabled ships to port when they are in trouble?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, if I might be permitted to make a slightly more than usually extended reply to the hon. gentleman's question I may say that last autumn—I have the date somewhere here—the hon. member will recall a question arose about towing by the coastguard. I undertook at that time to have the matter looked into and to see whether more satisfactory and more clearly defined arrangements could be made in this regard.

This matter has been receiving consideration and certain clarifications in the instructions—which I do not think the hon. gentleman would expect me to attempt to outline here—have been made.

With respect to the recent tragic events off the coasts of Nova Scotia there is, I am frank to admit, evidence that there was a certain lack of adequate co-ordination between the various—

An hon. Member: There sure was.

Mr. Pickersgill: I am admitting it without any hesitation, and with deep regret because lives were lost. There was a lack of adequate co-ordination between the various agencies which collectively have the responsibility for search and rescue. I am not pretending there wasn't. I have investigated this thing very carefully, or at least had it investigated. I have seen the reports, so far, of the investigations and it is my opinion that even if this lack of co-ordination had not existed, in the circumstances with which the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg is more familiar with than I, it would, unhappily, have made no real difference because there was no vessel capable of dealing with the terrible situations in those terrible storms. But if it did not serve to do any other good it did reveal there were some defects in communication and organization. I intend to do everything I can, and I am sure all the ministers who have this responsibility intend to do everything they can, to see that any defects in co-ordination are remedied without delay. I say this without even having had a chance to consult with my colleague the Minister of National Defence who has just returned to Ottawa and who has, as head of the R.C.A.F., the primary responsibility, but I know I have his concurrence.

I would not pretend for a moment that even the best practices in the world would enable us to deal with the kind of storm, the like of which has not taken place for years and which afflicted the east coast a short while ago.

Mr. Crouse: I wish to thank the minister for his answer and ask him whether in reconsidering the duties of the Canadian coastguard service he would consider giving authority to the captains of these ships to act upon their own discretion in cases of distress.

Mr. Pickersgill: There is a great deal more latitude given to captains now than they thought they had when this incident took place some months ago. This is a difficult problem because one has to be sure that we are not supplanting people who make their living by towing and that there is a genuine case of distress, not a case of someone who wants to get something free.

CANADIAN FLAG

INQUIRY AS TO DATE OF PROCLAMATION—CEREMONIES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Léon Balcer (Three Rivers): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister if he is in a position to inform the house at what date the government intends to proclaim the new single maple leaf flag, the distinctive national flag, and what kind of ceremony the government intends to prepare to observe this historical event?

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): This matter is under consideration. There are a good many formalities to be completed, as I have informed the house previously, including the proclamation by Her Majesty. It is hoped that these formalities will be concluded in a matter of weeks. Then there is the question of proclaiming the flag in Canada

as the Canadian national flag with the kind of ceremony which will be worthy of such an important national occasion. It will be a matter of some weeks.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Girouard (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put to the right hon. Prime Minister a question supplementary to the one asked by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer).

Should there be a ceremony to mark the inauguration of the new flag while the house is not sitting, and inasmuch as the distinctive national flag is the result of the joint effort of the various members and political parties of the house, does the Prime Minister intend to invite the members of the various political parties in the house to attend and participate in the inaugural ceremony of the new Canadian flag?

[*Text*]

Mr. Pearson: Yes, indeed. I would hope this would be a parliamentary occasion.

GRAIN

WHEAT—STATEMENT BY NORTHERN AFFAIRS MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): The matter I now raise has been before me for some time but this is the first occasion I can find to put it forward.

An hon. Member: Procedural difficulties.

Mr. Hamilton: I ask this question because I think it should be cleared up. Some of us have a feeling that this may be the last day for this parliament to sit.

Some hon. Members: Parliament?

Mr. Hamilton: My question has to do with the policy of the government concerning a matter which is of great significance in western Canada. It is addressed to the Prime Minister. Does the statement made by the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources in Saskatoon to the annual convention of the Saskatchewan Liberal party to the effect that a two-price system for wheat under which domestic purchasers would pay a higher price than the subsidized export price would be too much of a burden on domestic consumers, represent the policy of the government?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I have not seen the statement to which the hon. member has referred. I would wish to examine it carefully before replying because it deals with a very important matter. I will give an answer as soon as I have had a chance to consider the matter.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO SETTING UP OF COURT OF CLAIMS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): In the kindly spirit of Christmas I should like to address a question to the kindly Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and ask him whether he can tell us anything at all about the progress of the Indian claims commission.

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the amended bill has been accepted by myself and by the officers of my department, and the next step will be the discussion of this new bill amended by the cabinet committee on legislation.

[*Text*]

HEALTH AND WELFARE

INQUIRY AS TO CONFERENCE RECOMMENDED BY ROYAL COMMISSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the fact that the Hall commission report strongly recommended a federal-provincial conference within six months, what steps have been taken toward the calling of such a conference bearing in mind that tomorrow six months will have elapsed since the report was published.

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I think the hon. member was in the house on many occasions when this question was discussed. There is to be a meeting some time in the new year. Recently the premiers have indicated that they would prefer it not to be held too soon.

HARBOURS

VANCOUVER—RELOCATION OF INDUSTRIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): I wish to address a question to the Minister of Transport. This is a question of urgency; it is not a matter for the order paper. It arises out of the meeting the minister had

recently with the harbour board commissioners, with the delegation from the international woodworkers of America and representatives of industries which will be displaced by the plan to build a grain elevator on the north shore of Vancouver harbour. We are all grateful that there has been a two month extension of the time available to these industries.

Is the minister now able to say what consideration is being given to making available a financial subsidy or loan so as to enable the four industries concerned to relocate on sites where they may continue to operate and maintain their employment capacity?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Since the hon. member's question was somewhat lengthy, perhaps I might be permitted to say that I appreciate immensely the co-operation of the president of the Saskatchewan wheat pool who at some considerable inconvenience to the organization, which is anxious to get on with the building of its elevator, consented to make certain arrangements which give us two more months in which to consider the future of these industries. I should like to express my appreciation publicly.

I should also like to say that the delegation which I received was most understanding. I think I grasped pretty well what their problems are. The harbour board is giving them careful consideration. If the bell had not rung at 2.30 I would have had a report from the chairman of the harbour board who was trying to reach me by telephone. Not having received that report I am afraid I cannot yet give even a tentative answer to the question put to me by the hon. member. But the matter is under active consideration.

Mr. Winch: A supplementary question in order that the situation should be clear. Am I to understand that what is under consideration now is the making of a subsidy or a loan in connection with readjustment? Is that it?

Mr. Pickersgill: It was suggested to me that if certain financial help could be given to these industries they might be relocated without any undue displacement of employment. I, of course, could give no undertaking that such assistance could be given but I did say I would examine the proposition very carefully and if I felt something could be suggested to my colleagues I would propose it to them.

TRADE

AUTOMOBILES AND PARTS—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON DUTY FREE PROVISIONS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Has he anything to report as to whether or not Canada and the United States are nearing agreement to establish duty free trade in automobiles and parts?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this very important matter is under active consideration and there is nothing I can announce yet.

WORLD FAIR

TRANSFER OF ADVERTISING ACCOUNTS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister a question. In view of the letter on ethics and the abolition of patronage thereby, would the Prime Minister explain the reason why the Montreal world fair account has been transferred from six agencies, two of them French Canadian, to Cockfield, Brown & Co. Ltd., the chief advertising agency of the national Liberal federation?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, without accepting in any way the implications of the question, I would point out to the right hon. gentleman that the world fair corporation is not under the control of the government. However, I would be glad to look into the point he has raised. I would also remind the right hon. gentleman that the word "patronage" did not appear in the letter to which he referred.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Does the Prime Minister say that it was not to be interpreted, as the press interpreted it, as the abolition of patronage?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ALLEGED INTIMIDATION OF CANADIAN CITIZENS BY LEBANESE AMBASSADOR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and ask whether his attention has been drawn to the article which appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* of December 5, in which two Ottawa citizens, James Beauchamp and Fred L.

Farha, Canadian citizens of Lebanese extraction, contended that they were called in on the instructions of the Lebanese ambassador, M. Edmond Khayat, and intimidated with reference to their political activities with the threat of some misfortune or ill treatment being meted out to their families which are still in Lebanon? I want to ask the minister whether he has taken any action with respect to this matter, if the ambassador in question has been called in, and if any action has been taken by the government to ask the government of Lebanon to recall him if the facts in this article are correct.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the various press reports on this subject were called to my attention and I have received a telegram containing certain allegations in very general terms. This telegram is now being examined by the department in the light of normal diplomatic practice, and I have given instructions that it be discussed with the Lebanese embassy here in Ottawa. This is the usual practice. I arrived back just last night and have not had a report of these discussions. Perhaps before the day is out I may be in a position to say something further in this connection. Just before I left I gave instructions that this matter was to be discussed forthwith with the Lebanese ambassador, because on the surface the circumstances were certainly of an order that called for explanation.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs who the telegram was from and whether any of the officials of his department have interviewed either of the gentlemen in question in order to verify the newspaper reports of the accusations which they made regarding the Lebanese ambassador?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I cannot say who the telegram was from, Mr. Speaker. I saw it, but I forget who it was from. With regard to the last part of the hon. member's question, I will make inquiries about that matter.

FISHERIES

NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING ESTABLISHMENT OF STRAIGHT BASE LINES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Fisheries and ask whether he and his colleague the Secretary of State for External Affairs have been able to make any further progress since we last had an opportunity of raising the question of the establishment of straight base lines, which would alter our territorial seas and our fishing zones, in accordance with the principle outlined in the bill with which the house dealt some time ago.

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, as I replied to a similar question of the hon. member some weeks ago, negotiations are under way with the countries involved and progress is being made.

Mr. Barnett: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister suggested several times that the negotiations were under way. I wonder whether he would mind checking to see whether the engines of the ship of state have come to a halt and the ship has lost way.

Mr. Robichaud: I do not believe this is a proper question to answer, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANCE REGULATIONS—INCREASE IN PERCENTAGE RATE OF SUBSIDY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. Has any consideration been given to increasing the percentage rate of subsidy under the fishing vessels assistance regulations covering fishing vessels 35 feet and over, in order to bring the subsidy more in line with the tonnage rates formerly paid?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I do not think we can accept the statement made by the hon. member that the percentage rates now being offered are not in line with the tonnage rate, however, I can inform the hon. member that the whole matter is under consideration.

AIRPORTS

DORVAL—DANGER FROM TOWER AT WORLD FAIR SITE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. John N. Turner (St. Lawrence-St. George): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport which relates to one of the main landing routes into the Dorval airport. In view of the proposed tower over the world fair site, which is supposed to rise

1,400 feet into the air, has the minister inquired of his officials as to whether this tower will meet air safety regulations?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, at this stage that is a hypothetical question.

SYDNEY, N.S.—CALL FOR TENDERS FOR TERMINAL BUILDING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport, asking him whether he is in a position to advise us as to how soon tenders may be called for the new airport terminal building at Sydney?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I am not sure of the exact status of this situation, but I do know, as does the hon. gentleman, that it is under active consideration.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Léon Balcer (Three Rivers): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice whether the services of the R.C.M.P. have been requested by the government of Saskatchewan to investigate an alleged bribe, involving the small amount of $300,000, that was supposed to have been made to a former attorney general of Saskatchewan?

TRANSPORT

BORDEN-CAPE TORMENTINE FERRY—INQUIRY AS TO LETTING OF CONTRACT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a brief question to the Minister of Transport. Is the minister in a position to say whether a contract has yet been let for the construction of a new car ferry for operation between Borden and Cape Tormentine?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am not able to give an answer at this time, but if the hopes of the house leader are realized, I hope that I will be able to do so soon.

PENSIONS

CANADA PLAN—NEGOTIATIONS WITH PREMIER OF ONTARIO

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister what steps, if any, he has taken to negotiate or talk with the premier of Ontario regarding the Canada pension plan and Ontario's position relating to it, particularly in view of the fact that recent indications seem to be that Ontario is not going to take part?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have had no recent discussions with the prime minister of Ontario, but so far as we are concerned federally, we are going ahead with the plan.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, can we take it from the Prime Minister's answer that the arrangements in so far as the Canada pension plan are concerned, which were negotiated with Quebec, will apply, so far as the federal government is concerned, to Ontario, if that province is willing to accept them?

Mr. Pearson: That is a very hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker. We are going ahead with our consideration of a bill which will apply to Ontario.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Arising out of the answer just given by the Prime Minister, has there been any indication from the government of Ontario that it intends to set up its own pension scheme, or has the government of Canada received any communication from provincial authorities in this connection?

Mr. Pearson: No communication regarding that course of action has been received by the federal government from the government of Ontario.

CANADIAN CENTENNIAL

MINTING OF GOLD COIN TO COMMEMORATE OCCASION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance whether the cabinet has given any consideration, or has reached a decision as to the minting of a gold coin for our centennial celebrations?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): A number of suggestions have been made along those lines, Mr. Speaker, but no decision has been made.

Inquiries of the Ministry

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON DESIGNATED AREAS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I hope that the subject matter of the question I am about to ask was not dealt with during my absence. As the Minister of Labour is not in the house, I want to direct this question to the Minister of Industry.

Is the minister in a position to let us know when we shall be told which are the designated areas in the country?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I shall discuss the matter with the Minister of Labour.

[*Text*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PRIORITY OF ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED BEFORE RECESS—CHRISTMAS RECESS—PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR—SESSIONAL EMPLOYEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the house leader. In view of the fact that last night he indicated 12 items of government business for today, without indicating the order in which those items would be called, I wonder whether before we get to orders of the day he could tell us the order of priority among those 12 items.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I may have been a little optimistic last night. I did indicate at that time that we would call the opting out resolution first, and I think hon. members will understand why, bearing in mind new standing order 61. But if the house would agree that the provisions of standing order 61 would remain applicable if we called the legislation concerning the Judges Act amendment first, I have reason to believe it would only take a few moments, and the other place is waiting for the bill. Then we would call the Combines Investigation Act amendment, which I believe is equally short. We would call those two items and then the opting out resolution. I would also like to ask the house now, Mr. Speaker, whether it could be agreed that we would waive the private members' hour at five o'clock.

Mr. Knowles: Before we do that, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I may ask the house leader a supplementary question. So far he has told us about only three of the 12 items that he announced last night. What is the government's position with respect to the labour code, bearing in mind the commitment the government made that this legislation would be put through before Christmas?

Mr. McIlraith: With regard to the labour standards bill, Mr. Speaker, I do not see how it will be possible to call it, in the circumstances that exist today. I regret that very much, not only because of my own statements that we expected to have it through before Christmas but also because of the nature of the legislation, which the government regards as of the utmost importance. But we are unfortunately in the position where it would appear that certain amendments we have in mind to propose could not be expected to be passed in a reasonably short time. In any event, Mr. Speaker, there is still outstanding for discussion one point in regard to this legislation that is of concern to the government.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, if the house were prepared to sit on Monday, would the government be ready to proceed with the labour standards bill on that day?

Mr. McIlraith: I would think not, Mr. Speaker. I might add that I regret this very much because I for one feel that I did lead hon. gentlemen to believe that we would bring it forward before the Christmas recess.

Mr. Knowles: It was a very firm commitment.

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, I realize that, and I regret it very much. The answer to the question, in any event, is that I do not see how we could be ready with this legislation on Monday.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister give us some reason? Surely the house is entitled to be given some reason, in view of the very serious and solemn commitments that have been made, as to why the government is not ready today and cannot be ready by Monday to proceed with this piece of legislation that was before the committee of the whole four weeks ago.

An hon. Member: The flag was too important.

Mr. McIlraith: I do not know how fully I should develop the reasons, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member will appreciate that a great many

representations have been made as to the effect of the operations of the bill on certain labour groups in the country. Those representations had to be taken into account and considered very carefully, and they were. As a result there are some amendments that we propose to make to the bill. In any event, there is one question still outstanding and the government has it under quite active consideration. That is the way the matter stands at the moment.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, may I correct the statement that I made. I said it was a month ago, but I find on checking that it was two months ago that this matter was before the committee of the whole. It seems to me this matter was before the committee of the whole for a long time.

Mr. McIlraith: That is quite right, Mr. Speaker. It was many weeks ago in any event, although I do not have the precise date when the matter was before the house. A great many representations were made. This bill is one which in the view of the government is very important, and it is a matter of getting or trying to get, a perfect bill through to enactment, rather than a less perfect bill. These representations did reveal some need for perfecting the bill.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question of the Prime Minister or the leader of the house, whoever is the more appropriate to answer. Is the government in a position to state whether this session is going to be adjourned or prorogued; and in either event what is the period of time the government has in mind before the house is brought into session again?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to answer that question. The government proposes to submit a motion to the house, when the house is ready to receive it, providing for an adjournment of the house until February 16, subject to the provision which has been made in the last several adjournments that the Speaker can call the house back earlier if the necessity should arise. There is also a provision in the proposed motion that in the event that His Honour the Speaker is unable, owing to illness or other cause, to recall the house the Deputy Speaker could act in his stead if need be.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The previous speaker basically asked the question I wanted to ask, but I should like to ask the house leader if it is not possible, out of respect and consideration for those members who have to travel a great distance, to state the intentions of the government as to when it proposes to adjourn so that we can make our reservations.

Mr. McIlraith: Well, Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak for the opposition groups but I would hope it would be possible to adjourn in another two and a half hours.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Speaker, since everyone seems to be getting into a better mood may I ask a supplementary question which is prompted by the many approaches which have been made by the longshoremen regarding the labour standards bill, and which may give the impression that I am in favour of a delay in the legislation, or at least approval of what has been put forward. Will the minister assure the longshoremen, who are worried about the effect of this bill on their working situation in Halifax and Saint John during the winter months, that every opportunity will be given to them in the meantime to put their case forward; and if satisfaction is not achieved in this regard, will the government bring in amendments which will deal with their particular situation?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is yes; I hope these representations will be made very quickly.

Mr. G. L. Chatterton (Esquimalt-Saanich): A supplementary question to the house leader. Does the government have in mind the recall of the house earlier than February 16 if the Canada pension plan committee has completed its final report before that date?

Mr. McIlraith: Well, Mr. Speaker, one can never tell and it is impossible to give a precise answer to that question. I hope it will not be necessary to recall the house before February 16 because it seems to me there is a great deal of work to be done by the pension committee, but it may be necessary. I just cannot foresee the future.

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, one further supplementary question. I wonder whether the house leader could use his influence on the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare so that the members of the pension committee will have a little longer holiday than from now until January 12. I think this is asking too much.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Winch: Mr. Speaker, could I ask a further supplementary question of the house leader?

Mr. Speaker: Anything to do with holidays, I understand, is quite pressing.

Mr. Winch: In view of the fact that the permanent members of the House of Commons who have been sitting for 11 months receive an annual salary, could the minister state whether on the recess sessional employees will be kept on the staff and on pay?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. That matter has been considered very carefully, and in view of the large number of members of the regular and permanent staff who are still to take holidays, and because of the fact that there will be committees sitting and extra help required for the purpose, it is going to be necessary for all sessional staff to be kept on throughout the whole adjournment period.

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. My understanding is that this series of questions started out as a question to the house leader concerning the labour standards code bill, and my supplementary question relates to that aspect. I should like to ask the house leader whether, since he has indicated that except for one small point certain changes to the bill as originally drafted are in the mind of the government, he would not agree that it would be desirable that we at least resume the delayed consideration of the committee of the whole so that members of the house may become acquainted with the changes to which the government has already agreed, in light of the many representations and questions which many hon. members are receiving on this matter. If I may say so, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that even if we did not conclude our considerations we would be able to understand the whole matter in a much better light and deal with these questions during the recess if we were to agree to give some further consideration to the bill prior to any recess. This supplementary question relates to the one asked earlier by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam with respect to our spending some time on Monday discussing the labour standards code bill.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I am very doubtful whether it would be possible to accede to the hon. member's request, although I will consider it and see what progress we make. But I really do not see how it is possible to meet this request, much as I should like to.

[Mr. Monteith.]

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Girouard (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, may I direct to the Prime Minister a question which I think is of national interest?

Would the Prime Minister tell the house whether he intends to reconvene the house in February for a regular session, or rather, according to some rumours, to table a budget and announce a general election for next summer?

[*Text*]

[*Later:*]

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister about a subject we were discussing a moment ago, and I am sure the Prime Minister will realize that it is appropriate for me to direct the question to him. Without prejudice to the possibility that we might yet deal with the labour code before the adjournment of this session, may we have an undertaking from the government that this legislation is to be enacted at this session, as far as the government is concerned?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, that certainly is our intention. I share the house leader's disappointment that we have not been able to deal with it during this part of the session before Christmas.

As the house leader has stated, representations in relation to this legislation are still being received. Delegations also are still being received. Other business has taken longer than we had expected and we have not been able to reach that business before Christmas. Certainly it is our intention to enact this legislation during this session.

Mr. Knowles: I should like to ask another question. Are we in this present position because of the time which has been taken up in this house on other matters, or because the government is not ready to proceed with the bill?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, a lot of time has been taken up in the consideration of other very important national matters. We have received many more representations in relation to this labour code than we had expected. They are still being received from employees' unions and employers. This has required further consideration of some of the provisions of the legislation, but that consideration is just about completed.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, the one assurance we want from the Prime Minister is that the government is not getting cold feet about this legislation.

Mr. Pearson: No, we are feeling pretty warm about this legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles: So are we.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, do we have the agreement of the house on the two matters I raised, one regarding the five o'clock private members' hour and the other in respect of proceedings with the legislation on the Judges Act and the Combines Investigation Act, without prejudicing any rights under standing order 61?

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that we adjourn today until February 16. It is my belief that to do so would mean that we will again not get a summer vacation next year unless we have an election. I am not running this government, but I am one of those who is insistent that we should strive toward arranging the business of this house so that we can have a holiday in July and August. It has been my opinion since I came to this house that we were supposed to have a vacation in July and August, and if we now propose to do something which will not work toward that end I cannot give unanimous consent. Surely we are all adult enough that we can arrange our business in such a way that we have a summer holiday. When the government asks for co-operation it must be prepared to give some assurance that it will co-operate in working toward this goal, which I am sure is desirable to every member of this house. This long holiday we are going to get in the wintertime means we cannot possibly have a summer vacation next year when it would be much more advantageous to our families than a winter vacation. So far as I am concerned, the government is either going to have to give some assurance in this regard or I will not be willing to consent to giving up private members' hour.

Mr. McIlraith: I hasten to assure the hon. member in this regard because one of the main reasons for choosing this date was in order to permit the government to have its legislation and the estimates ready for submission to the house when the house opens. If the hon. member was listening to my remarks this morning when we were discussing the matter of concurrence in a report concerning the standing orders and rules of the house he will have noted the reference to one item at least which I hope will make it possible for us, come next session, to have the kind of adjournment in the summer season that all of us wish, those on the government side equally with the hon. member.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister if that is also his opinion? He has some say in this matter. I certainly would not be opposed to something unusual happening, but is it his opinion also that the fact that we have had a winter vacation will not be used to say that we have to spend the next 10 months in Ottawa on government business?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I hasten to assure my hon. friend that I share his opinion and that expressed by the house leader entirely with regard to this matter and I hope that next summer we will indeed have the kind of vacation which he has mentioned.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the adjournment of private members' business at five o'clock, I understand that the bill most likely to be called and with which I am ready to proceed is that under order No. 3 under public bills, an act to amend the Immigration Act, racial discrimination. I think it is a very important matter of legislation, but if the government will give consideration to making this amendment at some stage or other I will be very happy not to press it at five o'clock.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, we will give it consideration.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to say a word since the Solicitor General is not here, I spoke to the hon. member for Port Arthur about his bill which would have come up in the ordinary course and the Solicitor General told me that he would give an assurance to the house that the priorities of the bills as they now stood would, at the request of the government, remain as they are. I do not think the hon. gentleman would expect the government to make a decision like that without being able to consider the matter but I am sure it is a matter that would be considered.

Mr. Brewin: I did not expect the government to give their approval now. What I did say was that if we are going to have an adjournment and if the bill in principle commends itself so much to reasonable people I

hope they will bring it in as their own legislation after the adjournment.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, at this stage I am anxious to consider practically anything.

Mr. Speaker: Does the house give unanimous consent to the suspension of private members' hour from five to six?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Prittie: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister to consider private Bill No. C-48 while he is at it?

Mr. Pearson: Indeed I will, Mr. Speaker.

JUDGES ACT

PROVISION FOR SALARIES OF ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR MANITOBA AND QUEBEC

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to amend Bill C-112, an act to amend the Judges Act, now before the house, to authorize the provision of salaries for two additional judges of the Court of Queen's bench for Manitoba and to increase from three to five the number of additional judges of the superior court of Quebec for whom salaries may be authorized to be provided.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

The Chairman: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, it is rather difficult to follow what the exact amendments are. What will be the increase in Manitoba? In the copy I have before me there is no reference to Manitoba.

Mr. Favreau: No. The resolution now before the house purports to amend a bill, which on July 13 of this year received first reading, so as to provide for the addition of two judges in Manitoba.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Favreau, seconded by Mr. Pickersgill, moves that the said resolution be referred to committee of the whole on Bill C-112, an act to amend the Judges Act.

Motion agreed to.

JUDGES ACT

PROVISION FOR SALARIES FOR ADDITIONAL JUDGES

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-112, to amend the Judges Act.

[Mr. Brewin.]

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

On clause 1.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleague, the Minister of Transport, to move the following amendment to Bill No. C-112:

That Bill C-112, an act to amend the Judges Act, be amended as follows:

(a) by striking out clause 1 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

1. Paragraph (e) of section 9 of the Judges Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:
"(e) Seventy puisne judges of the Superior Court, each...21,000.00."

2. Paragraph (d) of section 12 of the said act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:
"(d) Seven puisne judges of the Court of Queen's Bench, each...21,000.00"; and

(b) by renumbering clauses 2 and 3 thereof as clauses 3 and 4 respectively.

Mr. Pickersgill: I so move.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

On the title.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Chairman, as a point of general interest, and I am asking for information only, this bill has to do with the salaries of judges.

Mr. Churchill: No, just the number.

Mr. Favreau: The numbers. It does not change the salaries.

Mr. Churchill: It is just increasing the number of judges.

Mr. McIntosh: In the copy I have here it mentions set salaries of $16,000, $21,000 and so on. I want this information for information's sake only. The salaries judges get are either from their duties when acting as judges or as commissioners of inquiries. How are they paid when acting as commissioners of inquiries, and what are they paid?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Chairman, the salaries provided for in this bill are the ordinary prevailing salaries of judges, depending on their respective jurisdictions. There are provisions in the Judges Act which allow for authority to be given in certain circumstances to judges acting as commissioners. The practice is usually to pay a nominal per diem allowance, or other sort of allowance, by the authority retaining them as commissioners. The salaries provided in this bill are strictly

their salaries as judges, and I understand that in certain provinces, not all, judges in certain jurisdictions receive an indemnity from the province to perform certain services under specified provincial acts.

The Chairman: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): I just want to be clear that the amendment included the additional two judges for Manitoba?

Mr. Favreau: Yes, it includes the additional two judges for the court of Queen's bench in Manitoba, as well as the two judges for Quebec.

Mr. Knowles: To be clear, Mr. Chairman, should you not call clause 4 as well?

Mr. Favreau: Clause 4 is contained in the amendment.

Mr. Churchill: That is the trouble which arose. Did you call clause 4, Mr. Chairman, or just clauses 1, 2, 3 and the title?

The Chairman: I have just noticed the last paragraph of the amendment so I will now call clause 4.

Clause 4 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall the title carry?

Mr. Prittie: Just before the title carries I would like to express the thought which has been felt by many people from time to time, that some time we should investigate the means of appointing judges and perhaps look at the United Kingdom practice which is almost completely non-political.

Mr. Diefenbaker: No it is not.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported and read the third time and passed.

COMBINES INVESTIGATION ACT

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-141, to amend an act to amend the Combines Investigation Act and the Criminal Code.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am sure there would be agreement if the minister would give a short word of explanation in connection with this bill.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, as the house knows, because of a situation which arose in B.C., in the case of a request under section 7 of the Combines Investigation Act, for an investigation into the operations and arrangements between fishermen and the purchasers and processors of fish in B.C., an amendment was made to the Combines Investigation Act providing for a moratorium during which the act would be deemed not to apply to those arrangements.

The moratorium was renewed and continued for further periods in 1960, 1961 and 1962. The last exemption by parliament in 1962 was for two years, to expire on December 31, 1964. Because of legal proceedings that have been taken against the restrictive trade practices commission and its members, which proceedings ended some time in 1962, the commission has not been in a position to send full notice to all the parties likely to be aggrieved by the proceedings and who ought to be heard, and it is not expected to be in a position to make a report for some time yet.

Furthermore, in the summer of 1963 there was a serious fishermen's strike, primarily over the minimum prices to be received by fishermen from the sale of fish. Arising out of this strike an intergovernmental committee, comprising federal and British Columbia civil servants, was appointed by the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Robichaud) and the British Columbia minister of labour to examine in detail the problems concerned with wage and price disputes in the British Columbia fishing industry and to submit to both governments recommendations of action necessary to minimize interruption of fishing operations in the future.

While I understand the committee is expected to submit its report shortly, it will be necessary to allow sufficient time for consideration to be given to the committee's recommendations and for a decision to be made concerning their implementation by either or both of the governments concerned.

It is considered, therefore, that the moratorium provision should be extended for a further 18 months, that is to June 30, 1966, by which time it is expected there will have been a full opportunity to assess any recommendations and to have taken what action, if any, is required.

With respect to the inquiry I might add that it is the view of the restrictive trade practices commission that before proceeding further with the matter it should know the committee's recommendations and any action to be taken arising out of these recommendations. Those are the reasons for the request to the house to extend for a further period of 18

months the moratorium under the Combines Investigation Act.

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the minister for his explanation. This is a matter which is of grave concern to the fishermen and the fishing industry of B.C., and had the minister not explained it I was going to point out this is something which was in a state of moratorium. Though I am quite willing to support early passage of the bill I think we should have some assurance that the present state of affairs, which I for one think is highly unsatisfactory, will not continue forever. I am reasonably satisfied with the statement made by the Minister of Justice and would be prepared to support the passage of the bill. However, I know that the Minister of Fisheries is interested in this matter and he may have some additional information he can give us. He may be able to tell us how soon he expects to have the information provided in the joint federal-provincial report which the Minister of Justice mentioned. If the Minister of Fisheries is in a position to make a statement to the house along these lines I for one would be interested to hear it.

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): I wish to state that the commission referred to by the Minister of Justice has completed its studies and submitted a preliminary report. This was about three weeks ago. We expect that the final report and recommendation will be ready early in the new year. This report will naturally have some bearing on a final decision with regard to this matter.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

On clause 1—*Application of acts to fishing agreements.*

Mr. Patterson: I do not intend to delay the committee but I would point out that the unions concerned with the various fishing agreements on the west coast are desirous of bringing legislation into line with the calendar year. It has been pointed out that this provision runs for 18 months and will expire in the middle of the calendar year. Does the minister feel convinced that before the date set out in this measure is reached he will be in a position to clarify the situation and put the legislation on a permanent basis?

Mr. Favreau: I am confident this will be the case. Instead of providing for the moratorium to expire at the end of the calendar year we have provided for a period of 18 months to end on June 30, 1966, and the reason for this was twofold. First, it will undoubtedly cover the period of the arrangements relating to the two fishing seasons and, in the second place, it will in 1966 provide sufficient time to enact whatever complementary or remedial legislation will be necessary. In other words, the arrangements being made at the beginning of the fishing season it would have been not abnormal but unnecessary to let the moratorium go until the end of the year because in the meantime it would not have been possible to provide for remedial legislation. But in practice this covers the arrangements between the fishermen and the fish purchasers and processors both for 1965 and 1966.

[Mr. Favreau.]

Clause agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the said bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Favreau moved the third reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

TRANSFER TO PROVINCES OF FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR SHARED PROGRAMS

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure of an interim nature respecting certain conditional grant and shared cost programs that have become established federal-provincial programs to enable such of the provinces as may wish to do so to assume financial responsibility for such programs within the ambit of national objectives; and, in respect of those provinces that assume such responsibility for specific programs, to provide a tax abatement under the Income Tax Act, a tax equalization payment and, where necessary, an adjustment payment, or to provide a cash payment in lieu of a tax abatement for particular programs or as cash compensation in other cases; and to authorize such agreements as may be necessary to ensure that the continuation in the interim period of any such program by provinces with such federal assistance will accord with national objectives; and to provide for other related or incidental matters.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

Mr. Gordon: This resolution and the bill which will follow it concerns the important matter of federal-provincial shared cost programs. It is designed as a prelude to a thoroughgoing review of the role of shared cost programs in Canadian confederation—a review which has been agreed to by all of the provinces. This review, to be undertaken by the tax structure committee, must be both objective and dispassionate if it is to produce a long run approach to shared cost programs which will be acceptable both to this house and to all of the provinces.

Let me say a word about these shared cost programs and how they developed before elaborating upon the intent of this resolution.

The primary purpose of certain of the federal-provincial shared cost programs was to stimulate the development of national programs and to ensure to all Canadians an entitlement to certain basic services, regardless of residence. The major services involved are well known to all hon. members—the hospital insurance scheme, the old age assistance payments and other related welfare services, unemployment assistance payments to others who are unable to work and to those who are temporarily out of work or whose unemployment insurance benefits have expired; vocational training, and the basic health facilities that are being financed partly by national health grants.

The major purpose of other joint programs was to facilitate the achievement of national and regional economic goals, primarily high and stable rates of economic growth. Examples of these programs include ARDA, the trans-Canada highway, the winter works and the roads to resources programs.

Still other programs, the smaller ones, were designed to meet temporary or short run problems, such, for example, as the camp grounds and picnic areas program, or the spruce budworm control program.

Everyone recognizes that in meeting these primary goals, the shared cost programs resulted in a very substantial transfer of funds from the federal to the provincial governments. These transfers enabled the provinces to undertake programs which were in considerable public demand without the withdrawal of funds from other important areas of government such as education which would otherwise have been necessary.

I should note, Mr. Chairman, that not all of these programs were inspired by federal governments—many of them were urged by the provinces themselves. It remains true, however, that the federal government has an interest in the shared cost programs; it is to be found in the broad national purpose which could be served by the establishment of certain Canada-wide programs, and in the transfer of funds to the provinces and municipalities.

It must be acknowledged immediately that the largest of these programs could be implemented only through legislative and administrative action on the part of the provinces—action which falls clearly within provincial jurisdiction. Some joint programs, it is true, were concerned with matters of concurrent jurisdiction—notably agriculture—and some of them were concerned with economic growth and development, an area in which federal initiative is generally acknowledged. But many of the programs, indeed, as I say, the largest of them, required the kind of legislative and administrative action which is within provincial domain.

Since the war we have seen a very substantial growth in these conditional grants. In 1945 about $50 million per year was being transferred to the provinces by means of these shared cost programs; by 1964 this figure had reached $903 million. In a period of 20 years the total is approaching 20 times the 1945 figure. When such transfers of funds reach these proportions it is time to re-examine the role and the purpose of shared cost programs. This is all the more so when one considers that unconditional payments to the provinces, namely equalization and fiscal adjustment payments, now constitute only about one third of the conditional payments. Yet it is through these very equalization payments that we can now overcome the unequal fiscal capacity of the provinces which contributed to the rapid extension of conditions grants.

The second reason for re-examining the role of shared cost programs in Canada flows from the first. Having overcome the most serious deficiencies in the fiscal capacity of the provinces, and given the vast improvement which has occurred in the staffing and the technology within provincial governments, the case for continued federal participation in joint programs is not nearly as strong as it once seemed to be. I think all the provinces recognize these changes; but Quebec in particular perceives that the equalization of provincial fiscal capacity now makes feasible a point of view which has tended to be argued in the past in theoretical terms: the discharge of provincial responsibilities without the degree of federal intervention that has

come to prevail—and come to prevail, I should add, in the post-war years. Quebec notes that shared cost programs as they have been used, however, have involved the continuing and the growing intervention of the federal government into matters which lie within provincial jurisdiction. This view is held honestly and firmly, and I think everyone must agree that when such a large proportion of Canadians come to share this view —and of course they are not confined to the province of Quebec—it is time to re-examine the intergovernmental arrangements which are in question.

There is a third reason for re-examining the role of shared cost programs in Canadian confederation. It is this: The primary purpose of many existing conditional grants may already have been accomplished. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that when hospital insurance has been established across Canada, that when old age assistance payments are being made across this nation, that when unemployment assistance is available to all Canadians, the prime purpose of these conditional grants may well have been achieved. These programs have been established and are not likely to be revoked. We want to assure, of course, that the benefits remain portable or, to put it another way, that barriers are not erected so that the citizen loses his rights to these services when he moves across provincial borders. But I think all the provinces accept this principle and would be quite prepared to maintain such important elements of nation-wide programs without the application of federal sanctions. This, then, is the third reason we feel it is time to re-examine the role of shared cost programs—their very maturity.

The fourth reason for re-examining federal-provincial shared cost programs is related both to their maturity and to the magnitude they have reached in terms of dollars. It has long been argued that he who spends should be the one required to tax. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said in 1905 that "it is a sound principle of finance and a still sounder principle of government that those who have the duty of expending the revenue of a country should also be saddled with the responsibility of levying and providing it".

Mr. Olson: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gordon: My hon. friend will find that quotation in the *House of Commons Debates* for February 21, 1905, if he is interested. In 1940 the Rowell-Sirois commission repeated this view. Obviously one cannot press this principle to its ultimate conclusion without eliminating equalization payments, but I think it is fair to argue that once shared cost programs have accomplished their initial purpose they should be reviewed with this principle in mind.

For these reasons the government of Canada has agreed that there should be a review of the role of shared cost programs in Canadian confederation. All provincial governments have agreed with this view. In consequence the tax structure committee has been assigned the task, as has already been reported, of studying the future role of shared cost programs in Canada. Its recommendations will be submitted to the federal-provincial conference; but this review will take at least a year and a half.

In the interval it seemed that some positive indication of the possibilities open to Canadian governments was called for. Consequently, the Prime Minister offered to the provinces on August 15 an alternative approach to shared cost programs, this alternative to prevail during the interim period while the tax structure committee conducts its studies. For the major programs involved—hospitalization, welfare programs, vocational training and health grants—this alternative will enable the province to tax their own citizens to pay for these major continuing shared cost programs with the federal government providing related equalization payments. The province in turn would agree to maintain the programs in their present form during the interim period. The provisions of the bill will apply for an interim period only.

I have deliberately refrained from enunciating at this time any government position on the role of shared cost programs in the long run. I think the reason for this will be obvious. The federal government has undertaken to discuss this question with the provinces, who are as much concerned with it as are we in this parliament, and we want to approach these discussions with an open mind and without having made our position clear or definite in advance. My hope is that hon. members will have an opportunity to consider this important issue carefully when the bill receives first reading and becomes available for study. We can then debate it fully when it reaches the stage of second reading.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important matters that will come before parliament, and the fact that it is being brought in in the last minutes of the last hour does not render it any less signif-

icant. Indeed, I am surprised that this question, important as it is to Canadian confederation, was not brought before the house earlier so that it could be given the careful consideration which the nature and importance of the matter deserves.

While the Minister of Finance has emphasized the fact that this is in the nature of an interim measure, the government of Canada has not enunciated or declared its policy, nor does it intend to at the moment. None the less the experience of the past has been that the things which have been interim and introduced as such have ultimately in many cases become the permanent course of action. Indeed, the pathways of experiment often become the highways of experience. For that reason this matter and its importance should have been discussed at very considerable length. Several of my colleagues would have dealt with the matter, to the end that the substantial changes inherent in the ideas which have been expressed by the government concerning some of the provinces receive the examination by parliament which would assure that what is being done here, when it is done, is to the advantage of Canada, and that it is strengthening rather than weakening confederation.

I want to have the assurance of the minister that in the event that this resolution is passed—and in order to preserve our rights we intend to pass it on division—no action will be taken by the federal government during the months intervening between the present and the resumption of debate and final decision on the matter by any of the provinces of Canada. In other words, what is done by the passage of this interim resolution is not to be considered as a determination made by the house.

We think that this matter is one on which there is widespread division of opinion. In outlining the circumstances of this matter the minister rather glossed over the situation. I think he did so intentionally so as to indicate that there are four or five arguments in favour of action being taken and that the position of the government, while not determined upon finally, might receive the support of this house; and then later on the membership of this house would be faced by an accomplished fact.

How far are we going to go in this direction? Are we, in accepting the generality of the idea of opting out, actually opting ourselves out of nationhood? This is a viewpoint which is being expressed in increasing measure. When this matter is placed alongside certain other plans of the government, when one sees the changes that are taking place or are anticipated or expected, and in view of the leadership which this government has given in certain directions, there are many Canadians who are wondering whether or not this is one measure, when taken in conjunction with others, has not got as its purpose ominous portents for national unity.

I have before me an editorial which appeared in the Vancouver *Province* for October 2 last in which this view is set forth. The view of this newspaper is that the clock is being turned back. The editorial goes on to say:

> The provinces want to opt out of shared revenues and shared responsibilities. If they are not careful they may arrive at a time when there is nothing left from which to opt out.

It concludes with these words:

> If there is strength in unity it is, perhaps, ironical that just as Canada is about to commemorate its centennial the government should be passing legislation which may prove to be a major step toward the eventual disintegration of confederation.

That is a viewpoint which is being expressed across this nation.

We want to look carefully into this matter, Mr. Chairman. We want to make our position clear so that no one will misunderstand it, and that the fact we are considering today the passage of this resolution shall in no way be interpreted as approval of the course which this government has in mind. The aim and purpose of the fathers of confederation was to bring about a united nation. The fathers of confederation did not believe in a Canada of two nations. They did not accept the principle of a state within a state. They did not accept the principle that the provinces, or any of them, might become associate states. The principles of Macdonald and Cartier and of all succeeding prime ministers up to the present Prime Minister followed the course throughout the years which was in keeping with the abiding principle upon which confederation was built. The expression "The building of one Canada" is not a new one, nor is it a new thought. It was the aim and purpose of the fathers of confederation that we should indeed be one nation, with our constitutional rights assured, predicted and preserved. We in the Conservative party went further than did the Liberal government of 1945 to 1949 when we insisted that our constitutional rights must remain inviolate, and that they could not be changed excepting by unanimous agreement not only

of the federal parliament but also of each and every province in Canada.

We want carefully to examine legislation which would allow a wholesale opting out; not an opting out on matters, constitutionally and necessarily so, within the jurisdiction of the provinces, such as education, but the whole field mentioned by the minister, such as ARDA, roads to resources, the trans-Canada highway and the like. We want to be assured that in any scheme to permit of a wholesale opting out we are not taking a step which will ultimately lead to the fragmentation of this nation and the deconfederation of our country.

Having said that, without going into great detail at this time, I conclude by saying that this is not as casual a matter as the minister has suggested in the statement he read to the house. This is one of the most serious matters which should and must receive consideration of parliament and of the provinces. Steps such as this, in order to achieve immediate purposes, are dangerous unless there is a most careful scrutiny and examination made to assure that in the years ahead the acceptance of the general principle of opting out by provinces will not lead to the creation in this country of a series of associated states, as it were; a culmination which I am sure none of us desires, because it would only lead to the weakening of national unity and a denial of the abiding purposes upon which confederation was envisaged, and finally consummated.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Chairman, while it is not possible to be sure what is intended by the legislation which is to come before us, I must say that I was somewhat disturbed by the minister's statement this afternoon, because it appears to bear out the anxiety I expressed some weeks, or possibly months ago, when I raised a question in the house about a speech made in Montreal by one of the minister's colleagues, the Secretary of State, which appeared to me to be an invitation to all the demands for fiscal decentralization.

At that time, the Secretary of State assured me that that was not his intention, and he very kindly provided me with the text of his speech in both French and English; and while there was nothing in that speech that one could definitely point to as an acceptance of even greater decentralization, the whole tone of it appeared to me to be in that direction.

This afternoon the minister has suggested the areas in which more decentralization should take place. In fact, he appeared to be of the opinion that when we have old age pensions, unemployment insurance and hospitalization across the country, we have pretty well completed the purposes of federal participation. It seems to me, sir, that there are some fundamental economic principles and fundamental national principles involved.

I was not impressed with the minister's quotation, that he who spends should be made to tax, which appears to me to be a clear statement of the government's desire to escape any odium by raising funds in an area in which it is not going to itself directly disperse them. That does not seem to me to be a very responsible attitude for a government of Canada.

I am concerned principally, however, Mr. Chairman, with the danger that I see resulting from a too far reaching program of decentralization, such as was outlined by the minister this afternoon—a danger to our federal control of the economy and monetary system. I have in mind the very close relationship which has grown up, and is now acknowledged by most people, between the federal government in this case, through national government bond issues, and national government fiscal powers and control over the monetary system. They are linked inseparably together, and in my view the government will have to be very careful as to how far it goes in the process of divesting itself of the fiscal power which will be required in order that it may fulfil its functions of controlling and managing the monetary system of our country.

The minister also made mention of conditional grants. I think this is an area where there should be some reform take place. These grants should perhaps be made on a much wider basis than they are at the present time, and I have in mind, for instance, grants that are made for hospital construction. It may very well be that in one province or other there happens to be at a particular time no current need for further hospital beds, but very urgent needs for other health services, perhaps in the way of cancer research or cancer treatment, or various medical projects of that sort.

As things stand at the present, of course the provincial governments cannot divert conditional grants made in regard to hospital construction to another purpose. I think it would be the better part of wisdom to make these conditional grants on a much wider basis, and base this decentralization of administration on that principle. I think it might well be quite dangerous to permit more and

more of the taxing powers in this country to devolve on the provincial government.

The minister made mention of the Rowell-Sirois commission. I have a very clear memory of that because I was sitting on the opposite side of the question in the provincial legislature. I remember the discussions that took place at that time about the transfer of fiscal powers from the provinces to the federal government. A great many fears were expressed as to the ultimate result of that transfer. I doubt whether anybody looking back over the history of the past 20 years could have any doubt that that was a move in the right direction, and if we consider what its specific and urgent purpose was, I think we will see how extremely important this division of fiscal powers is. It was, of course, brought on under the approaching pressures of war, which required a tremendous federal-national program of development. In order that we could have a national program of development for military purposes it was necessary to transfer many of the fiscal powers to the federal government.

I submit, sir, that we have today no less an urgent need for an overriding national economic development than we had in the 1940's when we were faced with that military situation, and for the government to divest itself of the powers which will be required in order to direct and stimulate that economic development at this time, seems to me to be extremely shortsighted. I hope that the tax structure committee in its examination of the tax structure of this country will bear these matters in mind and will not be too concerned about assuaging the local ambitions of provincial governments. I have on more than one occasion suggested that this problem of the provinces versus the federal government has been, as it is today, oversimplified.

We are being asked to believe that there is only one province in Canada which is engaged in these pressures for disintegration, if you like. Whereas it is perfectly obvious that this is an apparent characteristic of powerful provincial governments. Alongside that, if you are looking for separatists it is no good just looking over the Ottawa river. We should also look over the Rocky mountains. Indeed you may look also closer at hand. We have a very clear warning coming from Toronto these days that the Ontario government is getting all set to torpedo the national pension plan.

An hon. Member: The Christmas spirit.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): No Christmas spirit there. It is not Christmas day yet. These are dangerous trends in the country and they should be resisted in spite of a possible loss of favour among certain provincial potentates. I believe that today more than ever before there is a necessity for a national plan and a national purpose in the development of our country which can only be carried out if the federal government reserves to itself and retains adequate fiscal powers that will enable it to do so. I am extremely uneasy about the suggestions that have been made this afternoon by the minister. I can only hope my uneasiness may be allayed when I see the legislation, but I have very grave doubts in that regard.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, we listened with interest to the Minister of Finance when he spoke on the resolution respecting this measure of an interim nature dealing with certain conditional grants and shared cost programs. I am going to be as brief as possible and yet convey some of our thinking to the Minister of Finance in this regard.

He said first of all, I believe, that all of the provinces have agreed to review these shared cost programs, that this was being done through the tax study committee and that they were basically in agreement with the opting out provisions contained in the resolution. I think he could probably have been considerably more accurate if he had stated that in so far as the provinces are concerned there is unanimity respecting the matter of basic services, that all of the provinces have agreed that this is a proper area for the federal government to be in and that even though these services may fall within the jurisdiction of the provinces there should be minimum basic services in a number of the fields that the Minister of Finance suggested.

But when it comes to the matter of some of the formulas that have been concocted recently to distribute the tax revenue to pay for these shared cost programs there is vigorous disagreement. We in this party believe that there is a great need today for this kind of review. We also believe that along with such a review certain constitutional amendments should be made which would redefine and redelineate areas of responsibility. We in this party are becoming very concerned about the growth of a fourth level of government and the importance being placed on it. I refer to dominion-provincial conferences.

We believe we have almost reached the stage where a great deal of the authority in administering our national affairs has been taken away from the House of Commons. Whenever the government of the day raises in this chamber any matter that could have some overtones with regard to provincial jurisdiction the first question that is raised is: Have you cleared it with the provinces? I think this is an unhealthy situation that is developing.

The Minister of Finance said that since the war there has been a substantial growth in shared cost programs. The reason this has happened is that the federal government has not been willing to vacate or even partially yield some of the tax fields they took over from the provinces during the war years. In addition, the major growth of government expenditure has been in those areas assigned exclusively to the provinces under the constitution. I do not quarrel with that. I think the people have a right to have growth and expansion in those services they desire. In other words, they have a right to the results they want from the administration of their affairs and if it happens that the desire has been for expansion of services that were within the jurisdiction of the provincial governments, then I accept that. But what I do not accept is the fact that the federal government has not been willing to turn over these tax fields to the provinces so they could accept and discharge their responsibilities.

Another great problem that has led up to the situation in which we find ourselves today is the fact that all federal political parties have made campaign promises on matters exclusively within provincial jurisdiction. When the party elected to office attempts to keep these promises it finds itself in the situation where it has to negotiate with the provincial governments to find out whether it can undertake these things.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, there is one other thing about which we in this party are very disturbed, and we can see the kind of legislation that will follow this resolution, further aggravating the situation. I refer to the business of concocting formulas to meet a predetermined figure in dealing with the sharing of revenue. I am happy that the Minister of Finance referred to that famous quotation from *Hansard* of 1905 where it was said that the responsibility for collecting revenue must rest with the spending authority. This cannot be done completely and I realize that perhaps it would not be desirable to have different levels of personal income tax throughout the country, but I do think there should be some kind of fixed formula for the disbursement of revenue to the provinces.

We know, for example, that in the equalization payments certain factors are found in the formula that result in an unequal distribution of money. The province of Alberta has justifiably complained about the inclusion of half of the revenue from natural resources. I do not want to go into that subject deeply again because I am sure the Minister of Finance is quite familiar with the injustice of the inclusion of that factor in the tax equalization formula.

We also believe that the central government must maintain exclusive authority in certain areas and we certainly hope that the resolution and the bill to follow will not lead to a situation that will weaken the central government at a time when it needs to be strengthened. I am not one of those who believe in complete centralization and complete authority resting in the federal government in all fields but I think there are certain areas where the federal government needs to maintain its exclusive authority to the extent that it is not negotiable with the provinces at all. Otherwise we are always going to find ourselves in the situation of having to negotiate so-called political bargains with regard to the distribution of the tax dollars collected by the federal government.

We are not going to oppose the resolution, Mr. Chairman, or carry on the debate at any length today but we have certain reservations about this matter. In particular, we believe that the jurisdictions of the two levels of government should be redefined and that we should make sure that the federal government does not begin to move into provincial jurisdiction again as much as they have in the past, which in fact has led up to the situation that we face today.

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Chairman, there is one matter which I think I should clear up. The Leader of the Opposition in the course of his —I hope he won't think I am being offensive—refreshingly brief remarks said he would like an assurance from the minister that if the resolution is passed no action will be taken in the intervening months until the bill can be dealt with. Naturally, as I am sure he knows, I cannot give him that assurance. If the resolution is passed the provinces will be entitled to operate, as I think they are anyway, on the basis of the letters

from the Prime Minister, so far as deductions are concerned.

These changes will go into effect on January 1. Naturally, if the bill should not be passed by parliament adjustments will have to be made.

Mr. Cowan: I was quite prepared to discuss this resolution in detail but we are having the same treatment as last year when they brought in the C.B.C. estimates in the last hour of the last day of the year. In this resolution the expression is used, "that it is expedient to introduce a measure of an interim nature respecting certain conditional grant and shared cost programs." Would the minister be kind enough to state that when the bill comes down we will have time to discuss it in detail?

Order No. 2 on the order paper deals with the O'Leary report. This was introduced in the house on March 11 and a number of us have been waiting with interest for it to come up for discussion. Could the minister tell the committee—you ask me why I don't ask him privately, but I would like to have it on public record—at what time the bill might be brought up for discussion? Will it be nine months from now, as is the case with the O'Leary report introduced on March 11, or will it be introduced shortly after we reassemble on February 16?

Mr. Gordon: If the members of the committee would bear with me and permit me to answer the question I would be glad to do so. It would be my hope it would be one of the first items to be dealt with after we reassemble.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. Churchill: On division.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall I report the resolution?

Mr. Churchill: On division.

Resolution reported and concurred in, on division.

Mr. Gordon thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-142, respecting the operation of certain established federal-provincial programs.

Motion agreed to, on division, and bill read the first time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): When shall the said bill be read a second time? By leave now?

Mr. Churchill: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Next sitting of the house.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): May I have the indulgence of the house to read the following communication which has been addressed to the Speaker of the House of Commons:

Ottawa, December 18, 1964

Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Robert Taschereau, P.C., Chief Justice of Canada, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber today, the 18th December, at 5.45 p.m., for the purpose of giving the royal assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be,
sir,
Your obedient servant,
A. G. Cherrier
Assistant Secretary to the Governor General

FINANCE

AMENDMENT OF ACTS ADMINISTERED IN INSURANCE DEPARTMENT

On the order:

House in committee of the whole on Bill C-123, an act to amend certain acts administered in the Department of Insurance—The Minister of Finance.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Mr. Gordon, seconded by Mr. McIlraith, moves that I do now leave the chair for the house to go into committee of the whole on the said bill.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, what stage are we at now? I am afraid we have not followed you.

Mr. Knowles: It is order No. 76.

Mr. Churchill: Let us have a clear understanding. We have a few minutes left but this is a very long bill with 43 clauses and amendments thereto, and there was no agreement that we would deal with it this afternoon.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Absolutely not.

Mr. Gordon: It was dealt with by the committee.

Mr. Knowles: Let us take the labour code instead.

Mr. Gordon: Perhaps I might explain that this bill was referred to the banking and commerce committee after second reading. I indicated that I hoped the committee would favourably consider four amendments of

substance. The committee has now held its sessions. It has recommended the amendments that I suggested earlier, and one other one of a minor character, and it is reporting back to the house.

Mr. Churchill: I think it would be unwise for us to rush through a bill as important as this and as lengthy, despite the considerations of the committee. There are certain amendments which have to be looked at and the house would make itself look ridiculous if it pushed through a bill of this character in two or three minutes. We are not opposed to considering one or two other items if they are short and non-controversial.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could clarify the matter. We are quite agreeable to this not being proceeded with but I want to clear up one small matter. It is on the list I provided the house leader of the official opposition, but in any event we are quite content not to proceed with it now. It would be agreeable to us to call order No. 7 which I think is a bill of a nature that is not controversial, dealing with the Merchant Seamen Compensation Act.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Does the house agree that it be deemed order No. 76 has not been read?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

MERCHANT SEAMEN COMPENSATION ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING COMPENSATION ON INJURY OR DEATH

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (for the Minister of Labour) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-131, to amend the Merchant Seamen Compensation Act.

Mr. Churchill: Where is the minister in charge?

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Diefenbaker: You are speaking from a good position over there.

Mr. Knowles: Shouldn't the hon. member be in his right seat?

Mr. Churchill: Where is the Minister of Labour?

Mr. Byrne: Since the sittings of the house were out of order for such long periods today at the earlier stages I thought it would be more convenient to conduct the proceedings from one of the seats on the front bench.

[Mr. Gordon.]

In the absence of the minister, who is receiving a delegation today, I have been asked to proceed with this measure. While it does not seem to be one of exceeding importance it does have the effect of paying compensation primarily to the widows and dependants of merchant seamen who lost their lives in the performance of their duties. Because these accidents took place some years ago the rate of compensation is of course not in line with present practices and payments.

On the resolution stage the minister made a somewhat lengthy statement and of course I have a rather lengthy prepared statement here this afternoon. But understanding that the house wishes to proceed as rapidly as possible with these various measures I thought a short summary might be aceptable. The bill applies to no more than 2,300 seamen who are not otherwise covered by provincial statutes. The adjustments to be made will be made through the consolidated revenue fund as is the common practice under provincial statutes but with the adjustments in the future being paid by the employer. The measure provides for the raising of the age limit with respect to payments to dependants between 18 and 21 years of age having regard to the practice in other spheres of jurisdiction and to the policy of the government to keep chidren and youths in school as long as they are able to absorb the training open to them. For these reasons the payments will be extended to 21 years if the dependant remains in a recognized institution of learning.

During the resolution stage the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Cameron) inquired why the rates of which benefits are paid are not more in line with those in existence on the west coast. It should be pointed out that this legislation does not affect seamen on the west coast. In any event I believe the amendments do bring the basis upon which compensation is paid up to $5,000 from $4,500, which is in line with the provisions of provincial statutes. The hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) was concerned that there seemed to be relatively few who were receiving permanent partial disability payments. This is because of the sad fact that most of the permanent disability payments are on behalf of dependants of seamen who lost their lives during the performance of their duties. There are I believe some five seamen receiving permanent partial disability or total disability payments.

The waiting period has been reduced from four days to three days and burial allowance has been raised from $200 to $300.

In the absence of any assurance as to when this legislation would come before the house we did not make arrangements for any officials to be here. However, I would be prepared to answer to the best of my ability any questions which members may wish to raise.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): As far as we are concerned, we have studied this bill and approved of it and are prepared to pass it; we will not ply the parliamentary secretary with questions which he may not be able to answer.

The amendment proposed here appear to be sensible amendments and if they meet the requirements of the merchant seamen then, of course, they should go through the house. To the extent that provision is being made for widows and dependant children, we are entirely in agreement with the idea. As far as our party is concerned we are prepared to accept this bill and proceed with it right away.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee and reported.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McIlraith (for Mr. MacEachen) moved the third reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

TRADE

APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND HUNGARY

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (for the Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved:

That it is expedient that the houses of parliament do approve the trade agreement between Canada and the Hungarian People's Republic, signed at Ottawa, June 11, 1964, and laid before the House of Commons on June 11, 1964; and that this house do approve the same.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the house leader one question. I have no objection to this resolution, but are there any bills which are short and with which it is necessary that we deal before this house adjourns? Are there any such bills that required to be dealt with now?

Mr. McIlraith: I believe not, Mr. Speaker. There are a couple of other bills that I mentioned in the list given the other day, but there has been some question about taking them now. For that reason I was asked to have called the items concerned with the approval of trade agreements.

Mr. Pennell: Mr. Speaker, if I may interpose here, it is my understanding that Bill No. C-137 is essential. This is the C.N.R. financing and guarantee act.

Mr. McIlraith: There was an agreement about that.

Mr. Pennell: I may have been out of the house at the time.

Motion agreed to.

APPROVAL OF RENEWAL OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND RUSSIA

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (for the Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved:

That it is expedient that the houses of parliament do approve the protocol renewing the trade agreement between Canada and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, signed on February 29, 1956, and renewed on April 18, 1960, signed at Ottawa September 16, 1963, laid before the House of Commons on October 9, 1963; and that this house do approve the same.

Motion agreed to.

APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND BULGARIA

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (for the Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved:

That it is expedient that the houses of parliament do approve the trade agreement between Canada and the People's Republic of Bulgaria, signed at Ottawa, October 8, 1963, and laid before the House of Commons on October 21, 1963; and that this house do approve the same.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, may we now suspend the sitting until the bells ring?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have the consent of the house to revert to motions in order to table documents that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) undertook to table earlier today. One was a letter from the Prime Minister to his cabinet colleagues. This was referred to in the early part of today's proceedings and the Prime Minister undertook to table it. If I receive consent to revert to motions for that purpose, I will table this document.

The other material that I will table is correspondence that passed between the Prime Minister and the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale). There was a letter from the Prime Minister dated December 14,

a reply dated December 15, with certain enclosures, and attached to that is the envelope in which the reply came.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could take advantage of the good nature of the house, in this interval while we are awaiting a call from the other place for royal assent, to extend on my own behalf and on behalf of the government the good wishes of the season to the staff of the House of Commons. Unlike many of my predecessors who have done this in the past, I do not propose to single them out by groups or categories, because I have found that on every occasion on which that has been done in the past one particular group or category has been overlooked. This has never failed in all the years these good wishes have been expressed. Therefore I would content myself with expressing good wishes for a very happy Christmas and good health and prosperity in the new year to all the members of the staff who make the work of this place possible. I am sure I express the wishes of all hon. members in this regard.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McIlraith: I should also like, on my own behalf and on behalf of the government, to extend the good wishes of the season to all hon. members, and the hope that they will have a good Christmas with their families. I say that with some feeling for all hon. members in this house, because it has been an extraordinary session in that hon. members have been kept away from friends in their constituencies for a very long time, and have been kept away, in all too many cases, from their own families for too long a time this year. Mr. Speaker, while I have looked forward very much to this Christmas recess, I am sure that hon. members who have been separated from their families have looked forward to it even more. Therefore I would like to extend to them and their families the very good wishes of the season and for a very quick reunion with their families in order that they may celebrate the Christmas season together.

I should also like, if I may, to express a little of my own feeling, namely the hope that the adjournment will provide an opportunity for hon. members to have some rest and an opportunity to get that necessary degree of objectivity into our thoughts again before the session reconvenes so that we will come back here refreshed, rested and with the kind of approach to our problems that I am sure we should all have.

Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure how one does this, but I should like to express best wishes to His Honour the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker and the chairman of committees. Without more ado, I wish one and all a very merry Christmas and a happy new year.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the government house leader in expressing our good wishes to Mr. Speaker, his associates and all the people who serve the House of Commons so well. I would like to be as objective as the house leader; in fact, I thought we were always showing objectivity around here. If this were not 5.30 on Friday afternoon, December 18, on the 214th day of the session, I might attempt an eloquent speech in praise of the government house leader. But I have energy enough left only to wish him a merry Christmas; and as far as the new year is concerned, I wish him continued happiness in his private life and the strength to endure his public responsibilities.

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper to join with the house leader in his remarks regarding the staff. It seems to me that the staff has carried a burden because of our presence here for such a continuous length of time. Each of us sees only certain facets of the operation. Along the corridor from me is the *Hansard* index branch, where I have frequently seen people working overtime in the evenings. I realize the strain that particular branch of the staff of the House of Commons has been under and I imagine it applies throughout. I think we should not only give them our best wishes but also extend them something of an apology for the session we have had, which has put this particular load upon them. Most of them, of course, have borne it very well.

I am afraid I am not so much in the Christmas spirit that I am going to accept the remarks of the house leader to the effect that we will return after our break with some kind of renewed objectivity. It seems to me as this part of the session was coming to an end that we were finally becoming objective; that we were finally getting the measure of this government and just how good or bad it is. But I am leading into political activities and I suggest to the house leader and the members across the way

that if they want to close this part of the session with a smile they should take a look at tonight's Toronto *Star* and the wonderful cartoon by Duncan Macpherson. If they do that they will leave here with probably a feeling of amusement which is shared by the members on the opposite side of the house.

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I should like on behalf of the Social Credit party to join the expressions of good will to all members of the staff, to all members of parliament representing their constituencies and also to all those people they represent. At this time I remember the words of one delegate to the commonwealth parliamentary association from Western Samoa, when he rose to take part in discussions recently held in Jamaica. He said that they had a custom in his country which he felt he ought to follow, and that was first of all to give thanks to our Heavenly Father for his goodness. I bring that in just to remind us all that in the midst of all the festivities and the joy and hilarity of this season it would do us well to remember the real purpose and significance of this season, which is remembering the goodness of God. So as I say, we join in expressing good wishes to all who have served us and who do serve us so well in this house, as well as to each and every member of parliament and to the people of Canada.

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, being at this moment the only French Canadian on the opposition side of the house I wonder if, on behalf of the hon. members from Quebec, I may extend their very best wishes to every member of this house. I should also like to extend my very best regards to the Chair and to those who have occupied it since the beginning of this session. I think they have done a tremendous job because the work load put upon them was heavy. Even though during the course of debates we may have been divided on many occasions, and in certain cases accusations have been made against some people in Quebec, I can say for sure that all of us together at this time of year would like to forget about our divisions so that we can extend to each other our best wishes for a happy Christmas and a happy new year.

[*Translation*]

I should like to add that the French Canadian members have certainly appreciated, up to a point, the way in which debates have taken place in this house during the year. We appreciate the gains and progresses made, not only for the French Canadian group, but also the English Canadian group, in short for all Canadians across the land.

I can, on closing, but express the hope and the wish that the year 1965, which will see us all, I hope, together again in early February, will bring more progress and less discussion of the type that creates division.

My very best wishes to one and all on behalf of all my French speaking colleagues in the opposition.

[*Text*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

CHRISTMAS ADJOURNMENT

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, may I have unanimous consent to put the formal motion for adjournment at this point? I move, seconded by the Solicitor General (Mr. MacNaught):

> That, when this house adjourns this day, it stands adjourned until the 16th day of February, 1965, at 2.30 o'clock p.m., provided always that if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, after consultation with Her Majesty's government, that the public interest requires that the house should meet at an earlier time during the adjournment, Mr. Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied, and thereupon the house shall meet at the time stated in such notice, and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time.
>
> In the event of Mr. Speaker being unable to act owing to illness or other cause, the Deputy Speaker shall act in his stead for the purpose of this order.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, we are, of course, prepared to support this motion, and I do not wish to detract from the things which have been said in the spirit of the season we are about to enter. Nevertheless before this motion does carry I feel I must register our protest at this part of the session being adjourned without our having completed a very important piece of legislation. The government, of course, knows what I have in mind, because we had something to say about it earlier this afternoon. I refer, indeed, to the Canada labour code.

I should like to remind the government that when this session met first, ten months ago today, the proposed labour code was an important item in the speech from the throne. Two days later the Prime Minister spoke in this house and indicated, on February 20, the priorities in the view of the government for this session.

It is interesting to recall the first three items on that priority list. Number one was the Canada pension plan, No. 2 was the

student loan legislation, and No. 3 was the Canada labour code. Here we are, ten months later adjourning, and only one of those three first items has been enacted by parliament.

As the session went on we were given commitments that the labour code would be brought in by certain dates. Then we were given a firm commitment that it would be enacted before we broke off for the Christmas recess.

We are aware of the explanations given today by the house leader and by the Prime Minister, but we can hardly be blamed if we are a bit suspicious as to whether or not this legislation will get through during this session. It has been promised for years. It was the subject of a firm commitment this session, and for that part of this session before Christmas. We have now had to accept another commitment, namely that this government hopes that it will be passed before the session really ends, whether that is in February or March.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, we are ready to accept this motion. As a matter of fact we are glad the government is not asking that parliament be prorogued at this time but is merely seeking to adjourn it so that items such as the Canada pension plan and the Canada labour code can be concluded before this session ends, and we call upon the government to make absolutely sure that these commitments are not broken. With that understanding we are prepared to support the motion.

I am sorry I had to break into the kind of thing that was being said a few moments ago, because, like all of us in this house, I too share in the hope that everyone will enjoy a happy Christmas season and that we will have a productive and useful 1965.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a few minutes left while we wait for the signal from the other place, and I should like to draw to the attention of the members of this house once again the 15th report which was tabled in this house on Monday of this week. I ask hon. members to study it very carefully particularly those members of the government who will have to bring forward legislation to give effect to some of the recommendations which have been made.

If we can adopt most or all of the recommendations contained in this report we will not again have a situation developing such as we have just been through. There is provision in the report for detailed and exhaustive study of the estimates. If the estimates can be considered and passed early in a session, that will preclude the need for interim supply motions and things of that nature.

This would also accomplish one other important thing which has been pointed up during the long months of this session. The adoption of this report would provide one week out of five during which the members of this house could attend to their business in their constituencies. This would not only add to the efficiency and effectiveness of parliament, but add greatly to the effectiveness of democracy.

Certainly after having spent month after month in Ottawa, in some cases hundreds or even thousands of miles away from the people we represent, it is not possible to reflect accurately the opinions of those people in this house. There ought to be some practical time when a member can be available to his constituents to meet with them so as to be able to represent their feelings in this house.

In conclusion I make a last minute appeal to hon. members to give very serious consideration to these recommendations so that they can be dealt with at the end of this session, in order that they may become effective for the next session. If this report dies when this session is prorogued we will not then have the necessary amendments to the standing orders and other procedure so that the next session can be conducted in an orderly and businesslike fashion.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

A message was delivered by Major C. R. Lamoureux, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable house in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the house went up to the Senate chamber.

And being returned:

Mr. Deputy Speaker informed the house that the Deputy Governor General had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills:

An act to amend the Judges Act.
An act to amend an act to amend the Combines Investigation Act and the Criminal Code.

Motion (Mr. McIlraith) agreed to, and the house adjourned.

APPENDIX

COMMUNIQUÉ FOLLOWING NATO MINISTERIAL COUNCIL MEETING

FINAL COMMUNIQUÉ

The North Atlantic council met in ministerial session in Paris on 15th, 16th and 17th December, 1964.

2. Ministers surveyed the whole field of east-west relations. The basic causes of tension still persist, and will persist as long as it remains the aim of the communist countries to extend their system to the whole world. Ministers noted that recent developments in China and the Soviet union have increased the uncertainties with which the world is faced. They reiterated their conviction that it remained essential for the alliance to maintain and strengthen its unity.

3. Ministers also reviewed the situation in various areas in Asia, Africa and Latin America. They reaffirmed their interest in the stability of these areas and in the economic and social welfare of the peoples concerned.

4. In their discussions on the state and future progress of the alliance, ministers emphasized the importance of strengthening and deepening their political consultation. Recognizing the challenges that may face the organization in the years ahead, they directed the council in permanent session to study the state of the alliance and the purposes and objectives commonly accepted by all members, and to keep ministers informed.

5. Ministers reaffirmed their determination to continue their efforts to find a peaceful solution to the questions at issue between east and west. In particular, they continue to attach great importance to making progress toward meeting the legitimate aspirations of the German people to reunification on the basis of their right to self determination. In regard to Berlin, ministers confirmed the terms of their declaration of 16th December, 1958.

6. Ministers expressed their conviction that the unity and military preparedness of the alliance had safeguarded peace and preserved the freedom of the west in the past. So long as general and complete disarmament under effective international control has not been achieved, any weakening of the allied defensive posture would expose the alliance to increased pressures. Ministers therefore stressed the importance of maintaining the cohesion of member states in the strategic as well as the political field. Only a military structure demonstrably capable of swift and vigorous reaction to any aggression can meet the threat. To maintain such a structure, involving as it does a continuous adaptation to changing requirements, necessitates a persistent effort to improve the readiness, state of training, and equipment of the forces of the alliance. It further requires a sound economic basis for the defence effort and the most rational use of available resources.

7. Ministers also confirmed their determination to continue their efforts to arrive at agreements in the field of disarmament. In this connection, they stressed the importance of avoiding the dissemination of nuclear weapons.

8. Ministers examined the problems confronting the alliance in the field of conventional and nuclear weapons. A thorough exchange of views on these problems took place and will be continued.

9. Ministers took note of developments in the studies of the interrelated questions of strategy, force requirements and resources, initiated in pursuance of the decisions taken at their meeting in Ottawa in May 1963. They reaffirmed the significance they attached to these studies and instructed the council in permanent session to continue them with the assistance of the NATO military authorities.

10. Ministers also considered the special military and economic problems of Greece and Turkey. They reaffirmed the need for accelerating the economic development of these two allied countries, and for an effort to strengthen the defence of the southeastern region of NATO. They instructed the council in permanent session to continue to examine these questions urgently.

11. In the spirit of previous resolutions on defence aid to Greece in 1963 and 1964, ministers established a procedure aimed at contributing to the solution of the special defence problems of Greece and Turkey in 1965.

12. With regard to Greek-Turkish relations, ministers heard a report by the secretary general on the "watching brief" conferred on his

predecessor at The Hague in May 1964. In an effort to improve these relations and in the interests of the solidarity of the alliance, they agreed that this "watching brief" should continue. They reaffirmed their determination to lose no opportunity of contributing to a reduction in tension and a peaceful, agreed and equitable solution of the problem of Cyprus, confirming also their support for the efforts of the United Nations and the mediator.

13. Ministers considered a report on civil emergency planning. They reaffirmed the importance of such planning within the context of over-all defence, noting the progress which had been achieved and the work which remained to be done.

14. The next meeting of the North Atlantic council at ministerial level will be held on the invitation of the United Kingdom government in London in May, 1965.

END OF VOLUME X